

Elmer Andersen

- Student - University of Minnesota, 1930s 1-3
- Traditions of the University of Minnesota, circa 1870- 4-5
- State government and University of Minnesota, 1950s and 1960s 5-10, 15-
 - Mullen, Gerald 5
 - Dunlap, Robert 6
 - Rosenmeier, Gordon 6
 - Wenberg, Stan 6
 - Wilson, Meredith "Met" 7
 - Higher Education Coordinating Board 9
- Andersen as Regent, 1967-1975 10-24
 - Moos, Malcolm 11
 - student activism 12
 - Eastcliff 12
 - Rajender case 14
 - Moos' resignation, 1975 17-
 - University of Minnesota governance 17-
 - Magrath, C. Peter 20
 - Saxon 21
- Minnesota Foundation, 1968- 24-28

Interview with Elmer Andersen

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

**Interviewed on October 2, 1995
At the Home of Elmer Andersen**

Elmer Andersen - EA
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers and I'm interviewing this morning, which is October 2, Governor Elmer Andersen. The interview is being conducted in his home on Lake Johanna. We have a lovely fall day and we have lots of business to cover. It's a great privilege, sir, and a great joy. I've had the best time with this project.

EA: Yes, I'm sure.

CAC: I've talked with 90 to 100 different people who see the university in all kinds of different ways; so, it's been a great experience for me. You were an undergraduate student at the University of Minnesota. You had a double baccalaureate. Perhaps, we could start with your recollections of your . . . I see that your baccalaureate was 1931 and then you had a degree in Business Administration in 1937.

EA: No, no. There must be some mistake there. I had one degree and it was in 1931 and it was a Bachelor of Business Administration.

CAC: I see, okay.

EA: I think any later degrees would have been honorary.

CAC: All right. Can you say something about that degree? The University of Minnesota was such a different animal in those days.

EA: I entered the university as a junior from having attended a junior college in Muskegon, Michigan; so, I entered as a junior in the School of Business Administration. It was in the old building—I forget even what the name of the building was—it was an old red brick building that preceded other locations for the school. I remember particularly the incredible faculty. Russell

A. Stevenson was dean and his mother had been a high school principal in Muskegon, Michigan; so, we quickly had a special relationship and I appreciated his interest very much. Then, there was Arthur Marget, Alvin Hansen . . .

CAC: Ah!

EA: . . . who is the business cycle man who later went on to Harvard as the Keynesian leader of the Roosevelt Administration and other administrations . . . was in the school at that time. Alvin Hansen wrote a book on economics and I just had a wonderful time but particularly appreciated Arthur Marget and took every course he taught. He was really a finance and banking person but I took every course he taught with no intention of pursuing it as a career but just admiring him as scholar and a teacher. Then, there was Jack [John J.] Reighard. It was a wonderful faculty. I don't know if the University School of Business Administration, or the now Carlson School of Management, has ever since had such a collection of luminaries as it did at that time.

I was only in school for five quarters. I was working on the side, and wanting to get a degree, and get done; so, I carried fairly heavy courses but I also had some outside activity. I was on the university debating team and that was a fascinating experience. I can remember once debating with the University of Puerto Rico on the question of U.S. intervention in the Caribbean. We were trounced, so far as the audience was concerned, by these eloquent fiery, passionate Puerto Ricans as against our more staid reasons why the U.S. would have to intervene in the Caribbean under certain conditions. So, I loved my undergraduate years very much and I met my wife there; so, we were romancing, and I was studying, and I had a first little encounter with politics by being on the Board of Associated Students, which was kind of the governing student body board. I finished in 1931 as president of the graduating class of the School of Business; so, I had many friends and a wonderful experience and loved it all. I wore myself to a frazzle and old "Doc" [L.J.] Cooke . . . There was an option of having a physical examination on graduation and I remember "Doc" Cooke—luminary again of the university— . . .

CAC: This is Cooke of Cooke Hall?

EA: Cooke of Cooke Hall . . . examining me and saying, "Well, young man, it's a good thing you're leaving instead of coming in."

CAC: [laughter]

EA: Anyway, it was a great experience.

CAC: Do you keep in touch with many of your classmates other than Eleanor [Mrs. Elmer Andersen]?

