

John Adams

- Youth and education 1-
 - DeLaSalle 1
 - parochial schooling 2
 - St. Thomas 5
 - economics major 6
 - teaching assistant 6
 - graduate study - University of Minnesota 7
 - Henderson, Jim - Upper Midwest Economics Study 8
 - geography minor 10
 - shifts to geography major 10
 - Broek, Jan 12
 - Lukermann, Fred 12
 - coming of younger generation, 1960s 14
- Expansion of disciplines, 1960s 14
 - decline of the disciplines, circa 1975 16
- Adams develops urban field 17
 - National Science Foundation grants 17
- Penn State, 1966 18-
- Adams' first monograph, 1971 19-
- Adams Returns to University of Minnesota as faculty, 1970 21
 - research agenda 21
 - Urban Studies program, 1974 22
- School of Public Affairs 23-
 - director, 1976 24
 - Humphrey Institute 25-
 - French, John 27-
 - Magrath, C. Peter 28-
 - regents 28-
 - Congressional grant from Humphrey Institute, not for building 30-
 - misuse of endowment fund 31
- Adams returns to teaching 32
- Senate committees 33
 - committee on university press 34
 - Graduate School research 34-
- University of Minnesota citizenship 35
 - deficits in middle management 37, 42
 - impact of specialization 39
- Faculty Consultative Committee 40
 - Magrath 41
- Keller, Ken 43
- Newman Center 44
- Neglect of religious studies at University of Minnesota 45
- Decline of African and Asian Studies 52
- Fragmentation of scholarship 53
 - careerism 54
 - reward system 55

Interview with John Adams

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

Interviewed on August 27, 1994

John Adams - JA
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This afternoon, which is October 27th, Thursday, I'm interviewing John Adams. I hesitate to name the things that he's been, but basically he's a geographer in Urban Studies and Public Affairs, and university citizen, and has touched many things at the nearly a third of a century that you've been here now. As I suggested before we turned on this machine, it's always useful to start with a kind of intellectual, academic autobiography. I see right away that you were a graduate of DeLaSalle and that's such a unusual high school at least as I know it from the outside. Why don't we start there, and then see how you got to the university, and what your interests were, and when they developed.

JA: Sure. In order to talk about getting to DeLaSalle, I have to talk about what got me to DeLaSalle because that's part of the story, too.

CAC: All right.

JA: I grew up in southwest Minneapolis when that was the edge of town. My folks bought a house there, a new house in 1938 by 54th and Lyndale, right by the southwest edge of the built-up area. Then the war interrupted and then construction proceeded afterwards. I went to an elementary school, Annunciation Catholic School, parish school, when that was at the edge of town, at the growing edge of the southwest sector of the Twin Cities [Minneapolis and St. Paul]. The pastor of our church, his name was James A. Burns, had been the superintendent of schools for the archdiocese of St. Paul and Minneapolis. He insisted that all of the nuns that taught in that school have college degrees which was quite unusual for the day.

CAC: Yes.

JA: That combination of upper middle class, middle class people on the edge of town, coupled with this parish school environment led to some interesting academic outcomes. The kids that I went to school with were coming from a group of salaried executives and middle aged professionals who were quite comfortable with their educations. For example, this is a little footnote here. One of my classmates was Pat Mullen, in grade school. I went to grade school with Pat. I think most of the kids that I went to grade school with graduated from college, and quite a few of them went on to graduate school, and professional school in the 1950s.

CAC: That would have been unusual for parochial school at that time?

JA: That's right but I think the fact that the school was such a good school and the parents were so precocious and aggressive in making sure the kids what they needed, that combination worked. Plus the fact that we were in a demographic cohort that was short of people . . . anybody born in the 1930s. The short supply and good preparation meant that when we went on to school, we as a group did very well in those days. People like Andy Greeley are writing about that now. What was it about second generation and third generation Catholic kids in better parochial schools and how they performed in school and afterwards. It's something that's part of the social history and social geography of our country. But these were neighborhood schools. We walked to and from school. We knew everybody and when we graduated, we either went to the nearby public school for high school or else we went to the central parochial schools. That's how I got to DeLaSalle because half the boys in my grade school class went to "D" and the other half went to Washburn High School which was the edge of town, full of energy, lots of smart bright kids, good teachers, well prepared and all the rest. So I got to DeLaSalle and met kids from all over the city because it was a downtown school staffed by Christian brothers who were all pretty well schooled. I didn't like the school at all. I have very bad memories of going to school there partly because it did not prize schooling, education. It would be a long discussion to go into what I found distasteful about the place but it was really kind of a boys' school for boys who would be boys and a very, very heavy emphasis on athletics. Plus, quite a number of the teachers were gay. It wasn't vivid in my memory at the time but . . .

CAC: Because you wouldn't have known about it?

JA: No, we knew about it. We knew a few who were but subsequently in retrospect it's clear that a significant number were which in and of itself isn't any particular problem, except that those teachers played favorites with kids they liked. I didn't like their attitude and had trouble as a kid even though I graduated at the top of my class, a valedictorian of my class. I was not particularly liked and I didn't particularly like the school. But that's sort of a footnote.

CAC: Greeley doesn't talk about that.

JA: No. He doesn't. I mean there was nothing inappropriate about any of their behavior in the sense in which we're now discussing pedophilia and so forth but . . .

CAC: The denigration of education is a surprise to me [unclear].

JA: The people who were good students, and who liked school, and who wanted to be aggressive as students were not prized there. In order for good students to be appreciated in the school, they also had to be good athletes. And since I always had jobs while I was in school and although I was a good athlete, I didn't participate in school sports. I did it in parks and with my friends. When we were seniors and took a test for college placement, I was awarded a one-year scholarship at the College of St. Thomas and that's how I went to St. Thomas. I never even considered where I would go to college. I took the test because they made all of the people in the top three homerooms who were tracked in the academic group to take the test. They just sent me a letter that said you have been awarded a scholarship to college, so I just went there. I never even thought about alternatives.

CAC: You might have gone to St. Johns.

JA: Yes, except St. Johns didn't have a similar program for scholarship. They never offered me one or I might have thought of that.

CAC: I see.

JA: What they did do was recruit a number of my classmates who were football players because even then they had an aggressive football program. So the good students in my class who were also on the football team all went as a group to St. Johns, and those who were good students and were not on the football team went to St. Thomas, and some of them went to the university. That was pretty much the tri-partheid split.

Now the other part of my background that's important in all of this is that my father was a wholesale paper executive. He worked for John Leslie Paper Company which was a big wholesale paper operation here in the Twin Cities since the end of the nineteenth century. In the years between 1929 and 1946, he was a traveling salesman in southern Minnesota, the southern half of the state. He knew all the business people in the southern part of the state, newspapers, lumberyards, variety stores, grocery stores, you name it . . . all the print shops.

CAC: Sure.

JA: He knew all those people by name and worked with them for seventeen years. Through his business life and his inveterate tale telling as a person who liked to gab, he introduced us to the public life, business and political life of Minnesota through the eyes of all these customers that he worked with from the end of the 1920s up through the Depression years and then in the war. Of all my brothers and sisters, I was the one who listened most carefully to all these tales.

CAC: I should ask how many sisters and brothers there are.

JA: There are six, three boys and three girls. I am the middle son. That's girl, boy, girl, boy, girl, boy, and I was the middle boy. Others for a variety of reasons got a lot of attention. I was fortunate to be in the middle, and was able to be a listener and observer, and learned a lot about our state, about business and politics because in those days with the citizen legislature and people taking their turns serving . . .

CAC: Yes.

JA: He knew all these legislators and what was on their mind both in the good years of the 1920s, the bad years of the 1930s, and then the boom years of the 1940s when there wasn't any merchandise because everything was rationed. I grew up as a little kid knowing a lot about this stuff; and that coupled with my grade school and high school life meant that when I got to college, I probably was more knowledgeable about the bigger picture than many kids were.

CAC: I'm going to interpose just a minute to make an irrelevant footnote.

JA: [laughter]

CAC: See it becomes conversation as well as an interview.

JA: Yes.

CAC: I've done forty-one interviews now and how many identified themselves as having that compulsion of inquiry and listening and putting it together. As I listened I wondered where the hell does that come from?

JA: It comes from a lot of sources.

CAC: Not everyone in the family . . .

JA: Not everybody in the family has it. In fact, I've got sisters now who have been in therapy for years or in counseling for years trying to figure out why mother didn't pay more attention to them. I never thought as a kid anybody ought to pay attention to me.

CAC: [laughter] There were six kids.

JA: I had other things to do. I also delivered newspapers at the edge of town. Starting when I was ten years old, that paper route kept growing because they kept building houses there, starting in 1948 and going for the next six years. I had 200 people that I was . . . Those were the days also when you had to collect every week from them all.

CAC: Sure.

JA: So I knew all these people. All these backgrounds meant that when I got to college, the decision about what to study was not obvious.

CAC: Right, you had many stimuli going.

JA: Yes. I was a good student and that made it harder because I did well in all my subjects. I didn't gravitate to any one thing. Another thing was that during those years in the late 1940s in the Minneapolis area there was this terrible polio epidemic. We stayed home a lot, especially in the summer, because the rules were you just didn't go out. It was really contagious. At least ten kids in our neighborhood had polio that crippled them.

CAC: This was just before the vaccine.

JA: Yes, right. It was from 1946, 1947, up through early 1950s. One of the families that was closest to us, three of the four kids got polio and two were severely crippled. So my mother was terrified. The reason for mentioning this was that we stayed home. What we did when we stayed home was we read. We went to the bookmobile every week, and filled our wagon with books, and brought them home. We spent all week reading because that's all there really was to do.

CAC: Sure.

JA: Listen to the radio, read and play with our brothers and sisters. When I got to college at St. Thomas, I got into a pre-engineering program because I—as was normal for the day—associated going to college with a job. So I had to pick something that I could study that would lead to a job and that seemed okay—not that I knew what an engineer did—but I started that track. Then I looked at the second year curriculum and realized that this looked pretty dull. So I changed my major to business. My dad was a business man and I knew a lot about business. I read the newspaper and paid attention to what was going on. The first thing that happened when I changed my major to business was I was required to take a course in Principles of Economics which I thought was a terrific subject. I just loved . . . one of these things where you set out to read the first chapter of the text book and it's so interesting, you read the second chapter, and then you read the whole book before it gets assigned to you. It was Paul Samuelson's *Principles of Economics* which I thought was one of the best books I'd ever read.

CAC: Bravo! And it is.

JA: Yes and it really was. So I changed my major to economics before that first semester was out and I ended up being assigned to an advisor by the name of John Helmberger. I don't know if you ever met John D. Helmberger but he was teaching there at St. Thomas along with Jim Simler, who ended up as the chair of our Economics Department here, and a guy name Franz Mueller, who just died this week. He was an old professor at St. Thomas.

CAC: I knew him.

JA: He was one of my professors. I changed my major to economics and just absolutely loved it. It was so interesting. That was the old days when they were teaching economics in both terms of institutional settings as well as in the new analytical modeling that was coming along; but since I had such a strong background in math and knew so much just in general about how the world worked from my childhood experiences, this was a wonderful watershed, intellectual experience, making things fit together for me. I majored in economics which required me to do a lot of other things as well because that was a very old-fashioned curriculum at St. Thomas, you know, the usual math, and science, and foreign language, and philosophy, and history, and you name it . . . six or seven courses per semester, and music, and the whole thing. At the end of my junior year, Helmberger asked me—I was without any question the best student in the group, of my age group—if I would like to work in the department during my senior year. I said, "What would that mean?" He said, "You can be my teaching assistant." These are the days when school enrollments were expanding and he had negotiated with the dean that he would teach an extra large section of Introductory Economics if he could get some help. Having done his PH.D. work over here at the university with Walter Heller as his advisor, he understood what a teaching assistant would allow him to do. So, they said, "Okay, that was cheap." I worked on an hourly basis. I also, by the way, all during my high school years and my college years worked in retail grocery stores doing everything, meat, and produce, and I ran all these things, and I was a night manager at one store for this guy . . . so between the newspaper business and the retail grocery business . . . While I was in college, the Supervalu managers came out to try to hire me to go to work for them . . .

CAC: Of course.

JA: . . . because they were shorthanded. Everybody was shorthanded in those days.

CAC: Sure.

JA: Then I worked at the school all at the same time. It was a very interesting life. Then in my senior year they gave me a desk in the Economics Department office with Helmberger, and Simler, and Franz Mueller, and an Italian Jesuit by the name of Maritano, and then a fifth guy by the name of Mohamed Ali Salim who subsequently became the chair of the Economics Department. So the six of us were in this office for the full year. I did my senior year sitting in this office with these five professors . . .

CAC: Listening again.

JA: Listening, asking questions, carrying on a conversation on a regular basis, and I just hung out in the office. I'd come to work, unload my coat and my books, go to class, come back, go to class, come back, and really became a kind of young squirt around the office. It's very European, you know, the young acolyte hanging around the office with everybody in the same

room. It was just one room. Then when fall, September, October, November, came around, Helmberger said, "Well, now we've got to start talking about graduate school." I said, "What's graduate school?" [laughter] I didn't have any idea what he was talking about. He said, "There's this new program, the National Defense Education Act . . ." which had just been passed in the aftermath of Sputnik. This was in the fall of 1959. I said, "Well, what's this mean?" He said, "It means that if you apply for one of these fellowships and get it, they'll pay for you to go to graduate school. I said, "I wasn't thinking of going to graduate school." He said, "Of course you're going to graduate school. Don't be silly." [laughter] As a person, I might add parenthetically, I always asked for advice and considered it very carefully as a youngster. I figured people knew more than I did so I would listen to them. I was not a rebel in that sense.

CAC: You probably know that the brothers at St. Johns did the same thing for John Brandl. He had no idea what he was going to do. They said, "You're going to Harvard." They sent him.

JA: Oh, I guess he told me that once.

