

George Shapiro

- Youth and education 1
 - minor league baseball pitcher 2
 - undergraduate, University of Iowa and Wisconsin 2
- University of Minnesota, 1954-55
 - Smith, Don 2
 - Howell, William 2
 - models of open scholarship and community engagement 3
 - cross-disciplinary 4
 - break-up of Speech Communications Department, 1960s 5
 - tradition of general education 6
 - broken by specialization 6
 - faculty judging of high school rhetoric 7-8
- Williamson, E.G. - as dean 9
- University of Minnesota course in leadership 10
- Shapiro's military service, infantry, 1953 11
 - nuclear weapon tests 11
- Focus on ethical leadership 13
- Keller, Kenneth 13
 - antagonizes key constituencies 13
- Philosophical division within faculty 14-15
- Sibley, Mulford - debates 16
 - free speech issue 17
- Faculty Consultative Committee 19
 - Moos, Malcolm - leaves 19
- Search for vice-president for Academic Affairs 20
- Place of intercollegiate athletics 21
- Low faculty morale - recent trends 22
- Ziebarth, E.W. 23
 - tenure and promotion 23
 - litigious climate 23
 - drift in Central Administration 25
 - decline of sense of community 26
 - lack of vision 27-28
 - academic entrepreneurship 29
 - pressures on young faculty 32

Interview with George Shapiro

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

Interviewed on October 11, 1994

George Shapiro - GS
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers and I'm doing this afternoon—which is Tuesday the 11th of October—an interview with Professor George Shapiro who has been at the University of Minnesota in Speech-Communications for a long, long time, and has been active in many college, and university, and departmental affairs. He has had several different research interests but certainly most prominently the whole issue of ethical leadership which has been crucial to the university as well to Speech-Communications.

As I suggested, George, it's kind of fun to start with an intellectual autobiography, not an extended one, but how on earth were you turned on, and how did you learn about universities? How did you learn about Speech-Communications as a field? What was your perception of it? Where did you get your graduate training? How did you get to Minnesota? There's a whole set of questions.

GS: Oh lord! At twenty-four, if somebody would have said, "Are you going to be a university professor?" I would have said, "No way." At twenty-four, I was planning to be a major league baseball player.

CAC: Heavens!

GS: Yes. The difference between me and Sandy Koufax . . . we were both left-handed . . . we were both Jewish, but he had ability and I didn't.

CAC: [laughter] But you were a pitcher?

GS: Yes.

CAC: Semi-pro?

GS: Semi-pro . . . one year of minor league ball.

CAC: Good grief! With what farm?

GS: The Chicago Cub farm system. Then I got called back into service. I'd been in the service at the age of eighteen and I got called back in. I had done part of my academic work at the University of Iowa, part of it at the University of Wisconsin, and loved the University of Wisconsin. I found that a very compatible place. I got called back into the service and then when it came time to get out, I was somewhat searching, you know, and wasn't sure where I was going with my life. I came to the University of Minnesota, found two courses that looked interesting to me in the graduate level both of them taught by people you know well. One was taught by Donald K. Smith, who later became vice-president of the this university, and vice-president of the University of Wisconsin. The other was taught by Bill Howell, William S. Howell, who became my mentor. Bill made I sure I followed in his overshoe steps, in his galoshes steps. He had been chair of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs; and later when I became a faculty member, I became a member of that committee, and then chair of that committee. Then he became vice-president of the University Senate and then later I became vice-president of the University Senate.. He kind of groomed me and he was truly a mentor for me.

CAC: What do those ingredients consist of? He did these things to set a model but beyond that what is that mentoring role?

GS: He let me argue with him. We discussed things in his office. We would argue and dialectic dialog . . . call it what you will. He really set an example for an open scholar who was always willing to learn, and always willing to teach in various contexts, in many different kinds of contexts. It might be in his office or it might be in the locker room of Cooke Hall after we had played racquetball or tennis. That's why I have a theory which I modestly call Shapiro's Theory of Integrated Locker Rooms that women will get male mentors when the locker rooms are integrated.

CAC: [laughter] Yes.

GS: So much of it happened there when we'd either dress to go out and play racquetball or tennis or we'd be in the shower, and we'd talk about things about the university, about Minnesota politics. As you know, Don Smith was actively engaged in speech writing for the DFL [Democratic Farmer Labor], and so Minnesota politics was always a topic and world issues. Bill was very tuned in. His research was on radio Moscow, so he was always listening to what was going on in Europe. My undergraduate studies were in political science on Eastern Europe. So we fit together. They invited me to finish my graduate work here instead of going back to

Wisconsin. Wisconsin was on the semester system. Minnesota was on the quarter system and when I got out of the service, the Wisconsin semester had already started.

CAC: These are about what years?

GS: Nineteen fifty-four, fifty-five. I came here for one quarter. Then I was going to play ball in the summer and go back to Wisconsin in the fall. They invited me to stay and become what we called a teaching assistant back then. I did and got my Ph.D. Then they invited me to remain on the faculty . . . which I did.

CAC: It wasn't unusual in those days to do?

GS: No, it wasn't. Now, of course, it's extremely unusual and wisely so, I think. We need new and fresh kinds of thinking. It perhaps would have been wiser for me to move. As you know, a number of people came out of our department. E.W. Ziebarth was the dean, and the vice-president, and acting president at one time of the college . . . came out of our department.

CAC: And chaired your department at some time?

GS: And chaired our department. Don Smith chaired the department, and was a vice-president here, and then moved on. The department was such an interesting place, Clarke. This is part of this intellectual history perhaps at least of our department, if not the university . . . the hiring criteria, I would like to think, were: first, intelligence; second, creativity; and then third, a tolerance for all points of view. We were not specialists.

CAC: No party line. Oh, I mean specialist.

GS: Not even specialists in a narrow sense. Howard Gilkenson who was a psychologist but also a rhetorician, just a wonderfully open man. They set a tremendously open climate and a climate of respect for different points of view. I remember when Ernie Bormann came here. Ernie's a colleague of mine who just retired. Don Smith was ghost writing for Hubert Humphrey and for Orville Freeman. Ernie Bormann thought ghost writing was unethical. So Ernie wrote an article to that effect in a journal . . . young untenured assistant professor.

CAC: [laughter]

GS: And Smith wrote an article and then they debated here on campus on the issue—best of friends, most respectful of each other. Then they went national and toured nationally with this issue of Is ghost writing ethical or unethical? They were hammer and tongs in the debate sense and greatest respect and regard for each other, warm respect and regard for each other. That was the climate of that department. I also felt that in other departments I was fortunate enough to operate in. Back in the 1960s, I was very interested in the culture of poverty; and Barbara Knudson latched on to me, and would buy some of my time from the university to work on some

her projects. So I got to know people . . . Esther Watenberg, and Barbara Knudson, and Gisela [Konopka].

CAC: You had elbow room in your department?

GS: Oh, yes. They would sell me high and buy me low. [laughter] People like Gisela, and Barbara, and Esther, and John—why am I blocking on his name. He used to be in the Law School. He was a social worker and ran the program on juvenile delinquency in the summer to train—John Ellingson. Thank you.

CAC: Okay.

GS: So there was this cross-cultural synthesis of different points of view and openly. That was an extremely open kind of cross-disciplinary environment. I was extremely attracted to that and stayed. I took an early retirement. I chose to retire when I was sixty-two. I am now sixty-five.