EA: I can't say that I do. It's so many years ago now that I lose that orientation of whether they're former students or not. So many people have come into my life in the sixty-four years . . .

CAC: Oh, my. Right.

EA: . . . but to some degree . . . I was a member of Alpha Kappa Psi fraternity and still am but don't get to the meetings much or have much but so many of the people I knew particularly well at that time are gone. A person I remember very well, the person who pledged me to the fraternity is gone; so, one reason you don't associate with some of those people . . .

CAC: Of course.

EA: . . . is that they aren't around anymore.

CAC: Yes. It was a distinguished program in the 1930s—then a lot of those folks left or retired later—but apparently they were committed also to the undergraduate curriculum?

EA: Oh, they certainly were. We had courses from top faculty people. I had a course in business cycles from Alvin Hansen that I remember very well. I remember a book he wrote at that time, *Economic Stabilization in an Unbalanced World*. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EA: Such a wonderful title . . . *Economic Stabilization in an Unbalanced World*. He was obviously a great scholar and Arthur Marget was a great teacher. Jack Reighard was a very humanistic person.

CAC: How large were those classes? Do you remember how many students would . . .

EA: Oh, they varied of course. Those that were more lecture courses were pretty large but most of the classes were in the twenty to thirty range.

CAC: That's small enough.

EA: That's still pretty large.

CAC: Well, I started out at the university lecturing to 300 to 400.

EA: Yes.

CAC: A difference of scale.

EA: I remember when William Watts Folwell became president of the university, there were, I think, about twelve students and sixteen faculty, which was a pretty good student/faculty ratio.

CAC: [laughter]

EA: The first graduating class under Folwell had two students, two graduates. As you know when the university was first started, it was an academy. Then, it became defunct during the Civil War and was just inoperative.

CAC: Yes.

EA: Then, I think it was about 1870 when, under the leadership of John Pillsbury, it was revitalized and William Watts Folwell was called to be president. His inaugural address . . . practically every president I've known, I've always try to see to it that they get to read Folwell's inaugural address because he had a vision for the university that even today isn't fulfilled and he was speaking to this little group of students, and faculty, and friends when they were trying to rebuild a defunct institution.

CAC: When I began this project, that was one of the first documents I read even though it was way back.

EA: It's a great document.

CAC: It's a remarkable document.

EA: A wonderful document.

CAC: Your undergraduate training prepared you well for the business world as well as for the larger world that you became engaged in?

EA: One reaction I had at the time, there were core group subjects that we were required to take. I remember one course that I had, Analysis of Financial Statements. I was a salesman at the time. I kind of felt a rebellion against this core group and stuff because I wanted to have greater flexibility in areas of literature, and culture, and liberal education, as well as business. The interesting thing was that no course that I took had as practical application in later years as the Analysis of Financial Statements.

CAC: [laughter]

EA: And I realized that the people developing the program knew better what I was going to need than I did. In later years, I wasn't quite so sympathetic with always trying to cater to what students thought they wanted because I think educators may know better how to prepare for a career than students do.

CAC: Right.

EA: I think some of the mistakes the university made later on, which are now being corrected, was having it too easy to get into the university, too easy to get out of the university with less than the hard core subjects in any area that a student really ought have. I think lifting the admission requirements, which has now happened, and having fewer programs, and more demanding programs is all for the best in the future.

CAC: Good. The sales work was for Fuller? Did you move right into Fuller?

EA: No, no. I came to Minnesota as a salesman for a Muskegon, Michigan, firm. I was doing that while I was going to school, and did it for a few years after, and joined Fuller in 1934—after marriage and after graduation—for a few years.

CAC: Within six or seven years, you were president for the Fuller Company?

EA: Well, within seven years, I was president, yes. In 1941, I became president. It was a tiny company. When I became president, it had annual sales of less than \$200,000; so, it wasn't a great enterprise.

CAC: It was your direction that made for what it became.

EA: We had a vision, and we had a program, and it worked.

CAC: It worked so well that within seven or eight years, in 1949—you ran in 1948—you begin to take up your political career.

EA: In 1949, there was a senator whom I knew well from our district who was the majority leader of the state, Senator Charles N. Orr. He died in the 1949 session soon after it opened; so, there was a special election in 1949, January and February, and it was at that time that I was first elected and then re-elected. I served until 1958.