CAC: Yes. [laughter]

JA: I applied for this thing and I didn't get it. I only applied to one place, and that was Minnesota because Walter Heller was John Helmberger's advisor, and Heller was the chair of Economics over here. I didn't get it. I was the first alternate after six and all six they offered it to took it. Of course, the first three left the program within a year and a half but by that time it was too late to get the fellowship. Instead of that, they awarded me a research assistantship and so I got a letter one day from Walter Heller that said, "You're coming over here to Graduate School, please, come and see me sometime in August." I called up in August. I was working at the grocery store my last few weeks. I made an appointment with Nancy Lastina. I don't know if you remember Nancy? She was the secretary of the Economics Department at the time. I came over, and I sat down, and started talking to Walter Heller who I'd heard about and read articles by as a student. We had a nice start.

CAC: Having no idea what kind of specialization you . . .

JA: Well, actually I did. I was pretty clear in fact by the time I came over here and Helmberger and Simler had told me that it was a good idea to have an idea about what you wanted to study so they could know how to advise you. Jim Simler and John Helmberger were both in the process of finishing their Ph.D.s. Jim was a student of John Turnbull and John was a student of Walter Heller.

CAC: Okay.

JA: They both said, "Pick something that you want to study." My choices at that time were two. I was very interested in cities and how they worked because in reading my economics book nothing was said about this.

CAC: Went from macro to micro?

JA: That's right. They missed the intermediate scale. I knew from my dad's history that how his business fluctuated depended on the regional economy as you might have expected as a salesman going from town to town. The second thing I was most interested in was consumer economics because I used to watch the customers in the store where I worked, and watched my customers on my paper route as a kid, and wonder why is it that when I would show up at people's house to collect my money they didn't have any. [laughter] Forty cents is what they were looking for and there were lots of occasions when people were really very difficult to get money from. Then when I was at the store, I used to observe customers I got to know very well, and how they spent their money, and how they did their consumption. It becomes very clear. You get to know people and watch them year after year . . . I could remind customers when they forgot something. Their buying habits were so fixed.

CAC: [unclear]

JA: Yes. So I mentioned these two things when I got over here. Then the consumer economics business, they didn't quite know how to deal with that but they did say that they could handle that but on the regional economics and the urban economics things, they said, "We don't do that here. You might consider transferring to the University of Pennsylvania," where the regional science program was coming to life with Walter Isart in the 1960s.

CAC: Yes.

JA: I didn't have any idea what that was all about. I just thought that this was something that one could study. He said, "In the meantime, there's a certain set of basic things you want to do as a beginner, so we'll talk about this later." He steered me to the director of Graduate Studies. I don't remember who it was. It might have been . . . not Frank Boddy . . . the guy from the University of Chicago with the ruddy complexion who always rode his bike . . . and died of cancer a few years back. It will come to me. But he said, "You're going to work with Jim Henderson." Jim Henderson had just been hired from Harvard to run the Upper Midwest Economics Study and they were staffing up that study. I went to see Jim and so I lined up my courses. Oz Brownlee was the person I spoke with who helped me organize my program and then he assigned me to Jacob Schmuckler as an advisor. So Jake was my master's advisor until he died and then I worked for Jim. So I went to see Jim and Jim was only a few years older than I was because he was only in his twenties when he came here. We hit it off pretty well, although I thought he was a little odd. Did you know Jim?

CAC: No.

JA: You didn't? Oh. That's interesting. He was here for quite awhile.

CAC: You mean Jim Simler?

JA: No, I mean Jim Henderson.

CAC: No, I didn't know him.

JA: Okay. We went to work, and he hired a whole bunch of people to work on this study, and then it became the office where all of us research assistants worked which is on the fourth floor of Main Engineering over on the East Bank. There must have been eight of ten of us and then my classes. That was my life for the first two years . . . hanging around that study, and taking my classes, and getting oriented here, and realizing that although I was a really good student, I was not going to be a happy Ph.D. student in Economics. I finished the first year and realized that the second year looked deadly dull. It's one of these situations where you're good at something and you know it's not for you. But I really liked the study. I was torn between working for Henderson and Anne Krueger who came over from Madison [Wisconsin].

CAC: Oh, sure.

JA: And taking classes that were really driving me crazy—if this kind of sequence makes sense. Half way through my master's program in Economics, my advisor got sick and died, Jake Schmuckler. I don't know if you knew Jake or not? I didn't know what to do then but my program was pretty much complete. I finished all my papers, and all my courses, and my forty-five credits in the first year, which is another reason why I get impatient with students who figure that they have trouble getting their work done around here. I didn't know what to do next because I didn't want to take my exam right away because I wasn't sure I wanted to go on in Economics.

CAC: In the meantime you've been taking courses in supporting fields?

JA: I had taken a minor in statistics and I'd taken three outside courses in geography. A friend of mine, who I knew from a social church club we belonged to, was here a year behind me as an undergrad. He told me he was taking this interesting course from Cotton Mather in the Geography Department. He told me to come over and sit in on it; which I did the first week of the class; and so I added it to my program, and I took it. Then the next quarter, he was taking a course from [Fred] Lukermann. He said, "This guy's really interesting." So I did the same thing the next quarter. After the third quarter of this, I realized that this was really interesting because these guys were studying things. regions and places, the way that I liked to study them, especially . . .

CAC: Especially Lukermann.

JA: That's right. Especially Lukermann who at that time was doing a lot of research on economic geography. But I didn't even know that economic geography was a field because they didn't teach geography at St. Thomas at that time. That was very interesting for me. I started talking to Lukermann about this. I was walking across the mall one day going out of Walter

Library, heading back to Ford Hall where the Geography Department was located at that time, and I happened to mention to him that I was working for Anne and Jim on the Upper Midwest Study, and that I'd finished all my Economics master's work, and I wasn't sure what to do. I liked working for the study but I didn't want to go on in Economics. He said to me, "Why don't you think about coming over to Geography?" In fact, I think those are his exact words. And I hadn't thought of that. So then I went and talked to Henderson and told him about this. He said, "Well, you know, I want you to stay on the study. I don't care if you change your major." I said, "Will you support me if I . . ." He said, "Oh, sure." Then I talked to Annie and she said the same thing. She liked me and we got along real well. So I did. I went ahead then and scheduled my master's exam and applied for admission to the Ph.D. program in Geography. Then I continued working on the Upper Midwest Study for two more years while I was in the Geography Department.

CAC: [John] Borchert was going to set up very soon a parallel . . .

JA: Meanwhile, he had started the Urban Research Project of the Upper Midwest Study although I didn't work on that part. I didn't work for Borchert and I didn't really get to know Borchert until later because in those years, he was spending almost all of his time on the study. I really spent most of my time with Lukermann, and John Webb, and those guys. Later in the program then I spent time with Borchert. So that's how it happened. Then we moved over here to the West Bank and the whole study moved over here when these new buildings were completed. I occupied the ninth floor of the other building all the while I finished my Economics work and my Upper Midwest Study work; and then I came over, and became a teaching assistant in Geography.

CAC: Say something about the culture of the Geography Department when you made this transfer.

JA: It was a very small place. When I came over, Mather was the chair of the department. I had taken a course from him. He found me hard to deal with because he was used to charming people in ways that did not work with me. You know Cotton, I suppose.

CAC: Ah, so well. So very well.

JA: He thought highly of me but I thought there was something occasionally shallow about his approach to things. Although we got along in kind of a careful arm's length way and he never did anything but positive things for me, we never really clicked. I think he was always a little bit hurt about that. But in any case, he supported my entry into the department. He was eager to get me as a teaching assistant in the department as soon as I finished my Upper Midwest stuff. The department was small at that time. There were seven or eight people in it and I took work from all of them. Porter was there. Barrett was there. John Webb. Ron Haleen who subsequently left, was there. Borchert. Lukermann. Broek. And Mei Ling Hsu came along

about 1962 or 1963. Schwartzberg came along a little bit later. I worked with all of them, the whole gang. There was eight or nine I think total.

CAC: It was unusual for any graduate student [unclear] department . . .

JA: Well, that's right.

CAC: Now the department's thirty or forty . . .

JA: That's right. But the other thing is that Fred was eager that I do that. He thought that since I had two degrees in another field, the more I could fill in my background by knowing what they all did. The other thing that I think is important goes back to St. Thomas when I was an undergrad and in that office. In my senior year, I took a course from Franz Mueller who had been educated in Berlin, and came here in the middle 1930s because he was a pacifist, and a Catholic, and the Nazi's didn't like him, and he got forced out. He came to St. Louis University, and taught Sociology for awhile, and then came up here to St. Thomas where he finished his career. Franz taught this course on the history of economic thought and I thought this a really interesting course. The idea that you could have a history of a field of knowledge and a history of ideas of a field of knowledge was really quite intriguing to me, as it is for many bright kids to catch on to that.

CAC: Sure.

JA: Some people thought it was a big bore and a chore but I liked the course. The problem was that Franz Mueller didn't know how to test people. He would give these short answer tests and I would answer the questions and invariably would get them wrong. I was in the office with him. He knew I was the best Economics student in a group of maybe thirty that were majoring in Economics. I would regularly get the lowest grade on his tests. So this drove him nuts. [laughter] He was so frustrated. He used to have me proofread his exams for all the other courses he taught before he gave them out because he wanted to be assured that they were okay. He knew I would help him. I got into some very deep and long conversations with him about this subject. He would sit down with me after the test and go over my answers with me because he would want to know why I got them wrong given the questions that he asked. He would ask me the question again and then ask me orally to expand on what I meant. I studied the course so well that I could quote whole paragraphs of where I knew he was drawing the question from. He would just shake his head frustrated that I would read the same thing he read, and read it differently from the way he read it, and therefore answer it differently from what he expected. I wasn't just getting low grades in that. I was in danger of getting a "D" in the course from him when other mediocre "C," "C+" students were getting "As." I was getting these low grades. So he would make special provision for me to write blue book expansions on my answers, to elaborate, to explain why I answered the question the way I answered it.

CAC: Sure.

JA: Then that gave him an excuse for raising my grade up to a "C." I think that was the only "C" I got in college was from Franz Mueller. But that's background to the fact that when I got over here, and changed my major to geography, and then took a series of courses from Jan Broek on the history of economic thought, that now I had two methodology courses that I could work at side by side.

CAC: History of geographic thought.

JA: History of geographic thought, that's right. I thought Well, isn't this interesting? I began to see in my own mind how these streams of ideas had been developed, sometimes intersecting, sometimes in parallel, during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, and sometimes earlier, because some of the economic thought of course comes out of stuff much earlier than the nineteenth century. The same with geography. Then I became very interested in this stuff. After that first full year . . . Those were the days around here when we taught full year courses. You remember that? Fall, winter, spring in History, Geography, and other places.

CAC: Staggered.

JA: You'd have the course and the pro-seminar in year one and then you'd have the three-quarter seminar in year two. We had the same thing in geographic thought. Broek taught this three-quarter sequence in geographic thought and then Lukermann had the seminar which followed it. That really was very interesting for me. It was at that time that I really got on top of . . . You asked me the question about the culture of the department at that time. I guess I was fully aware of the social, intellectual framework of the department at that time at the same time that I think I was much more self-confident—sometimes naively so—than many of the other students because of my odd background. I had spent a lot of time as an undergraduate in an academic department.

CAC: Of course.

JA: Then I had worked in another department both as a student and as a research assistant. Then I was in geography as a teaching assistant and although I was only twenty-five years old, I'd had all this other stuff that had me feel as though I was quite good. I wasn't the least bit shy about interacting with the professors and the culture of the department was very accepting of this. That's based in part, I think on the fact that there had been this struggle in the 1950s after Jan Broek came to the department. He was very old-fashioned, a Dutchman, who had been hired with the expectation that he would be in charge of the department; and he would advise all of the Ph.D. students. Some of the younger people didn't agree with that. Borchert was sort of this figurehead and actual leader of a group with other ideas. Borchert was sort of a Midwesterner. He had one student, according to the story that I heard from several sources, who wanted Borchert to advise him, and Broek wanted to advise all the Ph.D. students. It came to some kind of a head at the same time that Borchert had an opportunity to go to another place. I guess it came down to a conflict point and it was decided that it would change, the culture of the department, that Borchert would become chair of the department, that more than one professor

would supervise Ph.D. students; and then they moved into the next phase of departmental life in which John Webb and Fred Lukermann as the young instructors, Ph.D. candidates, would sort of move into their own. After Porter came along and Barrett, they really sort of started taking over the department. At the same time the department enrollments were expanding, they were taking on more staff. By the time I got there and started taking courses in the very early 1960s, there had been five years of history of this new environment. Now Broek never really got over being pushed aside. He didn't feel as though others were joining him. He felt that he had been shunted to the side. This came out in his manner and in a lot of little things that I used to observe. But I got along very well with him and he liked me a lot because I was very interested in the history of ideas and that was the course that he taught. Then of course Fred, who had a lot of respect for Broek's knowledge but didn't like his manner because he was part of that young Turk's group who had felt . . . They were swaggering by that time. And Mather, who had been in Graduate School with Borchert—they're the same age—was here but never quite part of the group. Mather always seemed to be a little bit out on the edge.

CAC: Still is.

JA: Yes, still is. They all made a good contribution to the place. Then when Porter came along, Porter brought a kind intellectual vitality, and curiosity, and a good mind, and a good education that complemented these other people extremely well. In the early 1960s, new ideas started coming into geography, the kinds of things that had been going on in economics and psychology . . .

CAC: Methodological ideas?

JA: Methodological approaches that were different, new kinds of questions, empirical inquiry. Fred got to know these people like Herbert Feigl that were over in the Philosophy Department and May Brodbeck came along . . . some of these people who had been working in logical positivism, and quantification, and social science. That was a fertile field at that time and the people who were good, you know, the people who had been around and trained in the 1930s who could look back at teachers who were products of the nineteenth century, and yet were active in the 1960s when new ways of doing things were available, and there was a lot of freedom in the expanding academy to try things out, and to get supported for what you were doing . . .

CAC: You bet.

JA: This was a fun time to be in school. People like Broek felt a little bit hurt. He said this in so many words more than once that these new ideas he felt were perfectly consistent with the way he liked to do things . . . that he saw them as more of . . . whereas some of the younger people saw them as rather than.

CAC: [laughter]

JA: I could see this you see because I'd already been through this in Economics.

CAC: They were probably both right.