CAC: Well, phased rather . . .

GS: Phased. I was going to go the whole way. I was going to go terminal but Bob Scott talked me out of that. One of the reasons I decided to do that is I tried to do what I could do to continue or restimulate that cross-cultural openness and I wasn't successful. I saw the university . . .

CAC: You mean in other agency or institutional settings?

GS: Yes. I saw the university closing down, and in a sense building little walls around departments, and isolating themselves from each other . . . not only building little walls around departments but building little walls around specialties within departments. So there wasn't this respectful kind of thing that you would see between a Bormann and a Smith.

CAC: But they were in the same field.

GS: You're right.

CAC: But your department also had Speech Pathology, Theater Arts . . .

GS: Oh, yes. And at one time, all senior faculty, except those who were administrators, taught the basic speech course.

CAC: Even if they were in Speech Pathology?

GS: That's right. Or if they were in Theater. We came together every other Thursday afternoon for a meeting with the graduate students who taught the course and any other graduate students

who wanted to come and the senior faculty. We would always have an issue on the agenda and a couple of the graduate students and a couple of the faculty would debate and discuss that particular issue.

CAC: This lasts through the 1960s?

GS: That's when it started to fall off . . . when our senior faculty no longer taught the course. The departments broke up. I think Pathology left. We called them Speech Path. They're now called Communication Disorders. I think Speech Path/Communication Disorders saw that they could get more money if they went into the College of Education, that research grants would be more readily available.

CAC: Special Ed was just getting going there.

GS: Exactly. They went into that direction. When I first came here, I was assigned part time to them. I was doing work so I knew Ernie Henrickson, Bryng Bryngelson, Clark Starr and those people.

CAC: Ah! And you could do that research yourself?

GS: Yes, I was doing work on stage fright back then. [laughter]

CAC: Oh, tell me just a two minutes about that. How on earth does one do work on stage fright?

GS: They had both an oral and a paper and pencil test on stage fright that are supposedly national standardized, and so forth, and then the oral test that we'd come in and interview. Students who were severely stage frightened, if they wished, could get special help on that. I was the person who did the special help. We would get large samples of people who were supposedly stage frightened and those who weren't, and did different kinds of research in terms of physiological responses, their own internal responses, how they felt as a second type of measure, and then thirdly, how they were judged in terms of their stress and tension by outsiders. So that's how I got to know Ernie, and Clark Starr, and Bryng Bryngelson, and Dick Martin, and those people.

CAC: Did you get so you could predict, with graduate students for example, which ones were likely to be self assured and which one might get stage fright?

GS: No. No.

CAC: So it wasn't a predictive social science that you were . . .

GS: No, not really. It was kind of a post-dictive kind of a thing.. After you got the data, you explained why. [laughter] [Sigmund] Freud once said, "Psychology is a post-dictive science." Of course [B.F.] Skinner disagreed with him. So be it. There was that climate at the university.

CAC: Which meant that many of you, if not all of all of you, could be generalists?

GS: Yes.

CAC: You were encouraged to be generalists?

GS: Yes, absolutely. The people that I served on committees with were also broadly educated people. They were conversant in many areas not just in very narrow specialty. So that they didn't build the political boundaries around the speciality that I later saw happening here.

CAC: How soon did that come, do you think, George?.

GS: I think it started to come with the struggle for research grants when research dollars got harder to get. I think in our own department, in our own field . . .

CAC: I was going to propose that that's when they were easy to get that the splits came.

GS: Yes. In our own field it came earlier than that. Yes. When the people who were trained in the psychological background found it relatively easy to get research grants and the rhetoricians, the people who studied . . .

CAC: More humanistic?

GS: Exactly, the more humanistic people were not able to get research grants. Then there became the withs and the withouts, those who got it and those who don't. It became a kind of pecking order thing and a power thing.

CAC: Does it mean also that there was a difficulty of communicating when these subfields became more specialized or not?

GS: I think the difficulty in communicating came because the psychologists were putting down the humanists. That was the difficulty in communicating. They were disdainful many times of the humanists. We are very fortunate to have in our department a couple of people who are good in both areas. Unfortunately, we are losing one of them now to Texas A & M.—it's a real loss—a person who is outstanding as a humanist and outstanding as a psychological theoretician, who I would call multi-cultural in that perspective. For us it came earlier. It came when the research dollars started flowing in, and the psychologists got them, and the humanists didn't.

CAC: Now, this doesn't explain the Theater Arts though. They would seem to . . .

GS: Theater Arts. My explanation of Theater Arts is that . . . Coming from South Dakota, I would always pronounce it The·ā' ter Arts and they wanted it pronounced Thē'a ter Arts. They spent about two years trying to teach me how to say Thē'a ter.

CAC: [laughter]

GS: And I persisted in saying The·ā' ter and they could not stand it any longer. [laughter] No, that's partially a put on.

CAC: Yes.

GS: But Moulton and Ballet would just every time try to teach me, and of course I knew how to say Thē'a ter, and I would say, "Okay, now you guys in The·ā' ter . . ." Oh! It's like rubbing your fingers against the chalkboard.

CAC: [laughter]

GS: It was so much fun. Of course, Bob Scott, and Bill Howell, and Ernie, and Don knew exactly what I was doing. That split came. It was interesting. When this library opened up, the Wilson Library . . .

CAC: On the west campus?

GS: Yes, on the west campus. They asked us for our needs so that we could in a sense do an explanation of what we'd need in the library and at the same time the Guthrie Theater came in. It became clear to both of us that we wanted to remain a liberal art in the true sense of the word liberal arts. Their meat and potatoes came from these Guthrie fellowships, training of actors, training of directors, training of designers.

CAC: Which before they had not? They'd been general service and outreach to Minnesota?

GS: Doc Whiting was a chemist! He taught chemistry in high school.

CAC: He taught chemistry, right.

GS: He taught chemistry in high school. [laughter] Many was the time in the spring of the year, in March and April when we get our big snow storms, I would travel with people from Theater and judge debate and speech contests. They were qualified to do that.

CAC: Sure.

GS: We would travel together to Greater Minnesota and always run into a blizzard of some sort, and have to stay and hear wild stories about the theater, and so on. Yes, they were much more generalists, liberal arts, humanities oriented. So we saw—and they saw—that it was appropriate.

CAC: The division again was really more political again than it was intellectual?

GS: Yes. Yes. Then I think as it became more professional, then you had to be the specialist in the voice. You had to be the specialist in scene design of early French or later English, or you know how these things break down. We persisted—and we still do to this day—in claiming that we are a liberal art. We do not train people for a job. When I was director of undergraduate studies, students would come in and say, "Okay, what kind of job can I get?" I would say, "What you'd best do is go to the Office of Recommendation. They collect data on what history majors do, what political science majors do, what speech majors do, how successful they are in getting jobs, and what their salaries are. We do not claim to be that kind of place."

CAC: What did the hyphen with Speech-Communication mean?

GS: Oh, that's interesting. Again, you're getting a distorted view here. My claim is that happened again because of the research bucks. Speech didn't mean much to the research granting agencies in Washington, D.C. . . .

CAC: Ah.

GS: . . . unless you were talking Speech Pathology. So we had to add the word communication which would make us more attractive to that whole process.