CAC: So, you had a decade as a state senator before you became governor?

EA: Yes.

CAC: This then is the decade of the 1950s, basically 1949 to 1958. Can you say something about how the university appeared to members of the legislature at that time? This would have been still James Morrill.

EA: The key fact at that time was that there was one member of the legislature whose sole and exclusive dedication was to the University of Minnesota. His name was Gerald Mullen. He was a senator from Minneapolis. He devoted his entire senate career to the university and he was

chairman of the University Committee. He had a lot to do with nurturing choices of regents. He had everything to do with the budget. I can still remember his plea to the senate, "Please, let us go to the conference committee with the budget untouched. Don't reduce it. You know that House will be tough to deal with," and so on. I've lectured and tried ever since to see that some one member of the legislature would be that dedicated. I'm afraid it would be correct to say that Mullen was willing to trade a vote for almost anything in exchange for a vote supporting the university budget or university measures. There were times when there were constitutional amendments. There was once a constitutional amendment being drafted that was going to have to do with the experiment on animals—which is a continuing problem even today—and that would greatly hamper research at the university. That was a struggle at that time. There were sometimes when Gerry Mullen would get a little [unclear]. I worked closely with him. In fact, I had some aspiration that the university might want me to succeed him but they didn't. They picked someone else who didn't have quite the dedication, a wonderful person who worked on good programs and was a fine senator but he didn't have the fire that Mullen had and no one ever since has fought for the university the way Gerry Mullen did. That made a success of the 1950s.

CAC: This was Senator [Gordon] Rosenmeir that filled into that position? [unclear]

EA: No, no. Later on, it was Senator Dunlap.

CAC: I see.

EA: Senator Dunlap kind of became the favorite of the university. Dunlap, as I say, a splendid senator and we collaborated. I had a series of bills on special education when he had a series of bills on library development and we collaborated to pass both of them. I liked him and admired him very much but he didn't have quite the passion that Mullen had had for the university; so, the university didn't do quite as well under his concern. And no one since, that I've known of, has even presumed to kind of be the university guy in the legislature.

CAC: What was the source of Senator Mullen's loyalty and enthusiasm for the university?

EA: He was not a graduate of the university; he was a graduate of St. Thomas. I don't know, other than that he just thought it was important for the state of Minnesota, that the University of Minnesota was the fountainhead of education and, therefore, the fountainhead of economic development and then I think he loved the associations with the faculty, with the regents. He just loved the role and he was a lawyer; so, it was almost as if the university was his client and he just loved them. He was so effective and I just wish there were someone like him today.

CAC: It made Stan Wenberg's job easier to have someone like that.

EA: Stan Wenberg was a tremendous worker but he had the grubby kind of job of sitting in the Gopher Grill at the St. Paul Hotel till all hours of the night indulging with the senators who liked to do so. That was hard work but he developed friendships and loyalties, too, that certainly made

Mullen's job easier. Mullen was on the merit of issues, and the programs, and the money, and so on. Wenberg's relationships were very personal.

CAC: I see.

EA: One person he worked with very closely was Senator Rosenmeir who was a very influential state senator.

CAC: In those days, a lot of people have commented, the president of the university was not as daily engaged as some presidents would be later in cultivating the legislative mandate.

EA: Dr. Morrill was daily involved.

CAC: Oh, okay.

EA: I can remember clearly how there used to be little games in the Senate Finance Committee when Morrill was there. He would take out a cigarette—smoking was pretty common at that time—and Senator Morrill was something of a smoker, and he'd tap it, and he'd roll, and he'd handle it, and he'd lay it down, and pick it up, and there used to be little games to see how much time before he would ever light it.

CAC: [laughter]

EA: Sometimes, he never did. He just fondled that cigarette for about an hour while going through his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee. That's one little memory of Morrill. The other memory, of course, is how diligent he was in the halls of the Senate and the House. He was a tremendously active lobbyist for the university . . . Dr. Morrill was. I don't remember that as much as others because he was president of the university for most of the time. I don't remember, for example, that Meredith Wilson was over in the capitol quite as much. Meredith Wilson spent more of his time in relationships outside the university with the business community. He served on boards, on corporate boards, and he had greater relationships, I'd say, with the business community maybe than many presidents have had. But Dr. Morrill certainly worked with the legislature.