JA: Of course they were. Of course they were. And I could see this. My years in Economics and my history of economic thought, right up to the present, coupled with what I had seen in Geography gave me more comfort in addressing these things as one of our graduate students. I remember having the temerity, one time in my last year, of organizing a coffee hour where I suggested that the agenda would be a public discussion of Broek's new book which was called *A Spirit and Purpose of Geography*, his little book that was published in the midst of all these methodological discussions. Then there was another book that had come out from the National Academy of Science which was celebrating all these new approaches to geography and I thought Let's read both of these and discuss them.

CAC: [laughter]

JA: I didn't have the wit to realize how sensitive that must have seemed . . .

CAC: Insensitive.

JA: Insensitive it would seem to Broek. On the other hand, Broek was smart enough and a good enough academic to know that this was the right thing to do. [laughter] So although personally he has hurt, he had the grace and the kindness to compliment me privately in his office for having engineered this thing. I was really not even then . . . it was still years later that I really understood what was going on—as often is the case. But the culture of the place at that time was vital. There were lots of people coming and going, quite a few graduate students coming in who had come out of college in the 1950s and early 1960s having been trained and educated in the old-fashioned way by old-fashioned teachers who really knew a lot, and having had classmates that were qualified to go to college, and there with backgrounds that allowed them to take full advantage of what was offered to them. So I had a very rich experience as a graduate student and really very nice classmates, smart, aggressive, interesting and knew a lot. You could talk about science, you could talk about mathematics, you could talk about philosophy, you could talk about religion, and they knew what you were talking about because everybody had come out of a similar . . . Somebody was Dartmouth, somebody else was from Berkeley, someone else was from Carleton, somebody from Macalester.

CAC: I'm going to back up just a bit to the 1960s because you have really two related comments. One was the ferment of new ideas. The other was the availability of money.

JA: Yes.

CAC: It won't surprise you because you know this university very well that in Education and Microbiology, in History, in zip, zip, zip the same thing was happening.

JA: That's right. I knew that.

CAC: The 1960s is a breakaway and did you put the breakaway in Geography in a larger context then?

JA: Yes, fully aware of it. I was aware of it having been in Economics and spent time there and coming over to Geography and spending time there. I could see the same things going on in both places. John Borchert spent a year as associate dean of the Graduate School somewhere in there, 1963, 1964, 1965 and talked to me—because I talked to him quite a bit—about this what was going on around the campus and around the university. Your normal graduate student isn't paying attention to these things.

CAC: Of course.

JA: I got tuned in early because these guys were part of the administration and then John Webb was—maybe that was a little later . . . He became associate dean of one of the things.

CAC: Associate dean of Social Science.

JA: Yes. I was fully apprised of this kind of ferment and then subsequently after I came back, I was able to put things that I'd picked up into a context and understood fully how this expansion of the college, and expansion of the university, and the large amount of money that was flowing in had a couple of effects. First of all, it allowed us to support quite . . . on expanding programs, and all these different departments, but also was very liberating because there was so much happening, and things were expanding so rapidly that there was a lot of freedom accorded to the professors to do pretty much what they wanted to do, and also for the graduate students to do what they wanted to do. There wasn't the same kind of old-fashioned . . .

CAC: Structure.

JA: Structure imposed from the top as there was a freedom to expand from below. In that interesting period where very capable people were coming into the programs in the midst of freedom and financial support—which didn't last very long because by the time it got to the middle 1970s, the people . . .

CAC: Oh, less than ten years or twelve.

JA: . . . who were coming in were not as well prepared. I mean a lot of nutty things had gone on in undergraduate programs so that people who were in college say between 1965 and 1970 . . .

CAC: As undergraduates?

JA: As undergraduates. They came to Graduate School—I was back here teaching—and they just didn't have it. Not to mention the fact that by that time, we were also getting into college kids who had been high schooled in the suburbs at precisely the time when the high schools were being staffed disproportionately by people who really were not your best college graduates. I mean, I started exploring this issue. The expanding suburban schools in the 1960s were drawing from among some of the least qualified college graduates. When you consider that post secondary education . . .

CAC: Because they had other career opportunities.

JA: Oh, sure. The business world was expanding. The technical careers were expanding. The law was expanding. Who was left over? That's a whole separate subject but it highlights the fact that up through about 1957 or 1958, very few people were in Graduate School compared with the 1960s. After the 1973-74 recession, the money dried up and in many cases the quality of preparation of people coming into the program was different from what it had been in the early and middle 1960s. I guess by 1975, it was perfectly clear to me that that period was very unusual, very unusual. Plus, when people did finish Graduate School—if they'd finish promptly enough—they could get into expanding programs and take their interest . . .

CAC: Just by chance, you were the right age to take advantage of all this.

JA: Yes, although a lot of people my age—plus or minus a couple of years, people born say between 1935 and 1941 or 1942—many of them thought this was a golden age that's going to go on forever, and they fiddled around and never finished. I mean there's lots of casualties along the road there because it was so easy to get a good job and not finish. I went down the list once in Geography and made a list of all the people who got Ph.D.s in Geography in the United States in 1966, which was when I finished—and I guess I know 80 percent of them—and it's just amazing what happened to those folks.

CAC: You provide a structure and cultural atmosphere that's hospitable to these things. It's money and it's expansion. But where do the new ideas come from themselves? Because you see in Microbiology, they had to become molecular biologists just like that. [clap] In History, it had to be the new Social History. You had to gear up. In Education, it was Special Education. It just took off in the 1960s. So Geography, where did the new ideas come from? There's a hospitable environment.

JA: Yes. One of the things that happened in the 1960s in the area in which I was working which was in Urban Geography was that a number of new theoretical ideas came on the scene with regard to systems of cities and how they're organized nationally and internationally, as well as a series of ideas about the social geography, internal geography of metropolitan areas. Without question the leading investigator in this area is a guy by the name of Bryan Berry. Bryan Berry did his Ph.D. at the University of Washington in the late 1950s with a precocious

group that somehow got there at that time. It was about fifteen people who were all in graduate school with him, graduated plus or minus a few years of 1959. Then they scattered around in Northwestern, to Penn State, to Chicago—which became the big center—and a couple of other places. That set in motion two main streams of research: one on social geography of cities and one on a system of cities . . . how they're connected, and how they are connected to the national, international economy, why some prosper and some don't, what determines their relative stature within the hierarchical system of cities within a national system. These ideas were developed and refined in the United States in capitalist quasi-free market systems; and they were adopted wholesale in the centrally planned economies in Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union, and in some of the client states of the Soviet Union and China, in Africa, and in Asia.

CAC: This all coming fast in the 1960s?

JA: All coming very fast in the 1960s, between 1959 and 1970, in that ten or twelve year period. That was the environment that I grew up in. The National Science Foundation . . .

CAC: That turns you toward urban . . .

JA: No, I was already there.

CAC: Yes, except the field wasn't there but you were.

JA: Yes, that's right. I think it's fair to say . . . In fact I wrote several papers when I was in Graduate School on the idea of the geographical study of cities . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

JA: He did substantial work on that but in Urban Geography, it is the case that in 1965, 1966, 1964, there were between sixty and a hundred Ph.Ds. awarded in Geography each year; and over half of them were in Physical Geography and Physical Environmental Studies.

CAC: I see.

JA: So the people who were doing Social Geography, and Economic Geography, and Urban Geography were a real small minority. But that's partly because your undergraduate formation, and other, just pre-disposed you to study things that were standard in that sense. I had sailed in later with some of my own ideas based on previous thinking and studying as well as on my work on the Upper Midwest Study. I was able to kind of jump in mid-stream and do things that I might not have done had I started in Geography earlier. Then when I got here, I discovered that there was no one in the Geography Department when I joined it who had a bachelor's degree in Geography.

CAC: Heavens!

JA: All of them had bachelor's degrees in some other area and then had come to the geography field at the graduate level. The consequence of this was that there was a very catholic appreciation for how scholarship was done and the different ways in which you could ask questions and generate answers. I found that a very comfortable environment. So that's really how I got started on this business and then I went to Penn State in 1966.

CAC: So now you have your degree and this is your first job away from here?

JA: I got my Ph.D. That's right. In fact I finished my Ph.D. about Christmas of my last year here and I was a teaching assistant. That's why I had time to organize these coffee hours and get in trouble as an intellectual gadfly.

CAC: Were you married by then?

JA: Oh, yes. I got married in 1962. I was married the last four years of graduate school, and had two children by that time, and two subsequently. My wife grew up in Bloomington and she's a graduate of St. Catherine's. She studied economics and mathematics at St. Catherine's. We both had old parents. Judith's father was born in 1884, so he was a pretty old man and my dad was born in 1900 . . . you know, two nineteenth century fathers.

CAC: Sure.

JA: We decided that we didn't want to be old when our kids were little so we made a very explicit plan to do what we had to do in order to get settled young.

CAC: It took a good deal of courage.

JA: It did but at the same time those are optimistic years. There was a lot of promise for people who wanted to buckle down, and get their work done; and I didn't have any trouble ordering myself to get done with work. To this day, I'm still a little puzzled that it's . . .

CAC: You were a good Catholic. You had the Protestant ethic.

JA: I always thought that Jews and Catholics make the best Protestants. [laughter]

CAC: Right.

JA: I went to Penn State because Fred told me to. Fred Lukermann was my doctoral advisor. He had been at a meeting, one of our Geography meetings, and went to a session in which a whole series of these new ideas was being discussed. He discovered that at Penn State there was a chairman of the department who was especially interested in taking advantage of the new

thinking and hiring people that would carve new paths, rather than reinstate the old. He liked the spirit as he understood it there. He comes back from the meeting—those are the old days—and he said, “Allen Rogers, the chair at Penn State, wants you to call him.” So I called him. He said, “We want you to come out here.” See, this was what was a search in 1966.

CAC: Sure. The National Guild was smaller.

JA: That’s right. So I went out there, and I talked about myself, and told them what I writing my dissertation on. Then I got back home, and he called me up, and offered me a job. I asked Fred what to do. He said, “Take it!” [laughter] That was it. That was the beginning and the end. I went the last five months of my Ph.D. program with a job in my pocket, and my degree done, and I was a teaching assistant. Then I went out there and fell in with a bunch of new people who were all trafficking in this stuff. We organized a graduate orientation seminar that was dealing exclusively with all these new ideas. We sat down and figured out if we were a new bunch of kids coming in—big program, twenty to twenty-five new students—What should we teach them? What do you want new people to be reading, and thinking about, and talking about? So we organized a seminar. Then we taught it. Very exciting. Then we did the same thing the following fall but in the meantime, we had had such a good success with the first seminar that we said, “Maybe we ought to think about writing some of this down.” We made a plan for writing a book, the four of us who had put this seminar together. One of the guys dropped out. We decided we would run the thing the second time and then at the end of the second time write a book based on what we had learned, what had worked, what hadn’t worked, what we thought was important to teach and not teach, and generally make an introduction to the field, the modern field of geography. So we did. The chairman was just horrified because you’re not supposed to be writing books of that sort when you’re a beginning assistant professor. He was real nervous about this. “Allen,” we said, “cool it. Don’t worry about it. We’ll get our other stuff done but we want to do this, too.” And we did.

Then the second year, my office partner from Minnesota, who was also one of Lukermann’s advisees, came out there because they had another position to fill and they said, “Who do you know?” And I said, “Call Ron.” So he called Ron, Ronald Abler is his name. He’s now the executive director of the Association of American Geographers. He was my best, long time professional friend. We lived next door to each other at State College of Pennsylvania. We wrote this book and this book was a real sensation. I mean it really put all of us on the map. We got done with it in 1969, and then it was published by Prentiss Hall in 1971, and it was really a very well received book. It just came out at the right time.

CAC: Not monographic? A think piece.

JA: It’s a real think piece. It wasn’t organized like a text book. It was organized like a book. But it was called *Spacial Organization:the Geographer's View of the World*. That was the title, a pretentious title.

CAC: Very [unclear].

JA: Very pretentious. It's been known around the world that Abler, Adams, and Gould . . . Ron Abler from here, me, and Peter Gould who's a regents professor of Geography at Penn State now; and he was one of these early guys in this business. That book got a lot of attention, sold a lot of copies, circulated around the world as sort of the thing that you ought to read. It was really the second generation of such a book because an earlier two of three books . . . kind of getting at it, getting at this new stuff, bits and pieces . . . had already been published, well received and all the rest. Then we came along with one that was much more accessible, more interestingly written, better examples by Americans so that there was a lot of American material in it; whereas the others were written by Brits.

CAC: There's a real hunger for this kind of synthesis?

JA: At that time. That's right. We actually made money on the book. It's hard to make money on a scholarly book but each of us made about \$7500, in 1970 dollars.

CAC: Big money.

JA: So we're talking decent cash. On top of that, you see, it became almost an establishment way of thinking about human geography between 1963 and maybe 1983. There was a twenty year period in there. Then toward the end of the 1970s, new ideas were coming along; especially the Marxists and others were writing about social theory, and large structure and agency problems and issues, and whatnot, and there was a kind of falling away of favor of quantitative approaches and abstract theoretical models, and geometric analysis and whatnot—which was okay. They recruited me back here. My wife didn't like the state college. It was a boom college town. It was like living in Edina. Everybody was prosperous. Everybody was comfortable. Everybody was doing what they wanted to do. We got 10 percent raises every year. The university was just booming. It was about ten years behind the University of Minnesota in its growth curve.

CAC: They had a good football team in those days?

JA: Oh, yes. Bill Paterno [Joe Paterno] lived down the street from us. But she got restless and although I could easily see myself staying there because I saw that the future of the department was really almost unlimited. We were in a College of Earth and Mineral Sciences with a wonderful dean, a lot of support for the department. Without question, that was the best college, and as far as I know still is the best college at Penn State, the College of Earth and Mineral Sciences—125 faculty.

CAC: How long were you there?

JA: Four years.

CAC: So then you come back here?