CAC: But it didn't mean a change in the courses you taught or how you taught them?

GS: To the extent that we got new data on the communication process and that we started turning more to the social sciences for data, the people that studied small groups like [unclear], and people who would study organizational kinds of things who came out of psychology and sociology . . . yes, we approached things somewhat differently. For me personally, it's come full circle because I'm now convinced, in terms of my understanding of organizations, that if you really want to understand an organization, you understand the rhetoric of that organization, the politics which is reflected through the rhetoric of the organization. The best way to get into the heart of an organization is to get at the lines of argument . . . who has to say what to whom, when, where, why, and how. Aristotle . . . you know, all the available means of persuasion. And I've come full circle on that. I only had one course in Aristotle as a student and I'm now convinced that that's the way to understand organizations.

CAC: What range of courses did you yourself teach then in those early years?

GS: Oh, like all of us, I taught the basic course. My background was in psychology in the graduate field at Wisconsin. Bryng Bryngelson had an old course called Personality Development through Speech. It was highly Freudian. When he left, I took that over and made it much less Freudian. We now have broken that into two courses: one which is a basic theory course on communications theories and the other which is about problems of interpersonal communication. Then with Bill Howell and Ralph Nichols . . . Do you remember Ralph?

CAC: Oh, my wife worked for him for three or four years.

GS: The St. Paul campus.

CAC: The listening . . .

GS: The listening man. Right. Speech turned inside out, listening. Nick became kind of a mentor of mine, too. They were doing a lot of stuff in organizations. I got interested in organizational communication so that was one of my areas. Then in the last ten years, or fifteen years . . . You remember Paul Cashman? Paul had been a professor of Rhetoric on the St. Paul campus . . . outstanding teacher, very find teacher. He became vice-president of Student Affairs when Met Wilson came and I think he appointed a vice-president of Student Affairs because he wanted to not deal directly with Ed Williamson.

CAC: [laughter]

GS: Ed was so powerful.

CAC: Yes, you bet.

GS: Do you remember?

CAC: Oh, yes.

GS: Ed had dollars in everything, from the VA [Veterans Administration], all the Student Affairs dollars. So he had the health service and the counseling, and the Speech and Hearing Clinic. A terribly powerful guy.

CAC: And a national reputation he could bring to everything.

GS: And a national reputation. I think that's why we got a vice-president of Student Affairs, so Paul became vice-president of Student Affairs. Then when he left that position, we had during the Vietnam War . . . I'm skipping all over. During the Vietnam War there was a movement on many campuses to get rid of R.O.T.C. [Reserve Officers' Training Corps]. Our compromise was to take a number of the R.O.T.C. courses which could be taught, and appropriately taught by tenured faculty, out of the hands of the military office . . . military geography, history . . .

CAC: Ah.

GS: Leadership, okay? Well, Leadership went up for grabs. Nobody in the Business School wanted the Leadership course. Nobody in Psychology wanted the Leadership course. Remember, this is Vietnam, 1964, 1965, 1966?

CAC: Yes. Plus the women's movement and other things that operated by consensus?

GS: Yes. And again, my analysis of that is the Business School and the Psychology Department did not want the Leadership course because to study Leadership effectively requires qualitative rather than quantitative data. It's very difficult to do variable analytic research on real leaders. They won't stand still for control groups and experimental groups. [laughter] That was the kind of research the School of Management wanted to do, to get published in research and tenure. That was the kind of research the Psychology Department was doing to get publication in research and tenure. That was the kind of research the Sociology Department was doing. That kind of came up for grabs. Bill Howell was on the circle discussing this whole thing and said, "Well, Aristotle wrote about these kinds of things so we'll take the Leadership course." So the Leadership course became placed in our department.

CAC: Good grief. That's an engaging story.

GS: If you look at Leadership as leaders are people who have followers, then a followership requires persuasion. You've got to persuade people to follow. You go back to Aristotle, the rhetoric of Aristotle, persuasion. So we had that course and when Paul Cashman wanted to leave the vice-presidency, Leadership was one of the courses he was to teach. And he taught it. Then one summer day, Bob Scott called me. Paul and I had worked together on a course, not the Leadership course but a different course. I knew Paul wasn't feeling well. Bob called and said, "Paul Cashman has died." I was saddened by that. I said, "Goodby. Thank you." He said, No, I'm not through.—Bob was the chair of the department—"We need you to teach his course." Paul taught two courses. He taught Leadership and he taught Sexual Communications. I said, "I'm not going to teach Sexual Communications. God, I know absolutely nothing about that." He said, "No, we don't expect you to teach Sexual Communications. We expect you to teach the Leadership course because you've done work in organizations." So, I said to him—I made a great mistake at that moment—"I'll teach the Leadership course on two conditions: (1) I can wear my old army uniform and (2) I can teach a bunch of ethics in it because I'm very concerned about ethics in leadership." He said, "You may wear your . . .

CAC: What war was yours? What army service?

GS: Korea. I was in right after World War II and then got called back in for Korea.

CAC: And you served in Korea?

GS: Yes.

CAC: In what capacity?

GS: I was an infantry sergeant.

CAC: How long a tour did you have?

GS: It was about nine months there.

CAC: After the retreat from Chosan?

GS: Yes, after. Well after that. It was 1953.

CAC: Okay.

GS: Then like a fool—because the army's so boring when there's not combat, and all they have you do is parade and polish, and I still had time to put in in terms of my call-up—I volunteered for some kinds of tests that they were having in Nevada. I was on those nuclear weapon's tests in [Camp] Desert Rock.

CAC: Any of your health problems relate to that?

GS: Yes, only eight surgeries later. [laughter] But at the time when I first got out and went to the VA because I was sick, they said, "This is not service connected." So that's a whole other story.

CAC: Did they eventually recognized that?

GS: No. I've never gone back. I've never gone back.

CAC: But your medical folks are quite certain that . . .

GS: It's connected. Yes.

CAC: So you had an overdose at some point?

GS: Oh, that's what we were doing. I was going in checking radioactivity and then we'd march the troops through. Yes, and they told us we were safe.

CAC: George, I never knew that story.

GS: They told us we were perfectly safe. [Minnesota Senator Paul] Wellstone's doing a great job now with that. He's trying to get some stuff for the vets, the atomic vets. I have great respect for what he's doing.

CAC: I suspect it was just as boring as anything else you could have done?

GS: Well, yes. It was because it was repetitious and lots of dust. [laughter]

CAC: Oh, George.

GS: Tents, and dust, and boredom.

CAC: These were conditions—I don't want to report on your medical health record—that surgery could address?

GS: No, it's chronic. I've had it ever since and will have it as I go.

CAC: But it has disabled you at various times enough to keep you out of the classroom?

GS: Once. Well, no, twice out of the classroom. I tried to schedule the surgery when I wasn't having classroom kinds of things.

CAC: Does this have any impact on radicalizing you in any sense when you really piece this together?

GS: Well, yes. That's difficult because on one hand, my parents were refugees to this country before World War I; so this was the great land of hope, and so forth. They were very patriotic people, so I had this same kind of patriotism towards the country. Knowing something about Southeast Asia, I knew that it was wrong. I didn't really know enough about Korea at the time to really understand but yes, it has. Yes, sure, but more than just this. This has been the sense of lying, that the government lies to the people.