CAC: That brings us to the Wilson Administration. He came in 1960 and you became governor in 1961?

EA: Yes.

CAC: So, your 1961-1963 was during the early Wilson years.

EA: Dr. Wilson, I think, was considered a very able president of the university and a particularly academically inclined, scholarly man. I remember our relation. I had always considered myself

a friend of the university in the legislature and thought I was being pretty generous under the conditions of the time in the allocation that I made or the recommendation that I made to the 1961 legislative session but Met Wilson didn't think it was enough. I remember I felt kind of bad that he didn't think my increase was what it ought to be. Of course, no increase is ever what it ought to be . . . no amount of money.

CAC: Yes.

EA: The university's mission and its needs are so great that if you really ask or look for all that is really needed or could be invested wisely, there wouldn't be money for anything else. So I suppose, no president can ever be enthusiastic about a governor's recommendation. I remember I felt a little hurt that Met Wilson didn't think better of my recommendation. [laughter] He was an able president and continued in a role of educational leadership when he went off to California . . .

CAC: Yes.

EA: . . . and was head of something about Democratic institutions.

CAC: He was head of the Behavioral Center at Stanford.

EA: Yes. He was top-notch. To me, the outstanding president after Folwell—who I think has never really been equaled in vision and purpose—was [George Edgar] Vincent. I think it was under President Vincent that the real concept of the university came to fruition with special schools and colleges. He recruited some outstanding leaders of the schools he created. For the College of Education, for example, he recruited Lotus D. Coffman, who later became president.

CAC: Yes.

EA: So, Vincent had always seemed to me, from what little I know about it, as probably the greatest president after Folwell—but surely, Met Wilson would rank up there. I think, Nils Hasselmo is one of the great presidents. We'll get to him, I'm sure, a little later.

CAC: All right. We have so many comments and so much writing about the relationship of the university to the legislature and very little about the relationship of the university, central administration, to the governor's office. Was there correspondence? Were there conversations regarding the budget recommendation that you would make?

EA: No, there was little of what you might call lobbying of the governor's office and not much negotiation with the governor's office during the legislative sessions. I think the concept of the university was, and still is, that the key element in the relationship with state government is the legislature because that's where the money ultimately comes and normally the big appropriation bills are signed by the governor. He has the power of line item veto but doesn't use it very

much. So, the fact of the matter is that the legislature is more important than the governor's office, though the governor in some matters of policy might . . . I know at my time, one of my concerns was the competition between the university and other elements of post secondary education. I know that I used to have kind of an off the record meeting in my business office, so it would be out of sight of the heads of the college system, and the community college system, and the vocational education people, and the president of the university, to work in harmony with one another to make the total pie bigger rather than to get fighting with each other over the smaller pie . . . including the private colleges. There was always that easy way for the private colleges to feel that the university tuition was too low, and was unfair competition, and university tuition ought to be higher relative to the private colleges. I thought any kind of competition between, or negative, anti-feeling competition between the elements of higher education in the state played into the hands of those who didn't want to appropriate much money to any of them. So, that it was terribly important to try and have a united front, and be mutually supportive, and speaking well of one another. I think Dr. Morrill and Dr. Wilson were both very good at working at that and I think others have been, too. I haven't been as intimately close to some of that as I was when I was in the legislature. I was a member and, at one time, chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee that dealt with the education appropriation; so, I was very closely concerned and as governor, of course, was very closely concerned with the education appropriation. I've always felt that investment by the people of Minnesota in education is the best investment of any kind that they can make in public finance or in private finance.

CAC: Within a decade, what you started informally comes to be the Higher Education Coordinating Board. It comes to be bureaucratized.

EA: I served on the first formation of what was then called the Higher Education Coordinating Commission. It was made up of some representatives of the system but they worked too closely together. [laughter] Where the legislature wanted somebody to monitor and get after these systems of higher education, they collaborated so much that the legislature changed the whole structure and did away with having representatives of the system.

CAC: Ah!