JA: I was looking for a job. I went to Kansas. I went to Madison. Berkeley. I looked at a couple of other places. They really pulled hard to get me back here. So I came. But as I came, something else happened. This Bryan Berry whom I mentioned and John Borchert, David Ward who is now the chancellor at Wisconsin . . . is a geographer—maybe he's the president of the University of Wisconsin; he's the senior academic guy there—a guy from Berkeley and a couple of others organized a team to put together what they called A Comparative Analysis of American Metropolitan Regions. Bryan Berry went to NSF [National Science Foundation] and got \$50,000 to put together a summer institute at Chicago in the summer of 1970. It was a three-week institute; and he invited people from all over the United States, about forty people, to come and to make presentations and to engage in small group discussions of, If we were going to do a serious analysis of American metropolitan areas based on what we learned in the last fifteen years in American geography, what would that study contain? It was a very stimulating time because he brought in all the big guns and I was this young . . . I was only thirty-one years old and already out of school four years and I was invited because Borchert said, "You want to make sure Adams comes." So they had this workshop in June and then the professional association, our geographer's association, met in San Francisco that year in Berkeley. At the end of August when the meeting was over, they convened a small discussion of, What to do next on the heels of that June workshop. This was what was called the steering committee, led by Berry, and Borchert, and me, and a couple of other young whippersnappers. They talked and talked and talked. They said, "Well, obviously the next thing to do is to write a proposal to the National Science Foundation to get the study going. They all said, "That sounds like a good idea." Now, I realize everybody was looking at me. [laughter] They said, "Well, John, do you want to do that?" I said, "Who me?" They said, "Yes, you." Why do you think you're here was the implied message. So I said, "Sure." How could I say no? Here's the leading guys in the country on urban geography asking me—four years out of graduate school—to write a proposal and ask for funds from the National Science Foundation to do the study that would bring it all together. So I wrote the proposal, and we submitted it, and we got the grant. We got about \$380,000 in 1972.

CAC: This was staged out of the University of Minnesota or . . . ?

JA: Yes, it was here. I was the chief investigator. So then I knew this was going to be a big project and I needed some help. I called Abler, my buddy, who had been an office partner here when we were graduate students, who I dragged out to Penn State in 1967. We had done the book together. Now, he was getting groomed to be the chair of the department since they'd shed tears over the fact that I left because I was the heir apparent. I called Ron and said, "Can you come to Minnesota for two years to help me run this project?" He said, "Okay." So we ran it together. We did this from 1970 . . .

CAC: That's big research money . . .

JA: I had over a hundred people working for me.

CAC: Whew! But all over the country?

JA: Well, two-thirds of them were all over the country. We commissioned twenty individual city studies in the twenty largest metro areas of the United States. Then we commissioned fourteen topical studies on different issues: on housing, on health care, the litany of things people were worried about in the 1960s. So we had thirty-three separate projects out and then we had a home staff. We finished it all up and published all those books.

CAC: Did you have responsibilities forgiven for doing this or were you teaching a full load? That's a lot of responsibility.

JA: I don't remember having a reduced load. Maybe I did.

CAC: Boy! That's a big obligation.

JA: Yes. But I had a good staff here. John Webb was the dean at the time. I said to him, "I need some space and I need to bend a few rules and regs to get all this stuff done right." We got it all done, published all these books, became very famous in the urban geography business because god! we involved everybody. We had universities all over the country working with us. It was for a four-, five-, six-year period. The big project that the . . .

CAC: In the meantime there's no Urban Studies Program as such here?

JA: It had begun then. Borchert and Fred Lukermann had gotten the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs going, and then was its acting director briefly, and then Borchert was engaged to be its director in 1969, I believe. Then a couple of years later, they got the Urban Studies Program organized in the very early 1970s. Hy Bermann was the director of the program.

CAC: But you quickly . . .

JA: I became the director of the Urban Studies Program when Hy stepped aside which was around in 1974, 1975. Meanwhile, the School of Public Affairs had been created in 1969 and they . . .

CAC: This was a spinoff of the Department of Political Science?

JA: That's right. Actually, no, it didn't quite work that way. I wasn't here at the time but the Public Administration Program that had been a unit or a program within Political Science had separated itself from Political Science and had become—in the words of its critics—intellectually moribund by the middle or late 1960s, and then they terminated it; and they started the School of Public Affairs out of whole cloth and hired John Brandl to run it when they failed to get

whoever this guy from Mankato that was at Harvard . . . the blind guy. I can't remember what his name was. I had worked with Brandl one summer in the Upper Midwest Study. He had been home that summer looking for a summer job while he was at Harvard and I met him. We used to spend a little time together. I actually ran into him at Newman because he worked for the Upper Midwest Study as I did and we bumped into each other there. He came back here either at the very end of 1969 or very early 1970, and then I came back here in the fall of 1970, and then I saw him, and I asked him what he was doing, and he told me. Meanwhile Fred Lukermann had described—I'd kept in close touch with Fred all the while I was gone—he told me what was going on because he was working with Gerry Shepherd at the time as assistant vice-president for Academic Affairs.

CAC: Sure.

JA: He told me the whole story and I said to John, "If you need any help, holler. I'm right here." The school was located on the third floor of this building, Social Science Tower, and the Geography Department was on the fourth floor, and my office in Geography was on the fifth floor; so it was very easy for me to go up and down and talk about this stuff.

CAC: There was a carry over staff, even though the program . . .

JA: There was a small carry over staff of several tenured people. Orville Peterson was one. Lloyd Short was one.

CAC: George Warp.

JA: George Warp was one. And Jim Jernberg was one. I think those were the four.

CAC: But they were kind of free floating.

JA: Yes, but then once the school was created, then they were . . . There was also one other guy. I never did meet him. I can't remember his name. He was an old foreign service guy. He had an office over in Walter Library. What happened was that I kept in touch with Brandl because periodically I would go down there at the end of the day to see how it was going and chat with him. Somewhere along around early 1972, I believe it was, Fred Lukermann released a chunk of money—I think it was like \$40,000 or \$50,000—to start a planning program. Fred insisted that the planning program be lodged in the School of Public Affairs because he didn't want it to be in the School of Architecture because the architects wanted it as an urban design project; and Fred and Borchert and others knew that was the wrong place for it. Amidst great human cry over in architecture, they put it there, and then John asked me if I would help to develop it. I said, "Sure,"—not that I knew exactly what to do but I agreed to help—and that's how I got involved in the Humphrey Institute in early 1972. So while I was running the research project and teaching my classes . . .

CAC: It is not yet the Humphrey Institute?

JA: No, no. It was the School of Public Affairs then. So then what happened was I finished my project. I got a Fulbright [Scholarship] to go to Austria. I went to Austria the fall of . . . the semester of 1975. Then I came back in February. At the same time I was gone, Brandl had decided to leave—he had decided earlier to leave but they wouldn't let him—as director. He didn't want to do that anymore. A search committee for a new director had been established and Borchert was the chair. What they did was interview everybody who was working with the School of Public Affairs, and asked them what they thought was needed, and how things were going, and how it fit into the rest of the university, and all the rest. After this, I thought I was just being interviewed to find out how to think about it, but subsequently I got offered the job to be director of the School of Public Affairs. I started being director in the fall of 1976.

CAC: Then it is the Humphrey Institute?

JA: No, not yet.

CAC: All right.

JA: But there is a little interesting footnote to all of this that may go part way to explaining how I got involved in this to begin with. Aside from my early contact with Brandl during the years of the Upper Midwest Study, and my reestablishment of the connection after I came back here, and then my masters of planning connection for a few years before I went to Austria, I at the time I left Penn State was told by my former chairman, Allen Rogers, "Minnesota, huh? Going back to Minnesota?" He said, "If you ever run into an old pal of ours out at Minnesota, say 'Hello' to him. He used to teach political science here." I said, "What's his name?" He said, "His name is Frank Sorauf." [laughter]

CAC: Of course.

JA: So I get here in August, and I unpack my books, and the first thing I decided to do was join the Campus Club. This is the olden days. I thought of course you belong to the Campus Club. So I was walking from the Social Science Tower over to the Bridge and I saw another guy coming from where the law school now is. We're the only people here. It's like the third week of August and there's no one around. I see him, and he's smiling, and I'm smiling. So I shake hands with him and say, "Hi. I'm new on the campus. My name is John Adams." He said, "Hi. I'm Frank Sorauf." [laughter] I said, "You are? I've got something to tell you!" So I told him the story. He was highly amused by this . . . the first person I meet on campus was . . . So then I tell Frank, "Well, I did my graduate studies here and I'd be glad to help you out . . ." No, I didn't say that to him. I just got to know him because after that then I would talk to him. Then he became the dean the next year.

CAC: In 1973.

JA: In 1973? Whenever it was.

CAC: The fall of 1973.

JA: He called me up as soon as he was dean and asked me to be on a college long-range planning committee with Nina Archabal and a whole series of other people that I got to know through that device. That was really interesting. I didn't know how to do anything about long-range planning. This was of course the recession time. He becomes dean at a time when the finances of the college and the end of that growth here had occurred; and so I got to know Frank pretty well then, plus a number of other people, and I think between 1973 and 1976 while I was finishing my research project, while I was getting established in the department, getting to know people around the college, Brandl decided to leave . . . I don't know what Borchert and his committee ever said to Frank but I know that Frank was the one who asked me if I would chair Public Affairs. I said, "Sure." It was a small unit. It seemed interesting. I liked what they were doing. I believed in the mission. I got along with them all.

CAC: It had an applied dimension [unclear] so far had not [unclear] explicitly?

JA: No, that's correct. Although it didn't have as much of an applied dimension then as I thought it should have had because Brandl's model for the school was, as he put it, "An M.A. in Public Affairs—Education for the Public Service." They wanted to put distance between the previous program which was very much a training program and what he thought was more appropriate which was a post-graduate education for the public service, sort of like a French model. I went to work there and it was a very busy time. In early 1977, not six months into the job, the regents . . . Frank called me up and told me to come over to the office. He says, "John, what would you think of a Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs?" I said, "What do you mean?" He says, "The regents just created it." He was so pissed. He could hardly talk.

CAC: [laughter]

JA: Because he had not been consulted about this at all.

CAC: About the idea . . . ?

JA: I don't think he even liked the idea. He had been, of course . . . You should ask him about this but it certainly became clear to me that he, and Turner, and Holt, and those other folks who had in their mind created a new Political Science Department on top of this distinguished previous Political Science operation had been there, had very different ideas about what social sciences, and education for service, and all the rest would mean. Maybe there was chagrin or maybe there was anger. The idea that a discarded unit reestablished and renamed would suddenly be thrust into prominence after Political Science had gotten rid of it . . .

CAC: [laughter]

JA: . . . might have been irritating to say the least but what really angered Frank—according to what he told me—was that they didn't even ask him. They just did it. Of course in those days, the Regents' Board had a large number of political hacks on it who were close to the DFL Party and they thought this was an appropriate thing to do.

CAC: Sure.

JA: Those weren't the days of careful process.

CAC: It was conceived at the regential level?

JA: That's right.

CAC: Not out of Central Administration . . .

JA: That's right. That's exactly right. And so I guess the vice-president told . . . Well, I don't know who told Frank but he was really mad. So then he said, "What should we do?" I said, "Well, hell, we'll do it.. We'll figure out how to do it and do it."

CAC: It gave you access to a level of funding that the program would not have had without Hubert's name on it, right?

JA: Oh, I think that's correct. Although I guess that may be true, it's hard to know how it would have worked out differently. I certainly wasn't . . . I was qualified to chair the School of Public Affairs as it had developed up to that point; but in order to take it to the next level of prominence and whatnot that was needed, a different kind of person would have been required, a person who had a different kind of network, who was actively interested in the kinds of things that an institute like that would want to do. I was pretty much a kind of a hardcore academic more than I was any kind of a public policy activist of one kind or another.

CAC: Well, the kind of person like Harlan Cleveland who came later?

JA: Yes. Harlan had his flaws but what happened was they created . . .

CAC: He had different network.

JA: Different network, different ideas, different ambitions. In that period from January, February 1977 when the institute was created and when I resigned at the end of November in 1979, I realized that I couldn't do what was needed partly because we really couldn't get the support to do it from within. There was not any enthusiasm in the college for supporting that operation.

CAC: Was this [unclear] through the college?

JA: Yes. It was still in the college.

CAC: So, it wasn't free standing?

JA: It wasn't free standing.

CAC: Okay.

JA: There was a lot of anger around about the fact that it had happened. When Peter Magrath was president, I spent a lot of time with Peter, got to know him pretty well over this because it was as big a headache for him in terms of time spent on it as the Health Sciences debacles of last year were for Nils [Hasselmo]. I spent several hours each week with the president about this. I realized that for development purposes and for political insulation purposes, it was going to be necessary to get some external advice and help on the thing because at that time, initially, Hubert was still alive. A lot of people were trying to manipulate things on behalf of their own agendas and it was a difficult time.

CAC: I bet. Didn't it have its own advisory committee?

JA: No, it didn't at first and the dean didn't want one.

CAC: Because it would have brought in all of Hubert's friends?

JA: Sure it would have. So what I did, I went out and rounded up some people to help me think about it; and the first person I contacted was John French. Do you know John?

CAC: Oh! Yes! I will interview him later.

JA: Okay. I asked John if he would help me. I said the first thing I wanted to do was to have him help me find four or five other people who could help us chart an intelligent course that would serve the interests of the university and the institute and try to insulate us from some of this political and financial pressure that we felt we were under.

CAC: We should state for posterity—you and I know John French—but he was a distinguished lawyer.

JA: Senior partner of Faegre and Benson. He had been a graduate of the University of Minnesota.

CAC: Very active in the Alumni Association.

JA: Harvard Law Review. He clerked with Felix Frankfurter at the United States Supreme Court. He was a Rhodes scholar. He came back here, and joined the firm, and has been

managing partner at Faegre and Benson for a number of years now, and for many years was in the Democratic Farmer Labor Party state convention . . . the chair of the convention because everybody trusts him. They know that he is a person of unquestioned integrity and fairness.

CAC: Through it all, he maintained a connection to the university?

JA: Yes, right. He's a wonderful guy.

CAC: Very nice person [unclear].

JA: Besides that, he was my neighbor. He lived two blocks away from me and my daughter was his paper girl. [laughter] He was very interested in the fact that she went to West Point. But that's another story. John helped me round up several other people. After I got agreement from these five people to help us, I went and talked to Peter Magrath, and I told him that I thought I needed some advice . . . I was going to ask these people for advice. Peter was very disturbed. He was caught between board members who wanted one thing and his own agenda which was to make sure this turned out to be a decent academic enterprise and the fact that I was inside of a unit that had a dean that didn't approve of the whole thing to begin with. It was along around this time, after Hubert had died . . .