CAC: At what point chronologically did you realize that this had been the case?

GS: Oh, I think in Vietnam in 1960, not in the Korean and the atomic stuff. For all I knew, they didn't know either. It was only a year ago that I found out that the government knew of the dangers involved. It was just last year.

CAC: This may have some relationship to your interest in ethical leadership?

GS: It may. I think it does. I'm deeply concerned about organizations in a sense, the dark side of organizations and what do we do about that. I started teaching that course and initially team taught it with officers from the R.O.T.C. and got a whole new respect for them. The professional

officers were well educated. They weren't looking forward to war. They weren't gung ho—at least the ones I ran into here. Then more and more, we pulled the course away from them and it was our course. We were the ones giving credit for it. Clarke, what is an interesting point to me, back then, ten years ago in 1980—I guess that's fourteen years ago now—when I first started doing this, first started data for research on ethical leadership, one of the places I found it was in the military publications because they had been burned so badly in Vietnam with My Lai and the other stuff that they started taking serious concern in this. Everyone of their handbooks on officer training had a section on ethics and on the Nuremberg trials. . . the whole thing. Everyone of them had that. That was a surprise to me. My bias had been, well, no.

CAC: Sure.

GS: Then working in organizations, through Bill, and Nick, and then on my own, I worked in a number of different kinds of organizations: colleges and universities, health care institutions, businesses, governments. I'm convinced that it takes very courageous leadership and followership to keep organizations from becoming corrupt.

CAC: In the grand sense, yes.

GS: Yes, in the grand sense, where they lose sight of the mission and personal power becomes the real mission. Personal, and departmental, and divisional power becomes the real thing instead of education, research, new knowledge, service to the community. [These] become lost.

CAC: Did you use the university as a case in point?

GS: Often. Yes. Sad. Some very sad kinds of things. Again, we talked about Keller. Keller, I think, as I say, would rank with Met Wilson as one of the two most intelligent, competent people in the presidency of this university; but golly! he ran astray with some of the constituencies. I looked at that, kept all the clippings from that. I have a box of clippings, magazines, newspapers, and so on from that particular issue. There I think there were a number of constituencies that got him in terms of the history. I'm jumping around now. I think certainly the jock sniffers, or the athletic supporters, of the alumni were so angry with him in terms of the Madison, Wisconsin thing. I think he irritated a lot of women on campus when he started rejecting promotions to professor from people in the School of Nursing who happened to be women and didn't have what he thought were scholarly credentials to be full professors. I know he irritated the Iron Range constituency and admitted that that he would not dialog with them. I know he irritated the Extension agents when he, from their interpretation, didn't see a role for them in the university. There are two of them in every county.

CAC: And well understood . . . are clearly an authentic part of the larger mission of a Land-Grant institution?

GS: Yes. I don't know whether he saw it that way or not but they thought that he did not see a significant role for them. I talked to them about the issue in terms of my study of this; and they went back to their counties in the state of Minnesota, and talked to their county boards and the county boards would talk to the reps from that area of the state, and the reps would talk to the regents. He had unfortunately antagonized a lot of people. I still think he could have been a great president and still could have in other universities, perhaps. He was terribly intelligent. That's the scholarly stuff and I'm sorry I went all over the place on it.

CAC: Now, we have ethical leadership in the Humphrey Institute . . . I mean among other places it's taught?

GS: Well, that's an interesting point you're making.

CAC: It's a question, not a statement.

GS: Oh, it is a question? Okay. The person who came here—whom I've known for twenty some years because we used to bring him from the University of Hawaii to do a retreat for the students when I was a faculty liaison to the University of Hawaii—is no longer at the Humphrey Institute. The person has written a book on ethical leadership. He's no longer there.

CAC: Are you telling this as though there's more to that story?

GS: I think there was a mutual agreement that he not stay there at the Humphrey Institute. I think that part and parcel of it is—I'm having some problems here, Clarke, in terms of my own ethical stuff because I was on the evaluation committee of the program, the Mid-Career Leadership Program. I think there were a lot of people, as you probably know . . . The Humphrey Institute is divided into two groups: one is the tenured faculty from policy and the other is the fellows and senior fellows . . .

CAC: Adjunct staff.

GS: . . . who generate their own dollars and rent space from the Humphrey Institute. That person who was doing the work on ethical leadership, and wrote the book on ethical leadership, was a fellow, and many of the tenured faculty had little respect for either the quality of his research or his style. He responded in kind where he had very little respect for their teaching ability or the utility of their research.

CAC: And after he left, they didn't replace him with someone who would do that kind of work?

GS: No.

CAC: So that the kind of concerns you're talking about here academically are primarily still in the Speech Department?

GS: Yes.

CAC: Anywhere else . . . in Philosophy?

GS: Well, yes of course, Philosophy loves to take the position that they have a monopoly on ethics. I would never claim that I'm an ethicist. I'm a person who is interested in organizations and leadership, and out of that interest became concerned about responsible leadership and responsible followership. For awhile, we developed a consortium, an informal consortium, of people throughout the campus: Don Gilmore, the [unclear] Center, Vern Jensen in the Speech Department, who is one of the outstanding communication ethicists in the country—I'd say he's one of the top four communication ethicists in the country—and a number of people from throughout the campus. Of course, you had Art Kaplan, and Diane Bartels from the Bio-Ethics Center, and a number of people throughout the place, including Philosophy, who would come to the those consortium meetings that we'd have in the Union; and we'd talk about research, and teaching, and issues of interest. When I decided to go on phased retirement, I would not be here. The other person who was instrumental left, and went to another university, and when the consortium asked Central Administration for a part time administrative assistant in support of the consortium, we didn't get it. So, to my knowledge the consortium did not exist anymore.

CAC: [unclear]

GS: Okay. And on the St. Paul campus . . . some good people, too. They had the Kellogg project, Project Sunrise, that was doing work on ethics; and they were doing some good work. I honestly don't know where it's gone from there. The consortium is not active anymore. But I'm sure there are individuals. We were trying to pull people together to provide a community, a word that appears in University 2000.

CAC: Right.

GS: We were trying to provide a community of faculty, staff and students.

CAC: But one of the subtexts we're talking about the last half hour is the difficulty of maintaining that community with increasing specialization?

GS: Yes, particularly if that specialization tends to put the others down.

CAC: Ah ha. Yes.

GS: I think the harder it is to get dollars, the more likely that is to happen. Mine's important, not yours! You know, that kind of stuff. [laughter] So I was ready to go.

Going back in history, I think the significant experiences that I recall in the history of the university are certainly the free speech issue with Met Wilson when a student group decided to

bring the head of the American Communist Party on campus. We caught all kinds of grief and Met Wilson took a courageous stand saying that he's not concerned about the inability of students to sift, and winnow, and differentiate, and so forth. So Ben Davis came to the campus. I was, I'm sure, put forward by Bill Howell as a person to moderate that session. That was held in the ballroom of the Coffman Union. We asked people to submit questions; and at one time a man charged the platform, and through sheer luck, I was able to handle him, and kind of reduce it to absurdity in a respectful way.

CAC: Now, how did you pull that one off?

GS: He said, "You must answer my question. You must answer my question." And I said, "Our questions are in the box. If you get in the box, I may draw you, and we'll get you your question."

CAC: [laughter]

GS: And everybody laughed and he laughed. That's that situation, and thank God! that worked out, and there were all kinds of articles in the paper, and so on. Then Mulford Sibley—God bless him! a wonderful man—wrote his editorial in the [*University*] *Daily* about a university being a place that all ideas should be presented. So, a councilman from St. Paul somehow jumped on that—by the name of Milt Rosen—and I lost a lot of my innocence on that one. So Milt Rosen and Mulford Sibley were to debate which was . . .

CAC: They called on George Shapiro again to moderate it?

GS: Yes. I know have the reputation. You know, I've done it once so I'm an expert. So I get to moderate that, and Clarke, I'll never forget—and there's a tape recording of it, thank God! We met in the Campus Club before the debate. The debate was to be carried on WCCO-TV and radio. I said, "Professor Sibley if your supporters get out of hand, and start heckling Mr. Rosen, and I ask you for your help to calm them down, will you do so?" He said, yes, he would, of course. "Mr. Rosen if your supporters get out of hand . . ." "No, no, I believe in complete freedom of speech and my supporters should be able to do what they can do." Okay, this is fine. We have the debate. The debate goes very well. Nobody harassed Milt too badly; although, God knows he asked for it. Milton Rosen—tire dealer from St. Paul, city council person— becomes the hero of the right wing now for taking on this radical professor. At the end of the debate— unbeknownst to him the microphone was still on—he comes up to me, and he comes up to Sibley and said, "The students were wonderful. They were polite. They were ladies and gentleman. I'm really impressed and I want to thank you very much." Okay, that's on tape. The next week he goes to speak to a VFW [Veterans of Foreign Wars] and it's quoted in the St. Paul paper that he was in fear for his life because of the students and how the mediator did nothing about this. So I called the reporter, and played both tapes for him, and he ran a story on that.

CAC: Ah.

GS: That was interesting. Then I kind of lost it again, a little bit more of the innocence, when Sibley was to debate a John Bircher . . . and Wilson folded. He would not allow the debate to be held on campus. I think, you know, this is possibly a logical fallacy. The state legislature was meeting. A number of the state senators were really down on Sibley, tremendously, and thus the university, and this Marxist institution, this wild-eyed radical place; and so Wilson overruled. He made a very interesting kind of cute ruling that he served two positions. He served the administrative position and kind of the government's position. As governance, when the Senate Committee on Student Activities okayed it, he couldn't overrule it; but as an administrator, he could decide that no university space would be allowed for it. It was a very kind of cute angle on it. I lost respect for Met Wilson at that point. I could understand the pressures he was facing. And of course, in forbidding it, he got a lot more news.

CAC: Of course.

GS: There may have been 200 people if he allowed it but then it made headlines, "Free Speech," and so on. They held it at a Unitarian church out on about 50th and something or other in Minneapolis . . . got a large crowd. That was part of the free speech.

Another part of the free speech was when I became chair of the Senate Committee on Student Affairs. I've never taken harassment. Twice I've taken harassment at this university. Midnight phone calls . . . this was one of the things. The Senate Committee on Student Affairs was faced with a request . . . The Senate Committee on Student Affairs had to approve of every student organization. Approval simply meant that they were not in violation of university rules and regulations, city, state, municipal, blah, blah. Then they got accounting services and rooms. Remember FREE, Freedom from Repression of Erotic Expression? The gay society wanted to be recognized as a student organization. We voted seventeen to nothing that they should be recognized as a student organization. No problem. And I got midnight phone calls on that one. What were we doing at the university?

CAC: By people who were sophisticated enough to know that you were involved?

GS: Yes.

CAC: That requires a certain understanding of the university.

GS: Yes, yes, yes. I think—and I've got no data for this . . . Do you remember we had a regent by the name of Dan Gainey?

CAC: Oh, yes.

GS: I think the Gainey [Conference] Center is now part of St. Thomas property rather than the university property because of that issue. He expressed himself quite openly on that one. Oh, he thought that was just terrible. The other one I used to get midnight phone calls on—and you would remember this one . . . Remember when Met Wilson, before he left, appointed a committee to look at the School of Social Work because there were a lot of complaints going on about the School of Social Work, and John Kidneigh, and how he was managing and administering the School of Social Work?

CAC: Nothing to do with harassment?

GS: [laughter] No.

CAC: That's managerial styles?

GS: Yes, who was getting tenure, who wasn't and so forth. Wilson asked me to be chair of that committee. I think you served on that committee? No, you didn't? Okay. It was our ex-marine general who became a vice-president . . .

CAC: Hal Chase.

GS: Hal Chase. I asked Hal, and I asked a woman whose name I block on right now to co-chair that committee with me once we got put together. Well, I'd get midnight phone calls on "Do you know that this is what's going on at the School of Social Work? You should know this."

CAC: Oh, I see. They were bringing you information?

GS: They were bringing me information. Oh, yes, on what's going on at that School of Social Work.

CAC: Well, these were inside calls then?

GS: Yes.

CAC: Not citizen's calls?

GS: I don't think they were citizen's calls. Some of them might have been graduates of the School of Social Work. They would never tell me. I would say, "I cannot really take your information unless you're willing to tell me. You will remain anonymous." That was the other kind of free speech issue that I saw.

CAC: John was really one of the last—if I can make a statement in the form of a question again—of the . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

GS: . . . oh yes. [laughter] There certainly were, as we've seen in the Medical School, issues that have come forth. Again in this free speech thing, this particular issue, I remember serving on the Consultative Committee and the faculty kind of search group when [Malcolm] Moos left, and we were searching for a president to replace him. One of the persons under consideration . . .

CAC: Was the issue before that how to pull the rug on Mac Moos?

GS: Yes.

CAC: What form did that take in the Faculty Consultative Committee?

GS: That's interesting. When I really realized that the rug had been pulled is when I was presiding at the senate meeting. A couple of the regents' professors got up and gave public speeches attacking Moos. That was it. We knew that was all she wrote at that point in time.

CAC: Well, and then the resignation of Shepherd and company?

GS: Yes, oh, yes. And Don Smith leaving and going on sabbatical and all those kinds of things. All those kinds of things were going on at that time.

CAC: Being on the Faculty Consultative Committee you had to at least be a liaison to the regents in their search for another president, is that what you're saying?

GS: Oh, yes. Exactly.

CAC: Okay.

GS: And we sat in the Minneapolis Athletic Club.

CAC: With regential . . . ?

GS: Yes. Yes.

CAC: The whole board or a committee?

GS: No, the committee. Remember a regent by the name of Lee from Northwestern Minnesota?

CAC: Right.

GS: We were considering as one of the candidates as man who later went to Berkeley. Why do I think his name is Sax?

CAC: There's a Sexton?

GS: Sexton. Sexton. And it came out in that committee—and I think now if that had happened god! how the university would be sued—that this man was Jewish. Lee said, "I don't think we're ready for that yet at the University of Minnesota." And there was no reaction within the committee. The committee sat back and was aghast but took it. I remember being on a search committee for the vice-president of the university when a man from Purdue came. What was his name? He later went to Amherst and then is president of Arizona.

CAC: Oh, sure. [Henry] Koffler.

GS: Koffler. When I was charged with the mission of the search . . .

CAC: You were on that search committee, too?