CAC: And Magrath knew Sorauf's skepticism?

JA: Oh, yes. Oh, yes. Although Frank didn't seem to have much appreciation for Peter, I spent a lot of time with Peter. I think there was a lot more there than some of his critics on campus felt there was. I mean if you spend enough time with a person and get to know how they think and why they're doing what they're doing, especially in the midst of the chaos that this university was involved in since the middle 1960s up through Ken Keller—which is another whole story in and of itself—I was very sympathetic with the headache that Peter had to deal with because I knew some of those members of the board; and I couldn't believe that he could hold his equilibrium for ten years dealing with that board. It was just awful.

CAC: You became privy to the situation through conversations with Peter? You didn't yourself have contact with the regents?

JA: Yes, sometimes. They always wanted to know. Every time I would go to a regents' meeting to report, they'd collar me in the hall, find out what was going on, want to ask leading questions . . .

CAC: These were old Humphrey friends?

JA: Old Humphrey buddies. You know, half the board—it starts running together in my mind—David Roe, and Mary Schertler, and I wish I could remember their names now.

CAC: Neil Sherburne?

JA: Neil was okay. Neil was a pretty decent guy. Neil was clearheaded, helpful. He would ask what he could do to help but he would never try to steer things or to elicit . . .

CAC: David Roe.

JA: David Roe was awful. I think David Roe did not help this university in the long haul in a lot of ways. And Mary was not helpful. Those are the two that stick in my mind as the most troublesome.

CAC: But you had to deal with them directly as well as . . .

JA: Yes, because I had to report every regents' meeting and answer their questions; and then after I'd report, I'd go out in the hall, and they'd follow me out, and want to know more. I had this impression that they really wanted to direct what was going on inside for reasons that weren't made clear. Now if they would just be up front about it, we might have been able to do business but all of these veiled references . . . plus the fact that I really wasn't as neither sophisticated in the ways of those worlds as I am today, nor did I feel that I had much support from the dean because Frank was just angry from A to Z over this whole thing. He just didn't like it a bit for a lot of reasons. Now he's trying to run a complicated college in a difficult financial picture and all of a sudden, instead of paying attention to the dean's agenda for the college, all they wanted to do was pay attention to this monument Hubert and in the first year, just to posture in front of Hubert because he was still alive. Everything they did was for public consumption.

I'll just tell one more story because I don't think anybody knows this and if anybody ever were to ask me the question, Do I have any proud recollections or memories of my term of office of 3½ years directing the School of Public Affairs/Humphrey Institute, I would say, "Yes, one." It was decided that there was going to be a federal appropriation to the institute—I don't know if you knew about this—a 5-million dollar appropriation. Congressman Ford in Michigan was an old pal of Humphrey, not Gerry [Gerald] Ford, but . . . from Lansing . . . I don't know where he's from . . . doesn't matter. He was on the Education Committee and he introduced a bill that was written by his staff guide, Tom Jolly. They asked me to come to Washington to help them draft this bill. So I went out to Washington and was sitting in the hotel across from the White House there, that little fancy hotel. We were sitting down in the bar and he said, "Now we're thinking of 5-million." You know he's got his pad and paper out there and he says . . .

CAC: Was this to be an endowment?

JA: Yes. A grant. That was one of the earliest ones of this sort of thing. They do a lot of it now.

CAC: But a grant to go into an endowment?

JA: That's right. A grant for an endowment. And he said, "Now what we have to do is figure out what the money's for." I said, "The money's going to be mainly for student scholarships." That was the main thing. General purpose endowment is the other thing but the main thing was scholarship money because over the long run that's the kind of money that's hardest to get. "Money to get to support students," I said, "that's really got to be important." He said, "Okay." He makes notes to this and then he introduces the bill but in the bill, it's just a grant. There's no details. They passed the bill. We got the money. I got a call from a staffer a number of months later and he said, "I'm so and so in Congressman Ford's office, and we have to finish the legislative history of this bill, and we want to make sure that we got it all straight because this goes into the file."

CAC: Sure.

JA: I said, "Oh, what have you got? Tell me what you've got." He said, "Well, it looks here—there's a few notes that he gave us—it says, "Student scholarships . . . endowment money," and so forth. I said, "Okay, here's the way it is." So I read him the percentages that would go to each of these, like 40 percent for student scholarships . . . proceeds on 40 percent . . . and on those that he's figuring 5 percent on 5-million, there's 2½-million; so I figured if you had 40 percent of that, it would be million dollars a year for scholarship money. You could support a lot of students for that. Then I said, "Read it back to me." So she typed this up and read it back to me. I said, "That sounds right. You know what you do is put this in the file in case of any questions later and all of us are gone." "Okay."

Time passes. Harlan Cleveland is subsequently hired as dean and they start talking about the building. I introduced a bill over at the legislature and the legislature comes back and says, "Well, don't you have an endowment? You ought to use the endowment money, part of it for the building." So the lawyer for the university starts tracking down the history of what this money is supposed to be used for. They go back and find this paper in the files in Washington and sure as hell! they can't use it for the building. [laughter] That was nice.

CAC: Well, we know that courts honor legislative intent to some degree.

JA: They did. As soon as the lawyer from the university or from the legislature, or both, discovered this, they just stopped looking because they knew there wasn't any way they were going to change that. Then they got all the money, 17 million from the . . .

CAC: So that's still there, those scholarship monies?

JA: It's still there, and still being used, and over the years, it has been widely understood over there that the fact that the university, Humphrey Institute, has this money for endowment, for many years made it the second or third most lucrative scholarship fund of the Schools of Public Affairs in the United States. Princeton is the only one that had more.

CAC: It was a sum that not many other colleges or programs have, even at the University of Minnesota?

JA: That's right. Oh, that's right. That's absolutely right. But now where does us bring us? I don't know. I left, went off to sabbatical, was tired. It was a difficult time. Harlan insisted, of course as terms of his appointment, that the institute be separated as an independent college.

CAC: Yes.

JA: Of course at the time he came, there was a lot of money in the endowment fund but then through very stupid money management on the part of several people—I don't know who. Instead of taking that 12 or 13 million that they had and buying long term treasury bonds at 16 or 15 percent, which is what they were selling for, they started playing the stock market and lost their ass. Then they were back broke, not broke but with very . . . Then Harlan started using the endowment money to support operations, and trimmed it back, and then the last few years of his tenure built it back up again. But had they just taken the money they had in the bank when I left and bought long term bonds which were yielding at the end of the 1970s and early 1980s, 12, 14, 15 percent, they would have had a spectacular budget over the next decade instead of scrimping and saving as they did. But I was very happy with what little that I was able to do there. It was a difficult thing administratively at all levels, from the president, to the dean, the regents, the external community.

CAC: You bet.

JA: When I told Peter about this attempt to devise an advisory group, he forbid it. I believe that he thought it would just get him in trouble with the regents.

CAC: Sure.

JA: And I think he's right. Since the regents were the boss, he did what he had to do and I had to tell John that we couldn't proceed.

CAC: But you had good private advice from John?

JA: Sure.

CAC: Okay.

JA: That's right. Then I came back from sabbatical in 1981.

CAC: Where did you go on sabbatical?

JA: I was in California at the University of California at Berkeley, at the Institute of Urban and Regional Studies half time; and I was half time at the Research Department at the Bank of America. We had interviewed once at the Humphrey Institute a guy by the name John Oliver Wilson. He had been the president of Northstar and Development, Inc. which was this think tank that was created under Walter Heller and several others back in the 1960s. Wilson was an economist and when he left Northstar, he came over to the Humphrey Institute to see if he could find a new perch there; and we couldn't use him at the time because we weren't hiring during those late 1970s years. But then he went on to Bank of America and was the senior research director there. So I wrote to him and said, "I'm coming on sabbatical. I'd like to come and chat with you about maybe there's something I can do out there." I went down to Stanford to see one of my pals—the chair of the economics department there, a former classmate of mine here from Minnesota—and looked at possibly spending my sabbatical at Stanford, and then I went to Berkeley, and talked with those guys; and I decided to divide my time between the two. At the Bank of America, I was interested in studying country risk. How do international banks decide whether or not to lend money to developing countries and what are the criteria that they use because that seemed to me to be a . . . I couldn't understand why they did the dumb things they did and I wanted to study it. Then over at Berkeley I was working on some other projects. Then I came back and became chair of the department.

CAC: In the meantime, you're picking up an interest in Eastern Europe.

JA: I had gone to Russia in 1978. That's another . . . there's lots of stories. In 1958, when it first became easy for academics to go to Russia, a group from the University of Minnesota, including Frank Boddy, Phil Raup, John Borchert, Bill Howell, a bunch of senior people, went there with support I think from the Hill Family Foundation. They had a good study tour, about a month, came back. Then they went again in 1968. Then 1978 came along and they thought, Let's go again, but by this time some of the first people were not interested, or too old, or retired, or something; so that I got invited by John Turner to go and so I went. It was a good trip. I learned a lot and decided to pay more attention to what was going on in the Soviet Union. That particular interest didn't come to full fruition though until later. When I was chair of the Department of Geography, starting in 1981, I got elected vice-president of the Association of American Geographers. The next year, while I was chairman of the department, I was president of the association and was part of a delegation that went to Russia the second time. I spent a lot of time in several parts of the country then, and then I decided I was going to spend more time on this, and subsequently did. I guess having spent a lot of my early years on domestic urban stuff, I realized when I was in Austria in 1975-76 that I ought to pay more time on some international sides of my work; and so in the subsequent years, I went to Europe several times as part of these NSF exchange seminars where groups from both countries get together, first on one side, and then on the other side to exchange ideas and so forth. It turns out that I was in the minds of some of the senior people who organized these things, a better than average participant because I was aggressive socially and was good at taking advantage of these things.

CAC: [unclear] language barrier [unclear] conversations that you obviously have all over here?

JA: Difficult but not impossible. The reason I mention that is that I spent a lot of time in Europe in those years, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, and was I think casting a wider net of contacts, and responding to invitations by senior people in my field to be one of the younger people to take over from them. I'd been very busy in the previous fifteen years, and a lot of people knew me, and then by becoming chairman of a prominent department, and becoming president of our association, you really get a lot of attention.

CAC: A lot of visibility.

JA: And since I was willing to do this stuff and I had a nice stable home life that made it easy to come and go, I was really able to capitalize on these opportunities. Beside I like to go to place. A lot of people don't. They complain about the food. They complain about the hotel. They complain all the time. They're typical American tourists. I hate that because I like to go places and take them on their terms.

CAC: The only other person with the same enthusiasm that I know is Phil Raup. [laughter]

JA: I've travelled with Phil more than once and we get along fine for the same reasons.

CAC: In the meantime, you're publishing like crazy, too.

JA: Oh, I wrote a lot of stuff. I don't know how much. Some of it was well received. A lot of it is just the routine things that people do. A lot of it was by invitation. You know, it's another thing in any discipline, if you're a good citizen, if people ask you to do stuff and you do it well, they ask you to do some more. And if you're willing to do things on other people's terms without compromising your own integrity and your own interests, you'll get on every committee you want to be on. So I was always pretty busy. Those early books that I wrote were well received and got a lot of attention all around the world. So now even getting into my older years, I can go into just about any country and people know this stuff. [laughter] It's kind of interesting.

CAC: Yes.

JA: About the time you figure out how the thing works, you're about ready to fold your tent.

CAC: You've got a lot of things to do. I'm looking now at the recent University of Minnesota Service [unclear] and a lot of these you work up to. I mean you say you are available and you're known as a good citizen so you do it; but it's in the Graduate School, it's on the Consultative Committee, it's the University College Working Group, etcetera. Say something about your activity in the university community now.

JA: Okay. I got to know Gerry Shepherd through Lukermann pretty early. Shepherd put my name into things along with Fred in the middle 1970s and I got involved in Senate committee

stuff early—I suppose earlier than some people do. I was on the Senate Committee on Finance and Planning, although it wasn't called that then, while I director of the Humphrey Institute. I got to know Fred Bowen the short time he was here as I replaced president for Finance and became aware through conversations with him about some of the chaos in this place in terms of record keeping, financial management, and all this kind of stuff; and I expressed interest in it, and talked to Peter Magrath about it. I talked to Fred all the time because he was my teacher. But Fred has never been a very managerial type so things that Fred paid attention to were things that I thought were important but he was letting a lot of other things go that I could see we were getting into trouble . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

JA: . . . in terms of my subsequent university involvement turned out to be the most important. One was the Committee on the *Press*.

CAC: Oh.

JA: I was on the Committee for the *University Press* for five years and through that committee involvement became quite familiar with the stuff that was being done in the fields where the *Press* was most active: in philosophy, natural resources, Upper Midwest concerns, history, geography, some of the stuff in psychology, and agriculture, and applied economics, and some of the new criticism that was coming along. We would read all of these proposals that came forward from the editors, discuss the books. It's a wonderful committee to be on because you really feel like you're a university professor when you're on those committees. You find out what your colleagues are doing and you have a broad view of the big enterprise that's wonderful. The other committee that I was on was the General Research Advisory Committee [GRAC] in the Graduate School. I was on that for twelve years. When I first joined it, Skip Scriven from Chemical Engineering was the chair. I think he took over from Jack Darley or maybe there's someone in between. That's a wonderful committee also because you get to see what all your young colleagues are doing because half the proposals that come in, outside the Health Sciences, are from assistant professors . . . another wonderful window on what people are doing. I became known on the committee as a very versatile reviewer. They almost always gave me the proposals in History, Geography, Sociology, Political Science, Law, Geology, Archaeology, and a couple of the resource fields over in St. Paul . . . once in awhile from Business and Public Affairs, also. Now by that I mean, maybe thirty or forty each round, fall and spring rounds, and over a twelve year period, you really get to know who's doing what around here. It's really great.

CAC: And at what quality level?

JA: Very high quality. The people we've hired at this university at the junior ranks in the last decade are just impressive as all get out. I think that the senior people—this gets us off to

another topic—and the junior people are terrific. We've got a problem in some of the middle ranks in our university of the people who are . . .