GS: I was chair of that search committee . . . which has taught me a lot about search committees. [laughter] The person charging me was saying, "Now, the man that we get for this position . . ." I said, "Don't you mean person?" He said, "If you think that a woman is going to be filling this position, you've got another thought coming."

CAC: This was a regent also?

GS: This was a vice-president of the university who was giving me this charge at this time.

CAC: Okay. I assume they had Shirley Clark?

GS: Well, it was two years after that that they had Shirley. But what I did do was I made sure—we had a couple of women faculty—we added Nancy Persig to the search committee from the Civil Service. She was the first woman that we had ever had on a search committee like that. I had known Nancy from some other committees. She was outstanding on the committee, just an outstanding person. But those were the other things that I kind of recall in the history of the university. Then Peter Magrath coming, and the tensions of the university, and now . . . then Keller. Now with [Nils] Hasselmo . . .

CAC: You had commented earlier about athletics, and your being on some committee, and the response to the charges of rape and the basketball team in Madison, and so forth. Were you on the . . .

GS: No, no. I had interviewed Ken as part of my ethical leadership. Well, the way I found my interviewees, people nominated them.

CAC: I see.

GS: And Ken was nominated by six people as an ethical academic leader. So he became interviewed. This was long before any of the other stuff broke out. So I had interviewed him and gotten more from him on this. Yes, that was a . . .

CAC: Say a bit more. You just mentioned it in a subordinate clause.

GS: Well, I think big college athletics is a mess. I've had a chance to talk to Bill Friday, who used to be at North Carolina as president of that university, and came here to look at some of our problems and issues. I asked him, "What were the two toughest things to deal with as president of a university?" He said, "The right wing stuff that attempts to restrict academic freedom . . .

CAC: That's right there with Jesse Helms.

GS: . . . and the athletic stuff. [These] are the two toughest things to deal with because of the big money . . . in the athletics, just huge money. I think this university has gotten in the same place; and it's interesting as athletics has become a bigger and bigger business, it's gotten less and less support from the university community. The students don't go to the games. The faculty don't go to the games in any large numbers.

CAC: Maybe because we've not had a winning team for so long?

GS: That may be the case. Yes.

CAC: A contributing factor.

GS: Yes and they do go to basketball games and things. But it is so unacademic in the whole sense of the whole person, you know. I love sports. I participate in a number of them but I think the tail wags the dog, as the old saying goes. When a Harvey Mackay appoints our athletic director or our football coach . . . [laughter] That kind of stuff gets oppressive. I can remember Paul Geil's speech on the floor of the senate once when they were going to increase the number of basketball games that the team had to play and the faculty were asking about what does this do to their academic [unclear] and so forth? Paul Giel said he thinks they get a better education traveling than they do in the classroom.

CAC: For many of them, that may be true.

GS: Yes. Yes. Well, then years later, we looked at Madison, Wisconsin, and what happened there. But that's not fair. I think Paul is a decent human being just in the wrong place at the wrong time and the wrong job. I've never seen the morale lower at the university than I do now.

CAC: And tell me where you think that comes from.

GS: I've interacted in the Health Sciences. I teach in the spring in the Institute of Technology. I've done some work in the School of Management, and of course, my position is in Liberal Arts. I've served on a number of graduate committees in the College of Education.

CAC: Sure, you've been a university citizen.

GS: I'm still serving on graduate committees, doing these courses, and so on. So, I'm not just talking about Liberal Arts. I'm talking about Health Sciences, Liberal Arts, Education, Institute of Technology, and School of Management. There is a real sense of not being appreciated.

CAC: By whom?

GS: Well, that's a good point! I think it goes all the way up. I think not being appreciated by colleagues, again because of this specialization stuff.

CAC: We aren't appreciated because we don't know what the other guy is doing.

GS: Exactly.

CAC: Isn't that increasingly the case?

GS: Exactly. As I said, Clarke, back in the good old days, every two weeks, we'd get together for two or three hours, and take a particular issue out of a journal or a particular issue that was really hitting now, and discuss it as a group, as a community. Four people would be responsible to lead off but we'd all participate in it. We'd have coffee and cookies and it wouldn't be forty-five minutes.

CAC: So, people would come knowing there was an end?

GS: Right. It was a couple of hours long and there was time for real exchange. So I think that's a part of it. I think the sense of the budget crunch on the various colleges . . . that's another reflection of, We're not appreciated. Perhaps, not getting raises over the last period of time . . . not having people say sincerely and honestly—and felt—"Hey, I appreciate what you've done and the contribution you're making here."

CAC: You know, your former chairman, Mr. Ziebarth, when he was dean . . .

GS: Oh, yes.

CAC: . . . frequently did that.

GS: Oh, yes! Yes. I don't know if you knew about "Easy" but "Easy" was so articulate. We moved into a neighborhood in which there had been a physician who was a pediatric neurosurgeon and he had a stroke. "Easy" was over there every week for sure taking care of that guy, walking with him, eating with him, and so on. Not only was he great on the surface but he had great depth that most people didn't know about. I wouldn't have known about it had I not lived in the neighborhood and gone for walks.

CAC: And you know he suffered great pain?

GS: Yes.

CAC: I wonder whether that may contribute to . . .

GS: It may. But boy! I have great respect for him as a whole person. Ziebarth would do that kind of thing.

CAC: I have notes from him that he would write at two in the morning from this inclined bed he had, board really, because of his bad back, and he'd read some article I'd written, and he'd say something about it.

GS: So you knew that it wasn't just a fluff thing.

CAC: Yes.

GS: It's that appreciation from . . . And you're right, colleagues don't know what each other are doing. With the younger colleagues there's tremendous concern about tenure and promotion. I see it in our own department. Let's face it, the snow wasn't fifteen feet deep when I was young. It was relatively easy to get tenure and promotion when I was doing it. It's much more difficult today.

CAC: And the standards of quality are not higher now than before?

GS: I don't know. I don't know because nobody ever asked me to provide a brochure on my accomplishments when I was promoted to associate professor and when I was promoted to a full professor. Somebody got the stuff together without my knowing it; and I got a telegram from Ziebarth on a Friday afternoon saying, "Congratulations. The Regents have approved of your promotion to . . ." I said, "Oh, I didn't know I would be . . ." So, it's much more difficult today and there are fewer jobs.

CAC: Don't you think Affirmative Action, for example, and litigiousness of this society has contributed to that?

GS: Oh, definitely. Yes. Every tot and dittle or tittle and jot and so on. Yes, god! my syllabi reflect that. [laughter] If I don't put it in my syllabus, then I cannot hold a student accountable for it. Oh, yes. So that sense of community, a caring and respect for each other . . . Faculty are feeling tremendously lonely.

CAC: How is that expressed to you? You're still doing interviewing on this range of issues?

GS: As I go around in the other colleges . . .

CAC: This would be true in the Health Sciences, for example?

GS: Yes.

CAC: And it would take what form of expression there?

GS: Oh, complaints and they just bring it up. Things are awful and blah, blah, blah. We don't get anything, and somebody else gets it all, and nobody appreciates what we're doing, and we don't have any idea what's going on in Central Administration, and so on. It's pretty much the same thing in the Institute of Technology. They bring it up. I'm interested in ethical leadership, responsible leadership, as it contributes to building healthy community, healthy organizations. So then whenever that comes up, it [finger snap] gets people to flash on it right now. Have you looked at the university? What can we do here? It immediately stimulates people to talk about it.

CAC: And it's not technically a failure of communication?

GS: No.

CAC: Technically, I say.

GS: No, I don't think it is. I don't think it's technically a failure of communication.

CAC: But you know, in doing these interviews—I've interviewed a certain large number of persons now who had had a temporary position in Morrill Hall and David Lilly this morning—to find out what the culture of Morrill Hall has been. You see because as an outsider—and I'm pretty well informed—that's kind of a mystery. Who talks to whom? How do they do business? See, in that sense, I think there is a failure of communication.

GS: Oh, yes.

CAC: We don't know how they're doing business.

GS: Exactly. Our friend, Don Smith, when he first went and then . . . What have you got ten minutes left or five?

CAC: Lots of time.

GS: Okay. . . . when he first left the department . . . became an associate vice-president. Every noon we would hold bag lunches around a table. Everybody welcome . . . graduate students, undergraduate students, faculty. We'd bring our bag lunch and talk about this, that, and the other thing.

CAC: We were small enough community to get by with that?

GS: Yes. Yes. And we had a long table.

CAC: Okay.

GS: We had a very long table that we also used as a dissecting table in [unclear] Science. [laughter] Bill Fletcher. I don't know if you ever knew Bill?

CAC: Yes.

GS: We'd clean off the table, and we'd hold our bag lunch, and we'd talk about world affairs, all kind of affairs. Don came back one [day] after about four months with his brown bag and we were all waiting for the word. So one of us said, "Well, Don, what can you tell us about Central Administration?" You know how Don would talk. He'd purse up that . . . furl that brow and . . .

CAC: Take a drag on his pipe.

GS: Or his cigarette, his pipe. He said, "You know when I was faculty member and a chairman, I was angry at Morrill Hall because I knew there was a secret room someplace where they made all the decisions." Then he paused dramatically. "Now, I'm no longer angry. I'm frightened because there is no secret room."

CAC: What I'm hearing from witnesses is that they're too busy. They're just overwhelmed and some of them put it again—I make reference to the law—that so much time is consumed trying to protect themselves against cases that may come and cases that have already been brought that it just wears them down.

GS: Yes. Litigious nature of the thing. I have respect for Hasselmo as an individual. I've seen him at places where I've been asked to speak, and he'll show up on a Saturday morning, and be doing things for students, and so on. I have respect for him in that area. I deeply wonder if we can provide, if any place can provide, a community for its clients, students, customers, where the

faculty and staff do not experience a sense of community. I don't think a hospital can provide a sense of community for the patients if the nursing staff, physicians, and the rest of the people there aren't feeling that they're a community. The sense I have is that the university faculty today are not feeling part of a community, either at the collegiate level, or even at the departmental level, let alone at the university level.

CAC: And that's not because they're rejecting the idea?

GS: No. Oh, no, not at all. Not at all.

CAC: So there are systemic things operating?

GS: Yes!

CAC: We've talked of several of them?

GS: Yes. Yes. Yes. There are systemic things operating here and we've ticked off several of them.

CAC: And in society?

GS: The same thing. We're having the same issues in society. I'm doing work with the Blandin Foundation now. The primary mission of the Blandin Foundation is to develop healthy rural communities. And it's easier because they're smaller. We only work with communities of about 15,000 to 20,000 and below—the Blandin Foundation. It's much easier to work on developing a healthy community if you've got 7,000 people than if you've got 45,000 people. I don't know the answer. I really don't.

CAC: A colleague of ours that I interviewed this week used a term that I hadn't heard before. He spoke of the melancholy of the professoriate.

GS: That's a good term.

CAC: It's a good term.

GS: It's a great term.

CAC: Usually we say, lack of morale and so forth. I thought melancholy . . .

GS: Melancholy is better.

CAC: I've been thinking about it, as well as writing a little essay on it.

GS: It's a beautiful term.

CAC: But don't you go stealing it, George. [laughter]

GS: No, no. I won't write it.

CAC: It's in the public domain but that's a nice . . .

GS: That is a great one. That word hits it better. I was talking about morale. From what I've learned, and it's interesting how Hasselmo has tried to do it, and I don't know why it didn't come off . . . It seems to me that one of the things we expect from leadership is a vision, a vision that has hope that in a sense combines with reality. It's not so unrealistic that we say, "Hey, come on, get off that." But it's also a vision that has hope to it. Right now, I don't think there is such a vision for this university. I think our vision right now is desperate. Will the legislature give us enough money to continue to be a "humph, humph" university?—substitute whatever words you want, first rate, so on. I don't think University 2000 is such a vision.

CAC: Do you have any idea how one creates community? It seems to me that such a complex thing has to be indigenous; it has to be at the grass roots. Now, maybe it requires leadership to give a green signal and promote it.

GS: And promote it.

CAC: But authentically, how do you create community where specialization has [unclear]?

GS: Ah ha! What we're trying to do in Blandin—we've become relative experts at it, I think—is we start by taking stake holders throughout the community, and bring them together to vision, and come up with a vision that they can agree on. Then we develop strategy and tactics to accomplish that vision and break it into pieces, specific pieces. It starts with that common vision.

CAC: Yes.

GS: You're quite right. You've got to get the right twenty-four people together. They've got to be representative of the entire community, the entire space.

CAC: So it's not excluding?

GS: So you're not exclusive. Yes. I think Hasselmo tried to do that after the fact. I remember when Peter Magrath went around, and again as vice-president of the senate, I went with him. He went to every college of this university; and I developed what I modestly call Shapiro's Postulate, and had them present their vision to him, and their mission. What was their vision and mission? Then he went back into Central Administration and tried to come up with something

that would be a tent for all of these. That was an interesting experience for me. If you look back in the . . .

CAC: You learned from it?

GS: Oh, I learned tremendously.

CAC: I mean what did you learn?

GS: My modest Shapiro's Postulate is The more powerful the college, the less prepared their presentation to the president. [laughter]

CAC: That's plausible.

GS: The less powerful colleges had overheads, and visuals, and . . .

CAC: I see.

GS: . . . different people wired in to present. You went to Med School, and a couple guys came down with the greens on, and a little blood here and there. [laughter] That was it and goodbye. At Blandin, they're pretty sure it's a year long process, at least.

CAC: Oh! [unclear] generation long?

GS: Yes, at least to get it started, it's a year long.

CAC: Well, George, I can share this. This spring when I got back from my winter leave, I was asked to speak to a citizens' group on the question, Is the country governable? This was in April. I said, "Well, it's pretty damn hard." I tried to look historically, beginning with Madison's number ten [Federalist Papers], and coming forward rapidly from there. I think if I were to give that same address now, it would be far more despairing. I'm thinking of the national community now.

GS: Yes.

CAC: I just think that it's beyond . . . We have learned the last seven months, we can't govern ourselves.

GS: Oh!

CAC: I think that this melancholy is not university alone but we are a reflection of much broader issues, George.

GS: I think you've right. You're absolutely right. The last seven months have been a . . . On the other hand—there's always the other hand—I spent two days having conversation with John Gardner last week. He's eight-two years old.

CAC: Oh, you're a lucky fellow!

GS: Oh, I consider myself . . .