CAC: Plenty of whom are full professors.

JA: Yes. But I mean people who between the ages of thirty-five and fifty-five, that bunch. For a lot of interesting and complicated reasons, the vitality that ought to be there, and the productivity we ought to be able to expect from that group, isn't what I think we need. But those two committees, GRAC and the *U Press* Committee were wonderful experiences and I guess being chair of a department in CLA [College of Liberal Arts], paying close attention to college affairs, and then having these two windows on all university things, and knowing quite a few people around campus, and making it my business to write to people, pay attention to people, get to know what they're doing . . .

CAC: And doing your homework . . . just why you keep doing these things.

JA: And it's interesting. Plus . . . you know I can go back . . . Somebody asked me recently—one interviewer—why I do some of this stuff. I said, "Well, you know . . .

CAC: You mean you've been interviewed by others?

JA: Yes . . . Give me a break! Somebody asked me. Maybe it was . . . it doesn't matter. I don't even know. It's one of these university relations people.

CAC: But nobody for posterity?

JA: Oh, no, huh uh. No. Why do I do this stuff? I said, "Well, you know I'm a Minnesotan." He said, "What do you mean?" I know who it was! It was the retirees group. I was the speaker at the thing this month. That's what it was. I said, "My mother's family homesteaded in Minnesota in 1908 in Koochiching County and my father's family started farming in Waseca County during the Civil War." And I said, "Both my parents grew up in Minnesota. I've just always felt like I was Minnesotan. My godfather graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1942, during the war, and I went to his graduation. It was the first time I was ever on this campus. I've just always had a sense that this was an important part of our state and then when I had a chance to be a teacher here, it just seemed like a very comfortable thing to do.

CAC: Do you know how few of us there are?

JA: There's very few.

CAC: My grandparents go back to the Civil War—all of them.

JA: In Minnesota?

CAC: Yes, in Minnesota.

JA: Oh, I didn't know you were a Minnesotan.

CAC: I'm fourth generation.

JA: [laughter] I'm fourth generation on my father's side but not on my mother's because my mother's parents were both immigrants.

CAC: My father was a B.A. and then an M.D. for Minnesota.

JA: I'll be darned. That goes in some ways toward explaining a citizenship of an extra sort. I mean, we're all citizens of our discipline, and of our country; but when you're also a citizen of your state and your city, it's easier to worry about things in the social capital sense that people like Robert Putnam write about.

CAC: I'm just going to interject here for posterity. The History Department now has got forty-five, fifty members. I'm retired now. I was the only one that ever had a connection to Minnesota, I mean family connection.

JA: Is that right?

CAC: Yes.

JA: I didn't know that.

CAC: Well, in the last thirty, forty years.

JA: You know, I talked to John Turner about this. He has Minnesota/Dakota roots.

CAC: Well, he's South Dakota.

JA: Yes. I think Holt does.

CAC: Oh, yes. But they're very rare, very rare.

JA: Very few.

CAC: We're an out of state university.

JA: Rare breed. That's right. Fred Lukermann was a Minneapolis native, you know.

CAC: Is that so?

JA: He went to Roosevelt High School but he's the only other one in the department. He's not there either. He's retired.

CAC: That makes an interesting observation but I don't know where it carries us.

JA: I don't know where it takes you but I think it has to do with concern for the institution in the same way that you might be concerned about your old neighborhood. There's not anything you can do about it if you're not there but if you are there . . . I'm a member of this faculty. This is my institution. This is part of my state. I feel a loyalty to it that I don't feel to the University of Wisconsin; and if I'd moved to Wisconsin—and I had the chance to go there once—I'm sure that I would have been a good university professor, but I wouldn't have had the same sense of belonging that I do here.

CAC: Do you know David Riesman's essay about the *Homeguard and the Mercenaries*?

JA: No. [laughter] Sounds like a good title. Is it about this?

CAC: Yes.

JA: *Homeguard and the Mercenaries*. That puts kind of a hard gloss on it, doesn't it?

CAC: Well, people commit themselves to an institution not alone because their grandparents settled in the region, but it's one factor.

JA: That's one and of course I would never say that just because a person has a roots in a place, that that's going to make them a good citizen . . .

CAC: Sure.

JA: . . . nor would a carpetbagger necessarily not perform well.

CAC: These university committees you served on, John, how effective were they? Is there a difference between different kinds in really guiding the policy and management of this sprawling university? Is this important work? I'll give you the graduate research because that's internal and not really managerial. You're really giving the green light to all kinds of careers but Finance and Planning, and Faculty Consultative Committee, and Operations Development Committee, and so forth . . . What is your sense of their contribution?

JA: It's hard to say. I believe that in the interest of inclusion, and fairness, and citizenship, and democracy in the last few years, we've created processes around here that are a choking the place. So that in some ways, by participating in all of these committees, I'm actually probably—were it not for the fact that I'm able to with lots of energy put in a lot of hours—wasting my time on a lot of this stuff. I end up knowing a lot about what's going on but

as far as actually being able to influence events so that they create long term consequences that make a difference, I'm not . . .

CAC: Can you name one for instance?

JA: Yes, I can name one for instance. I can name my own department. I believe, at the present time, that we have a decent but not exceptional Board of Regents. I think we have an exceptionally good president. I think the president has a clear vision about what this university might become and I think he has a fairly good idea about what you have to do to get there. I'm not so sure that all of his lieutenants are up to the job; but I think that's why he's reorganizing Central Administration because he has a senior vice-president for Academic Affairs who is very smart, and I think has great values but tends to be a micro-manager rather than a leader. Beneath that level of jurisdiction, we've got weakness in several quarters. In some of the professional schools, we have good strong deans who know what they're doing and are doing the job; but I think in IT [Institute of Technology] and in CLA, we've got real management problems at the middle level. And I think that's a consequence of inappropriate leadership at the unit level. I think in IT, we've got one kind of problem, namely, long term heads who run things in a way that pretty much leave the rank and file out of the operation of their units. They do good work but they're not teams.

CAC: Yes.

JA: I think in CLA to an uncomfortable degree, we have units that are run by amateurs rather than people who share a vision with the deans and the senior leadership about what the university needs to do, and are trained as managers and as leaders to translate that mission into action down at the unit level, and know how to work with people to get their best work out of them. We have chairs who are, for the most part, clerks. We have a civil service bureaucracy that I think is very good; although I think that because we have weak leadership in so many units, and inexperienced leadership in so many units, civil service is more of a dead hand of the past than a partner in progressive leadership on behalf of the future. And even the strong departments have this problem. Now when you talk about this stuff, people say, "Well, you certainly don't want to go over to the other extreme," which is the normal response. When you criticize an existing system, they think you're talking about doing the opposite. There's something wrong now with our system and consequently I'm not sure that this committee activity that I've been involved in all of this time is addressing where the weak link in the whole chain is located. We've got proper diagnosis at one place about where we want to go and how we want to get there but we can't execute it because we have . . .

CAC: It's a process of implementation down the line?

JA: Down the line. Implementation. Mechanisms are not available. In the two biggest colleges where there's a thousand professors almost, we have, in some ways, the weakest ability to deploy the solutions. For example, right now when you talk about the U-2000 agenda, many faculty

have no idea what you're talking about. They're just doing their work. They're doing their research. They're writing their books. They're teaching their classes. When you talk about how does what you're doing over here in eighteenth century relate to what somebody else is doing over here in something else, they're not sure what the question is because we were hired, many of us, in order to avoid overlapping or duplicating what other people are doing. In the History Department and in the Geography Department and in other departments, we're not hired as part of a team. We're hired as . . .

CAC: Specialists.

JA: Specialists. Autonomous specialists. In fact, sometimes—I am told—there are some units in this college where if you hire someone whose field overlaps someone else's field, you've got an incendiary situation where people are not at all happy about that. Well, that's unfortunate but it's an example of how it's so difficult to get people together to define the mission of each unit, to figure out how maybe it really would be better if Bill taught seven courses a year because, let's face it, his research program has really slowed down. The fact of the matter is, he's not earning his salary, and we've got classes out here, and he's a very good classroom teacher. He likes students. Students like him. Now, what's her name over here, you know, she's really riding high these days with that research agenda. She's got two big grants. She needs to develop that program. Why are we saddling her with this job for the next couple of years when she really ought to be doing something else? We can't even have that . . .

CAC: General Management doesn't have the elbow room to make those decisions.

JA: They don't have the knowledge, the sense of support or . . .

CAC: The will.

JA: Or the will or the experience to pull that off. Nor do they have the resources at their command, carrots as well as sticks, to bring it about three, four, five years down the road. It's common around here for person "A" to be chair of a department during the search for someone and their first year aboard. Person "B" is chair while they're going through the middle years of their assistant professorship and then person "C" is managing things when they're up for promotion and tenure. Well, how can you develop faculty properly when there's no one in a no one in charge world? This is wrong. I can't see that that's helpful. Plus when the private universities have resources of a different sort than we do, more freedom of action . . . and they're the competition. The student/faculty ratios are different. The authority they feel they're able to wield in managing their affairs are different and in some ways they can give people more autonomy and more support to become more productive than we can around here with our peculiar way of doing things.

CAC: When did we lock ourselves into a three-year rotating chair for example?

JA: When we wrote our constitution in the early 1970s and as far as I'm able to recall, John Webb was one of the people who drafted . . . partly, as I listen to these guys talk, in reaction to an earlier time when you had a . . .

CAC: You don't want a Broek coming around again.

JA: Broek isn't the example they used to mention. They used to mention [Elio D.] Monachesi.

CAC: Oh, Monachesi. [unclear] I can give you a long list. I came in with him.

JA: Yes. Okay. But you see, the solution to twenty-nine years is not three or two.

CAC: [unclear]

JA: That's one of the things that I am learning. When you ask the question, How do I feel about these committee activities? They're helpful in getting you to understand what's going on but they're not really helpful in implementing a solution.

CAC: But they may be helpful in supporting or modifying Morrill Hall initiatives.

JA: Oh, they can certainly give the president the support that the president needs when the president needs it. It's a pretty lonely job being president of a big university these days. And it's not any wonder that very few capable people want those jobs. There's no reward aside from the sense that you've done a . . .

CAC: You've been on the Faculty Consultative Committee [FCC] how long? You're chair this year.

JA: I'm chair. I've just been on it 2½ years. I'm a newcomer to the FCC..

CAC: Yes. Say something about your access to officers in Morrill Hall then or to the regents.

JA: I try to avoid dealing with regents. My own belief—which is not shared by some other faculty leaders around here—is that the more the FCC deals directly with the regents, the more it weakens the president. So I don't approve of this. When I disagree with the president, I'm going to tell him directly that I disagree. When I agree with him, I want to tell him directly and publicly that I agree with him. When I have questions, he gets back to me in hours when I call. Access is no problem . . . the same way with [Robert O.] Erickson . . . the same way with [Ettore] Infante . . . same way with any of the deans around here that you have questions of. They are very, very good. But there's an interesting reciprocal relationship in university governance around the country I'm discovering, that if the senior officers pay attention to the governance system, good people want to work in it. If the senior officers ignore the governance system, the good people have other things to do. At the moment, and for the last five years as

far as I'm able to tell, the governance system at this university has had some awfully good people involved in it, people who understand the institution, are working on its behalf, and are able to contribute to it, and aren't doing it because they're going to get any thing personally out of it. You do it because you're a citizen.

CAC: Sure. And you know there's an end to it.

JA: And you know there's an end to it. I have a lot of respect for Nils. I'll tell you a little story about university presidents. Most of us professors have not had the experience of dealing with a lot of university presidents but when this Humphrey North/South Fellowship Program was created—this Fulbright exchange for mid-career people from developing countries in the Carter Administration—I got a call from Peter Magrath one day. He said, "This program is going to be announced in Washington and we got an invitation from the White House to go with all the other university presidents in the Ivies, and Big Ten, the Big Eight, and so forth. There's going to be a whole bunch of them there and they want you to come along with me because you're the director of the Humphrey Institute." I said, "Great." So we went together, out and back. It was a one day deal. We went into the briefing room in the White House there where the press meet. The President, and the Vice-President, and the Secretary of State, and all these people were there to make this big announcement that this program was going to be created. They announced it and then they asked, "Are there any questions?" Well, one after another, these university presidents—there must have been sixty of them there . . . the whole room was practically full—stood up and started asking questions; and what an inarticulate bunch of flannel mouths I never saw in my life. I could have talked down three-fourths of them in ten seconds because they had a very great difficulty making an explicit declarative statement. They would beat around the bush, and they'd hem and they'd haw, and they'd posture, all this disgusting behavior. Then Peter stands up, you know odd Peter . . . crystal clear statements, nice questions, nice repartee. In that group of people, he stood out so brightly. I'm no great fan of Peter but I began to see in that context why academic leadership is as odd as it is. There really aren't very many presidents of our big universities who are very impressive folk. But he was impressive in that group, I must say. I had a lot of respect afterwards for . . . subsequently when I've seen the jobs that he's had. He went to Missouri. Now he's president of the American Association of Land Grant Universities. He's a sharp guy but in a very weak pool, it seemed to me. When I hear people criticize—this is a long roundabout way of coming back to Nils—Nils, I wonder what are they comparing him with? What are they using as a yardstick? Do they actually believe that if they ran him out of town, that there's eight other people standing in line to take that crummy job at \$125,000 a year, or whatever it is, so you can work a 100 hours a week, and have everybody yelling at you all the time? Who needs it? You can get a job as a professor, and be a lot happier, and earn four times as much per hour, and have your evenings and weekends free. [laughter] It's a thankless job. I'm amazed that he'll do it and maintain a good humor in the process.

CAC: But we're saying also that at sprawling institutions like the University of Minnesota—we are one of the largest in the whole country measured by any measurement—it is at the middle management level that the real troubles of implementation . . .

JA: Troubles start, and where the work gets done, and if you don't do it right there, the best president in the world isn't going to be able to pull the fat out of the fire.

CAC: Is there anything that the best president in the world can do to improve the efficiency and efficacy of that middle management?

JA: Well, that's the bottom line of all of this when you asked me about what I've done. I started a campaign a year ago to get these guys to focus on unit leadership as the key in the success of their enterprise and now that's what they're talking about. So once you get the ear, and say it twenty-five times, and talk about it out loud enough, and get quoted in the print frequently enough, people start thinking maybe he's got something there. I mean, I've been badgering Julia Davis about this. She sort of says, "What can I do?" I said, "You can start a movement to change things for one thing." And I said, "You can't have strong units without strong effective unit leadership." That doesn't mean you have bosses. It means you have people in charge of units that know how to work in a solid academic unit with people for . . .

CAC: Creating consensus.

JA: And creating incentives. You've got to give them things to work with and that includes training. You don't get infused gifts to know how to do this stuff. Any big organization trains people to do. We expect that this is a natural gift. It's not. Now, she's beginning to think. I think actually she thinks so all along that this is something that she's going to have to do but she's not at all sure how to do it. I raised the question last year when Kinley Brauer was the head of the assembly . . . I raised on an E-mail exchange with the assembly people the possibility that we would reconsider this issue and it got a unanimous negative vote. They didn't even want to talk about it, just turned it down flat as a subject to be discussed.

CAC: Okay.

JA: So that's what we're up against you see. I think some people are afraid because they don't see the institution, and its need to meet a mission; and they don't see, as I do, clearly that the resource of this university are the people in it. It doesn't follow that just because you want to do what you think you want to do that that means that's the best and most effective use of your time, and your energy, and your talent. You've got to have somebody to talk with about that. We've got a lot of professors around here—I was on the Promotion and Tenure Committee for a number of years in CLA—believe me, there are some people around here who are really not earning their money and not delivering the goods. They're earning a lot of bucks. That's a resource not being used effectively.

CAC: It's very difficult for deans [unclear] to . . .

JA: Well, just because it's difficult doesn't mean it can't be addressed. I personally believe most people want to do a good job. They may have a different idea about what that is and they may have grown up with expectations that don't square with today's realities. You have people whining that they're only earning \$60,000 a year, and you say that to somebody downtown Minneapolis, and they say, "What are you whining about?" [laughter]

CAC: I used to tell my colleagues in the corridors, not in meetings, that we were paid in the top 5 percent of the state of Minnesota.

JA: You bet. If you would work it out in an hourly or monthly or any other basis and add to it the freedom of movement that we have, there's nothing comparable. My lawyer friends who are earning \$200,00 a year think I have a lot better job than they do.

CAC: You had comments from the inside with Mr. Hasselmo and Mr. Magrath. Did you have any contacts during the short Keller Administration?

JA: Oh, yes. Oh, yes.

CAC: Do you care to share some of that?

JA: There was some committee that I was on when Ken was vice-president for Academic Affairs where I saw him all the time. I can't remember what the connection was. Also when he was in the Graduate School, I was on some committees where I saw him all the time. When he was president in the early years, I guess I would have to say that interactions were minimal. I liked the things that he said and I liked his academic values but I felt that he was not in tune with the culture of Minnesota or the general culture of the University of Minnesota; whereas, Peter Magrath could go out to Kandiyohi County and give a talk and feel uncomfortable but people felt at least his heart is in the right place. Ken had a way of patronizing people that he didn't agree with.

CAC: Including some of his faculty?

JA: Yes. He has great strengths and people with great strengths I think also sometimes have great weaknesses. I guess I thought that he was important in Central Administration but I guess I would have rather had him remain the vice-president of Academic Affairs than president. I thought he was more effective there. That was unfortunate. Then his business with the house, I think that was just a pretense for getting rid of him because people didn't like other things about what he was trying to do. I think his academic values were tops. Coming out of a top department where he really knew what good science was and good academics were, it was hard to fault that. In terms of translating an agenda into action and getting the best out of people, I don't think he knew how to do that.

CAC: I don't know whether it's time in our conversation to turn to recent community and professional activity but the list there is also long.

JA: [laughter]

CAC: And it is a list that one doesn't see often in a secular university from the advisory committee on the pastoral and the economics. [unclear]

JA: See John Roach is a pal of mine, the archbishop of St. Paul/Minneapolis. He asks me to do things.

CAC: It's not entirely Catholic but there's a good deal of your church things operating here. Do you care to talk about that? You're still committed to the Newman Foundation?

JA: I don't participate in Newman. I was on the Board of Directors of the Newman Center for a number of years because Paul Johnson, the Dominican priest who was director of Newman for a number of years grew up in my neighborhood. My mother knew his mother. There was a family relationship there. When he asked me to help, I was glad to do that. I guess I grew up in a Roman Catholic family that was rather strict observance and was always very comfortable in religion because I guess as a kid I was quite precocious and could see the difference between rules and regs for their own sake versus what a good religious formation would mean as a healthy adult. Although some of my brothers and sisters went off the deep end in one direction or the other, I was always very comfortable as an active religionist. When I was in college and graduate school, I was active in a Young Catholic Single Adults' Club here in the Twin Cities. It had 600 or 700 members. I was president of it for awhile. It was a social club with a religious overtone and it was a very nice operation. It was a combination discussion club/social club that I was very happy being involved in. That's where I met my wife actually. A lot of my friends today are people we met under those circumstances then. When we came back to Minneapolis in 1970, we joined a parish in southwest Minneapolis, the pastor of whom as it turned out was one of the most well respected leaders in the St. Paul/Minneapolis Archdiocese.

CAC: What parish was that?

JA: It's called Christ the King.

CAC: Okay.

JA: Our kids went to the parochial school. I was in the parish council. Several people in the parish are very involved in diocesan affairs. I kept in close touch with Terry Murphy, president of St. Thomas. I used to go over there once in awhile. The [unclear] for the president was a Dominican priest named Jerry O'Leary who was very precocious and thoughtful about religion in higher education. He'd written a number of books on the subject and was a great devotee of religiously oriented colleges and universities. We used to talk about that, and he used to wonder

with me why religious studies at the University of Minnesota got such short shrift over the years; and through this conversation with O'Leary, and with the provost, and the president—whom I got to know pretty well—they tried to hire me a couple of times over at St. Thomas. I almost went. They have an endowed chair over there in Social Sciences that I almost took one time just because I was ready to do something different.

CAC: Sure.

JA: This connection with Minnesota, my understanding of how the Lutheran and Catholic communities in Minnesota provide part of the social foundation for the state, the St. John's connection, United Theological—I know some people who teach up there—Luther Northwestern Seminary—I know some people who teach over there. This Catholic/Lutheran nexus is very important to the cultural fabric of the state.

CAC: But not in the same degree at the university?

JA: No, not at all. Quite the contrary. Not at all. In fact, if anything, I've often felt that that's been one of the major gaps in our great university here is that we've never capitalized on the prominence of the Twin Cities Jewish community in national Jewish affairs, the importance of the Lutheran church here in national Lutheran affairs, and the central role that the Catholic community here, especially at St. John's played in Vatican II and subsequently.

CAC: How could that have been done here?

JA: Well, I don't know but I look at other universities and when I got to Penn State and look at their religion departments, they're a flourishing operation. I go to the University of Iowa and no problem. I sent a student of mine to the University of Chicago for two quarters and saw the role of the Divinity School and in the overall fabric of the University of Chicago—and no one would call the University of Chicago a religious school—but the Divinity School is a great operation.

CAC: Oh, you bet.

JA: I spent a year at Berkeley, and fell in with a graduate theological union out there, and discovered the ten different houses the Benedictines, the Franciscans, the Dominicans . . . There's a Jewish community there. There's a Presbyterian house and so forth. These scholars and teachers run their seminary over here, and then the research faculty form the faculty of the Graduate Theological Union; so you can do a Ph.D. at Berkeley in Religious Studies, and the people who are in that program are among the leaders in the world at the present time and thinking about the role of religion in contemporary life. A number of years ago when the National Science Foundation did a survey of leading people in all of the social science fields asking, What are some of the leading edge issues that the Foundation ought to be paying

attention to? I remember writing a long essay on Religion and Public Affairs. This is just being ignored. And it's being ignored at our peril. People don't understand what's going on here. Of course, you say that to some people and they look at you like. What are you talking about? I stopped going to church or synagog when I was ten. Why are you telling me this is important? That kind of narrow-minded reactionary view . . .

CAC: That's a major part of this university to which you are so loyal?

JA: I know it is. I know it is. And I think it's a problem. I think it's a serious problem. I almost started teaching a course once on the Geography of Religion. I just don't have enough time in my schedule to do this.

CAC: Sure.

JA: I've supervised two theses in the Geography of Religion. Huntington from Harvard wrote this essay in foreign affairs a year ago last summer on the Clash of Civilizations and the whole argument has to do with the religious foundations of culture in the world; and the major fault lines in culture are Islam, south Asia, east Asia, orthodoxy, western Christendom, and so forth, and what this means for public affairs for our time. People have translated their own personal problems in upbringing in religion, and have closed doors, and slammed them shut, and have these blinds spots with regard to what might be paid attention to in our own time. Now if you go downtown and talk to people running the Fortune 500 companies in town, they don't have this problem. They all know what they're doing. They think about these things. You go talk to people at the seminary. I've lectured at some of these seminaries around town about some of these points. It's just not in the framework of thinking in many of our social sciences. They think it's a variable, you know. Quantitative types will put it in a column, a "1" or a "0" as to whether or not you went to church last week and that's as far as it goes. When you ask them to explain, Give me a theory or a rationale for why you ought to pay attention to this as an individual or as a group or as a society, they don't know what you're talking about.

CAC: A person whom I interviewed last week spoke of the culture of the university not being hostile but indifferent, and that was worse.

JA: I think it used to be hostile. I think it's now indifferent. I talked to Fred Lukermann once. When I was chair of the Geography Department, I organized a group once to go and talk to Fred about why religious studies in the College of Liberal Arts is a non-starter. Fred thought this was a very interesting question. It turns out that when he was an undergraduate, he had written a couple papers on Luther. [laughter] You can't bring up a subject that Fred hasn't got some background in. We had a good conversation about the confessions and so forth, and Augsburg in the old days. But it really never went anywhere because Fred is of course not really an entrepreneur. If he has the resources, he will support other entrepreneurs but he has a hard time, at least in later years, inaugurating something like that.

CAC: How do you account for this climate in the University of Minnesota, whereas at Penn State, and Berkeley, and so forth . . . ?

JA: I wish I knew. I wish I knew.

CAC: You can't see what's lacking here?

JA: I think it has something to do with the same background that led to the anti-Semitism here in Minneapolis and this Yankee background in the business community in Minneapolis back in the 1930s and 1940s. I don't know enough about the social history of the state or the personal backgrounds of the leadership community that acted in ways that ensured that this would not happen here. I just don't know. I tried to find this out when Barbara [J. VanDrasek] and I were doing this book on the Twin Cities [*Minneapolis-St. Paul: People, Place and Public Life*]. We interviewed quite a few people to see if they could shed light on this issue and we kept drawing a blank.

CAC: It's probably also the case that with the exception of the YMCA [Young Men's Christian Association] at various times in the university's history that the Campus Ministries themselves have not been assertive and powerful, except for a brief time for example with—I'm making these as statements but really with question marks at the end—Father Garrelts in Newman Foundation.

JA: George Garrelts and I had our wrangles. When I was a graduate student here in the early 1960s, I used to eat lunch at Neuman everyday. But that was the same time that I and several of my pals were running this club in Minneapolis that had 600 members. It was a really active group. It was organized out of the Catholic Youth Center in south Minneapolis, the Joe Beaulieu—a priest from the west side of St. Paul, a bright charismatic guy—that's where we were headquartered but we ran it our own way. George always felt that the leadership of this group was—the college and university students, the largest chunk of whom were here at the University of Minnesota but we were running this thing off campus, you see—he felt that the energy that was going into that was energy that was coming out of his organization.

CAC: Ah!

JA: So he didn't like us at all. He especially didn't even like us coming over there and eating lunch. He'd come and sit down at our table and rag at us for doing this.

CAC: [laughter]

JA: Oh, yes, he was an interesting guy. During that period in the 1960s when that place should have been taking initiatives—it's getting vague in my memory now—to make a place for religious studies on campus. Those were the very days when people were interpreting any initiative of that sort as a confessional interest rather than a scholarly interest. And for people who didn't know

much about either side, they didn't know how to make a distinction between the two. Now for instance, to talk about my brother-in-law . . . You know Terry Dosh, don't you?

CAC: Heavens, yes! I didn't realize he was your brother-in-law. Oh, yes, okay.

JA: [laughter] Well, we could talk a long time about networks but Millie, my sister . . .

CAC: We should say for posterity that he was a priest who got married and left . . .

JA: Terry Dosh did his Ph.D. in history here in your department.

CAC: Yes.

JA: He was a monk at St. John's in Collegeville. He left the Benedictines at the end of the 1960s, right around 1970; and then a couple of years later, he and my sister were married. My sister was a former Poor Clares nun. That's what Terry's Ph. D. was in is the history of religion in Europe.

CAC: Right.

JA: He's a historian. He teaches church history and he's lectured all over town. He's lectured all around the world as a matter of fact. It's interesting when he starts studying history curricula around, he discovers that this is a non-subject in many parts. You can have political history, economic history, ethnic history, and so forth. In fact I was on a committee for one of your students recently—I wish I could think of his name now—and I asked him this question because he had on his program: Indian history, Chinese history, women's history, this history, that history. I asked him to explain, Why are all these separate history courses on here? What's that all about? He was giving me a long methodological explanation and I said, "Okay. Now is this a complete list or are there other histories that ought to be on the list that aren't on the list?" He said, "Well, what do you mean?" I said, "You tell me what I mean." We talked a little more about this and I said, "How come there's no history of religion on here?" He didn't know what to say. He never thought about it. I said, "Well, think about it." Who is your colleague that's doing the census, public use samples, the hat, the smoke . . . What's his name?

CAC: Steve [Ruggles].

JA: He was there and also the one that had the stroke.

CAC: Rus Menard.

JA: Rus and Steve. They just thought this was a really funny question to come from me. He struggled with it—Todd. He's one of the instructors. You probably don't keep track of these guys now.

CAC: Well, I've been retired four years.