CAC: See, how lucky I am to have spent the afternoon with you.

GS: [laughter] The first thing of Gardner's I ever read was that article in the *Saturday Review* [Moral Decay and Renewal, 46:18+, December 14, 1963] in 1963 on organizational renewal. He's still got hope for this but again, he says, "It's got to start at the grass roots," which is what he tried to do with common cause, and what he's doing with another organization now. He's got a new organization going . . . city managers and administrators, and they're going nationally with that.

CAC: I'm going to come back to the university briefly on this point.

GS: Yes.

CAC: Do you think that the specialization and the emphasis upon research has weakened or changed, transformed—let's us use a neutral word—the teaching-learning mission in such ways . . . ? I'm making this now as a proposition.

GS: Right.

CAC: The teaching, hyphen, learning is one way that community is created . . .

GS: Oh, yes.

CAC: . . . and if the emphasis and the rewards are for other kinds of activity, then it's difficult to sustain that mission of the university. What do you think?

GS: I have a limited yes. It's how the research . . . See it's not research in and of itself. It's the great emphasis on grant getting. For instance, my Leadership Course is a research course. It is tremendously community building. I do very little in it. The kids build their research community themselves. They have to develop research teams to go out, and find leaders in the community, and study them. They get to know each other, and they get to appreciate each other, and they give honest evaluations to each other, to the extent that they're willing to. So I don't think research in and of itself is community splintering.

CAC: Okay.

GS: I think if there is respect for different research perspectives, if we can understand as Dick Sykes says, "Qualitative research gives us meaning and quantitative research gives us probabilities" and that we need both; so that if we have a respect for both, and what each can contribute, I think research can be a community building activity, and students become part of it.

CAC: If it involves the students in the process?

GS: Oh, yes. If it involves students and other colleagues in the process, particularly students. I think that the university has done a good thing with this one thing for undergraduate students. I'm sorry I've forgotten . . . URAP [University Research Associate Program].

CAC: Yes.

GS: That program that gives students a grant so that they can work with a faculty member on a research project. That can be community building and there can be a community built there if the research is done properly by respectful people who don't put other . . . I'll just talk about our own department. I know that there are people in our department who put each other down because of the research methodological approach used. It's kind of like the difference between the Baptists and the Methodists . . . Oh, you know a Bap . . . ? Oh, you know a Meth. . . ? . . . that kind of stuff, that's terrible, instead of the respect for what each can bring to the table to get the whole thing. I don't think it's research alone. I know that research can be community building because I do it in my undergraduate . . . these are undergraduate kids. They're bright. They're creative, and they're innovative, and they turn out stuff that I would take to a national conference.

CAC: George, how can you cut from the excitement that you are manifesting now . . .

GS: [laughter]

CAC: I know you're not cutting and running.

GS: Don't make me laugh. It hurts. That's a damn good question and I'm torn. I'm torn by that. I have a course in the summer that I'm excited about. It's really Communication and Community Building. It's about communication for community building. It's a very experiential course and I've offered to continue to teach that in the summers. I'm going to hate giving up that Leadership Course because those kids are so exciting. God! Clarke, when I see what they produce because they have to present a written document and an oral presentation as you would in an academic conference. The quality of what they do is as interesting and as good . . . These kids know stuff. They've taken statistics. I'm the research consultant. I provide consulting help to the groups in the class at various times.

CAC: That's a different perception of the role of the instructor, however?

GS: Yes. I lecture for about 1½ weeks now. It's just so they can get time to get going. And then I give each of the groups a half an hour during the day and give them consulting help on their research.

CAC: Have you talked to John Wallace?

GS: No, I haven't talked to John.

CAC: John Brandl?

GS: No, I haven't talked to either of them about that.

CAC: Well, I have in mind—because I have interviewed them the last three weeks—they're saying precisely what you're saying.

GS: Okay.

CAC: So there is a real hunger here and there are people scattered around the university . . .

GS: Now, if we could get them together, there's a community. There's a sub-community that would excite me. I'd go until I was seventy. [laughter]

CAC: Seventy. All right. George, do you realize how many times in the last hour and a half you have used the word respect and respectful? Fifty times.

GS: Really?

CAC: I haven't counted each one but I think that that says a great deal about . . . You are our communicator after all and whether you are consciously are using this word *respect*, whether you realized you were italicizing it but it's cast all through. It's laced through all you've been talking about. To me, I sense it. I heard it because you were saying it. I think that is a crucial element in any sense of community.

GS: Yes.

CAC: If that is lacking, forget it.

GS: Yes. Yes. I'm not looking for the big bucks. If I wanted big bucks, I would have gone to work in industry. One of the most important things for me is honest respect for my colleagues and for many years, I got that here. I got that.

CAC: You're getting it elsewhere in other communities?

GS: Oh, yes, now. You ask about how I know about this stuff. I'm now seeing and one of the young faculty used the word last spring. She said, "I miss you terribly. You are the grandfather of the department. You're the person I can come to and talk about my pain." There are a number of the people who come. We've got a split department. Probably five or six of us are old buffaloes who have been here for a hundred years and five or six are young who have been here five years, three years, four years; and the young ones are suffering tremendously, and the old ones are confused. We can't figure out what's happening, why it's happening. Yes. Again, the time issue . . . in community, you've got to have some interaction. As I described to you before, we'd sit at the lunch table four days a week and have lunch together as a group.

CAC: Maybe it would be a good investment for the university to make the older buffaloes, if you wish, to kind of hang around, and sit in their office, and not necessarily teach a range of courses, but to be available.

GS: That's what seems to be the need for young faculty. They're feeling really out on the trapeze.

CAC: I've been retired officially for four years. I taught part time by contract and now I'm doing this project, and when students hear my voice here . . .

GS: [whispered] They come.

CAC: . . . they knock on the door.

GS: Yes. Yes. What's that say?

CAC: Yes.

GS: It says one thing—let's not be immodest about it—you were an outstanding person in terms of your openness to difference and to creativity, and to other people. You're one of the people we think of . . . but the crying need for that . . . that lack of community. Your point is well taken. Community is shattered throughout this country. How do we rebuild it? This is what Gardner's working on. I guess I feel I can work on it better through Blandin than at the university.

CAC: Good. I was thinking back on this because this is a recurring theme in my interviews. I was thinking in my own case, in the 1960s and 1970s, I had certain connections with the African-American community outside the university.

GS: Right.

CAC: And that meant a great deal to me and it enriched my life. The last fifteen years, you know, you don't do it. It's not that the races are that much separated but we don't have the occasion for meeting.

GS: Yes. I remember the 1960s. That's where I got there was from Barbara Knudson's work.

CAC: I had to flee from the church because the church was working against community.

GS: I've spoken to a number of people who are trained as pastors and priests who have said exactly the same thing. Not knowing about it, I said, "Tell me about community." They say, "Let me tell you about commu . . . That's why I left my work. That's why I left the church. That's why I left this is because of the lack of community, the claim of it, but the lack of it." Boy! I don't know if Nils Hasselmo said to me, "I'll do whatever you tell me to do. Tell me what to do right now to build community in this university." I'd need at least twenty-four hours to think about it. And I'd call you, and I'd call some other people, and say, "Okay, what can we do?" But he hasn't asked.

CAC: This may be a good point to . . .

GS: Stop. [laughter]

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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