JA: Yes. We talked about this for awhile and I said, "Why isn't this important if you're going to be doing social history? He didn't have a clue about how to answer the question which revealed to me that he really didn't have a clue because it hasn't been part of our way of thinking about how . . .

CAC: Jim Tracy teaches the Reformation and that's it.

JA: That's it. There's a lot of pieces to this interest that I have.

CAC: Yes.

JA: Because I'm looking at Upper Midwest life, Upper Midwest society, Minnesota, the history of Minnesota, the role of the churches, the schools, and how that all fits together.

CAC: But you don't find the university community inhospitable for this indifference, and this positivist secularism?

JA: Say that again.

CAC: You don't find the culture of the university inhospitable because it is not open to the kinds of things we've been talking about the last eight minutes?

JA: I don't know. I haven't thought about this for awhile because I went on to other things after a five-year effort of trying to make sense out . . . Inhospitable. I think indifference is the better term. People are now even more narrow than they used to be. If it isn't something that they write about, teach about, think about . . . There might be polite passing glances at it but not an interest in seeing how it's relating from one part of knowledge to another.

CAC: You know History had Tim Smith briefly . . .

JA: Till he went to Chicago.

CAC: When he went to Johns Hopkins.

JA: Hopkins. That's right.

CAC: But that was the beginning and the end.

JA: And then of course, Terry was here when Tim was here and speaks very highly of him.

CAC: Yes.

JA: I never knew him. He was here when I was a graduate student. I remember seeing him around but he was here a short time.

CAC: I'm meandering about this having in mind persons who will listen to this conversation down the line, including someone who will write a history of these fifty years.

JA: Oh, I keep forgetting who we're talking to here.

CAC: And if what we're saying is reasonably accurate and deeply felt, then it's a question that some historian has to address. At Iowa there is such a program and [unclear] and so forth.

JA: At Harvard. At Princeton. Most of the Ivies have a very active interest.

CAC: So then that says something. It's an historical question of absence that is [unclear].

JA: That's right. How do you explain this absence?

CAC: Yes.

JA: Especially in a place that . . .

CAC: Where the churches themselves are so strong.

JA: That's right. Where I have thought for a long time . . . For example, over at St. Thomas, Terry Murphy had the bright idea to start this Catholic/Jewish dialog or this Jewish/Christian dialog, and the Jewish community in the Twin Cities has bankrolled this thing, and it's become a very important element in the University of St. Thomas' over all program. People all over the world come to lecture at this place.

CAC: St. John's is an ecumenical . . .

JA: Ecumenical institute. And it's flourishing. The United Seminary here is very active. The Luther Northwestern Seminary here is I think the biggest Lutheran Seminary in the United States. We have all kinds of resources here and it's not thought by our leadership traditionally that it's an important subject. You look around in the Political Science, in History and Geography and Sociology and on down the line where you would think there would be a natural interest in this sort of thing. Because we have Urban Studies. We've got American Studies.

CAC: Art Johnson taught the Sociology of Religion for a long time.

JA: Yes, that's right.

CAC: But it never drew.

JA: Never drew.

CAC: No.

JA: I don't know how to think about this. I just have been puzzled for years. When I ask questions of older people, I am told that at an earlier time there was an anxiety to keep it out; and now I think it's more accurate to say that there's just an indifference, especially at a time when you're retrenching, and trying to figure out how to do more things with fewer resources, or the same things with fewer resources. That just seems to fall by the wayside. The same, I might point out, is true of some of our area studies programs. For example, during the last few years of Fred's deanship when Craig [Swan] was associate dean, they just killed off Russian East European Studies here. South Asian Studies has been hanging on by a thread.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

JA: . . . studies program on the heels of our discussion of Why not more strength in Religious Studies? This is a big university but we do so many different things here that the sheer size of the place doesn't really provide an accurate forecast of what we ought to be doing here in the core college.

CAC: Well, in the process of down-sizing, it's unlikely to happen, to be initiated?

JA: That's right. On the other hand, we do have 500 professors here in the College of Liberal Arts and if private colleges with 125 people can do thirty-five different things, I sometimes wonder why we have such a hard time doing thirty with five times as many faculty. I guess I know the answer to that. [laughter] I don't know what to say beyond that. I feel bad though because I think we're not positioned to change with the way the world is changing. When I think of how important Africa is becoming in the world and realize we've got about eight people on our college campus who are really proficient African scholars, participating fully in the scholarly investigation of Africa in History, Geography and the Social Sciences . . . maybe ten . . .

CAC: [unclear]

JA: No! I look at East Asian Studies. I mean it's all we can do to keep the Languages Departments going.

CAC: That's declined.

JA: That's right.

JA: South Asian Studies . . . we've got basically three people, one of whom is getting ready to retire. That's Swartzberg. And we have one of the best research libraries . . .

CAC: A couple retire soon.

JA: That's right. We have one of the best research libraries for South Asian Studies in the world here and the college has not seen a way to make an appropriate investment in it or to get the endowment necessary to support this independently of the legislative appropriations. But that raises a larger question about the university and our college. I have come to the conclusion that this college has supported its research and graduate education efforts, over the decades I've been associated with it, on the backs of an undergraduate mission. It thinks of itself generally, and has thought of itself generally, as an undergraduate teaching college not as a graduate and research institute that has an undergraduate mission. I think the very way in which you frame the mission, and the way in which you keep track of what you do, and report it, and make a pitch for support from the dean's office has ultimate effects on what you do around here. For example, the last batch of statistics I saw coming out of Central Administration assigns the budget of the college, with the exception of the Central Administration of the college, to the instructional mission. We don't even count the time the faculty devote to their research and graduate activity. It isn't even counted. We calculate ratios based on student credit hours generated, and so forth, and assume that my salary is basically from undergraduate instruction . . . no attention paid to governance activity, no attention paid to outreach, no attention paid to my research programs.

CAC: Attention to your own salary?

JA: That's right. All my salary is assigned to my undergraduate teaching. Well, in the face of this practice, we have devised in the last year workload policies that ask us to specify at the departmental level what proportion of our work in the unit is for teaching, what proportion for research and graduate education, what proportion for outreach and service but we don't translate that back into our numbers. Meanwhile the rhetoric of the college trots out: how many undergraduate students we have, how many people we serve at the undergraduate level in other colleges, how many people we graduated, what the graduation rates are. All the discussion is about this stuff. Nobody talks about how many Ph.Ds. did you grant in History last year? What kind of jobs did they move to in academia and in other lines of professional life? We don't talk about where they come from. We don't celebrate the books that people are writing, the TD presentations. You put something on Channel 2 or Channel 17 on the history of Minneapolis and St. Paul, and thousands of people see it, and learn more . . . it doesn't count. It doesn't count in two ways. It doesn't count professionally in the same way writing a book counts but even if it did, it wouldn't be taken into account by the college as a central mission of our college.

CAC: They've closed down KUOM [radio].

JA: Yes. Yes. So therein lies part of our fundamental problem and of course when we ask our senior professors to take charge of our units for a brief tour of duty as chair, then what? They usually just stack that on to their other stuff because they don't dare drop their teaching.

CAC: And they know it's three years.

JA: And they know they're in and they're out and somebody else can do it. That is a fatal flaw in building a strong college. It seems to me with 500 professors in this place, plus another couple of hundred supported teaching assistants and research assistants around here, this place—as good as it is and it's really a very good place and I travel around enough and see other colleges to know how terrific it is—it doesn't begin to reach its potential because of fundamental flaws in the way it thinks about what its job is. The way we honor people? The attention we give to the things that we do? It's sort of Minnesota tradition that you just watch what people do and let them do it. They can do it for forty years, and then you pat them on the head, and put them out to pasture. That's not good.

CAC: Before we resolve our conversation here this afternoon, many colleagues from many different colleges—I'm not talking about the Arts College alone now at all—have suggested and then given for instances from their own experience the last twenty-five, thirty, thirty-five years that in the 1960s there came this opportunity . . . We're going way back in the tape now. There was money. There was a growth of staff. They were expected to declare specialities. They begin to fragment and that there was in the fragmentation of knowledge, learning, and teaching, a subversion of collegiality. Now, this is not universally agreed. I'm just seeing it as a recurring theme and I wonder—implicitly you've kind of commented on this—do you want to say something specific?

JA: Oh, yes. I can see this fragmentation associated with this loss of community but I think it's a larger issue. The terminology that I find comfortable in talking about this these days is this notion of social capital. A group of people came in to academia in the 1940s and 1950s who had good understandings of the reciprocity of social life and political life. You give and you get but you have mutual obligations and mutual rewards for your involvement in community activities whether it's in a scholarly society or in an academic department or just in your neighborhood or your city. So the loss that I see of community in the university departments these day is certainly associated with the fragmentation of knowledge, and the independence that people feel they have had since then in doing their work; but I'm not sure it's a cause affect as much as it is an accompanying outcome of other forces that are at work which have rewarded independence rather than rewarding collegial action. The people in the 1960s and 1970s, like myself, who established a big reputation in their field got rewarded individually for doing that. Now it happens that I was sufficiently old-fashioned in the way I thought about things and the way I used my time that I did that, and did this other stuff also, contributed to the unit, and paid attention, and worried about the unit, and was constantly badgering my colleagues to worry about this, and to worry about that, and to do things or we're going to have trouble later on. They didn't do it and sure enough! we have trouble later on. But I don't see the fragmentation and the

loss of community as one necessarily causing the other. I think the money got in the way. I think no one went into academia in the 1950s expecting to get rich quick. It was much more a time when people picked a professional human service vocation more as a calling, for the same reason people became ministers, and doctors, and lawyers, and things like that. You might make a secure living but that wasn't the reason you did it. You did it because that was a worthy thing to do, and you got social acclaim, and public status for doing it.

CAC: You liked to do it.

JA: You liked to do it, too. The personal autonomy that being a professional provided was one of its greatest rewards coupled with some of the security that it might provide. But when the money got involved in the 1960s and the bidding context in the time of short personnel, then you get an encouragement there to be more of an independent operator and less of a colleague. If everybody is going to be poor together, we're going to enjoy our life together because we're not going to be out on the circuit. That's my sense.

CAC: We became careerists.

JA: We worried about a career instead of worrying about the job that there was to do in all of its many parts. I remember when Jan Broek used to invite us as graduate students over for dinner and his wife, Ruth, would serve us sherry and tea. You know this was sort of the introduction to the grown-up world of . . . We thought this was kind of nice. I remember the varied reactions of some of the graduate students to this. Some felt that it was sort of an initiation into a guild, and others thought that they were putting on airs, and others were just embarrassed because they didn't know what to do. They'd never held a sherry glass before or a cup of tea and they didn't know how to react.

CAC: An anxiety about being co-opted?

JA: Well, that may have come later. I never put that construction on it in the early years.

CAC: I'm thinking of the 1960s here.

JA: I think in the late 1960s, it was clearly the case when they wouldn't even accept the invitation. But in the early 1960s, you went because it didn't occur to you not to go but after you got there you didn't know what you were getting into. I actually liked that stuff because my mother . . . She was a daughter of Irish immigrants, and of course the Irish always hate the English, and even though they hated them, they looked up to them. She worked for a number of years for what she called a "lady" whose husband was a pharmacist, over here underneath where the practice football field now is. My mother learned early that there are such things as nice things in life and she didn't particularly crave them but she appreciated them. I learned about that attitude early in life and other people apparently didn't. But whether the fragmentation that accompanied the loss of community is a case of mutual cause and affect or whether it's the

money, the careerism, the opportunities that opened up, the actual going after people who were prominent, inviting them out for a lecture series, inviting them out, and then offering them a job at a 50 percent increase in pay . . . Those opportunities never occurred in an earlier time.

CAC: You know what that does to morale within a department?

JA: Sure it does . . . it rewards the behaviors that work against building the social capital you need in the unit to make it work as a unit; so that the race horses get the prizes and the work horses get ignored or taken for granted. It's not any wonder therefore that some people drop out, become demoralized, see that their work is not appreciated, and develop this attitude that we so often see. It really hurts me because I've been well taken care of, although I had lots of opportunities over the years to do other things. People who are men who are of a certain personality, certain appearance, who can speak in ways that can be understood, who are naturally comfortable talking to other people . . . there's plenty of opportunities for those kind of folks, if you want to move. I didn't want to move. I like it here. When these opportunities in the early 1980s came flooding in . . . I had in ten, twelve years done all this stuff, had been head of two different units, had been president of my association, all this kind of stuff that people sometimes do to build their resume but this stuff just fell into my lap. I never applied for a job in my life. My mother was old and living with us and my four kids were in school. I couldn't move. I didn't even think of it. So I didn't. I stayed here. This is fine. And I'd learned a lot of it from Borchert. You know John and I used to talk about some of this stuff.

CAC: Oh.

JA: You know John pretty well.

CAC: Yes.

JA: You know Jane took care of the money in their house. He never even paid any attention to it. He never knew what was going on. She managed it all. He just did his work and she took care of things, kind of very old-fashioned, fully dependent on the spouse . . .

CAC: They had four or five children themselves, right?

JA: Four. yes. Just like ours, three boys and a girl. That leads to other kinds of recklessness and difficulties but John never did anything because of the money. You know I've talked with him about this stuff. He did it because he thought it was important or interesting or both. The same way with Fred. Fred's the same way. Fred never was known to chase a buck. It's interesting.

CAC: Are there other reflections that we should share now?

JA: [laughter]

CAC: You'll go home this evening as I will and . . .

JA: And think about all this stuff that we might have talked about.

CAC: It can't be definitive . . . any given interview. You've opened up all kinds of things that are extraordinarily valuable, John. Very valuable.

JA: I suppose you know, you talk to anybody, they'd come up with the same bunch of things to muse about.

CAC: No. That's not true. They're different . . .

JA: They are different? There are other things that I think about all the time that we haven't talked about . . . stuff like the design of this campus which is so awful. Years ago when I was . . .

CAC: Oh, I agree but let's not get into that.

JA: [laughter] I've often wondered how environment hurts academic life like this building we live in. It's so terrible.

CAC: A colleague of mine used to call it the highrise basement.

JA: It is and a fire escape to get in and out.

CAC: Yes.

JA: It's been good talking to you. I didn't know we were going to be at this this long.

[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