EA: They wanted somebody to ride herd on the higher education not really serve it or work with it. I remember very well . . . it was at the time of the first Coordinating Commission that the first scholarship program and loan and grant program got going and that was unheard of at the time, that we were going to public funds and give it to students to go to college. It's grown now, of course, to where it's a very huge program of loans and grants and a splendid program. Yes, I remember very well. I remember Sidney Rand represented the private colleges in that. There were some fine people and I think it functioned very well but it didn't quite serve the purpose the legislature had in mind.

CAC: Now, with the consolidation of the other systems, it's become largely useless. I think it being phased out, isn't it?

EA: I think a sunset provision has been passed.

CAC: Yes.

EA: It's going to go out of business.

CAC: Yes. You weren't out of the governorship very long before you are elected, in 1967, to the Board of Regents of the university. I would imagine that it was a political position for an important position of influence but it was political. You had to initiate the campaign to get that election?

EA: Well, I didn't really initiate nor have much of a campaign though I had some friends in the legislature; and I really don't remember whether I initiated it. It came as somewhat of a surprise to me because of a number of things. Number one, the seat that was open was the Fourth District and that had traditionally, for thirty years or more, been filled by a representative from organized labor. George Lawson had been a wonderful member of the Board of Regents for many years from the Fourth District; and at that time, there was a suggestion that Neil Sherburne, who was then secretary of the AFL-CIO, should come from the Fourth District but some of my friends in the legislature talked to me—they knew I'd always loved the university—and asked if I would be willing to serve if I was elected. I said, "I sure would. In fact, I'd be thrilled." They went to work and sought my election but I had one condition. I thought organized labor should have a place on the Board of Regents but I thought it really more appropriately would be one of the at-large seats rather than one from one of the congressional districts because that tended to exclude anybody else from that district from ever serving.

CAC: Ah, yes.

EA: I knew Neil Sherburne; I liked Neil Sherburne. So, I said, "I'll be a candidate and I'll appreciate being elected on condition that the first at-large seat that becomes available will go to Neil Sherburne." So, it was a Republican controlled legislature that a couple of years later elected Neil Sherburne to the Board of Regents. Of course, he and I became very close associates on the Board of Regents and had to do with certain programs. One thing we thing we felt, that traditionally officers of the Board of Regents had served too long. The chair of the Board of Regents shouldn't go on forever. At the time that Les Malkerson was kind of designated—in our minds at least—to be named chair, we had an understanding with Les that he would serve for two years, and that would kind of get to be the pattern, and that the vice-president, vice-chair, should succeed him; so, the vice-chair would have a time of preparation. I became the vice-chair; then I became chair and Neil Sherburne was vice-chair under me. He became chairman. Wenda Moore was vice-chair under Neil Sherburne. I think the program then hit a hitch or two. I was gone and others were gone and it varied a little from that. I think now, when there was some difficulty with Jean Keffeler, it was kind of made the point that she wasn't going to be re-elected as chair . . . she kind of wanted it. I'm not sure whether the vice-chair was elected but it isn't quite as neat and orderly now as it was for quite a number of years. [laughter]

Going on the Board of Regents . . . I remember to this day, walking around the campus, really with tears in my eyes, I was so thrilled to think that I was still going to be able to have a relationship to the university after all the years as a student, and then the [Minnesota] Foundation, and different things, and thought it was all over, and here I was going to be on the Board of Regents. It was a very thrilling experience. I worked hard at it. I tried to do my homework. I greatly enjoyed being on the Board of Regents. We made some mistakes and there were some difficult times and traumatic experiences but that's typical of a great institution.

CAC: You came aboard when the presidencies were changing. Met Wilson left in 1967 and Mac [Malcom] Moos came on.

EA: At my very first meeting of the board . . . two things I remember about it. One was that Mac Moos was being finally approved to become president of the university and I had known Mac Moos politically. I had known his father who was an insurance man in St. Paul and had been very active in politics. The other thing I remember at that first meeting that kind of shocked me was that Jeno Palucci was making a gift of an airplane to the University of Minnesota. It was my first meeting so I wasn't asking many questions but it was quite clear that it was a kind of airplane that the university would have no use for. It wouldn't fit in to the teaching program. There was nothing they were going to be able to do with it. I had been around enough to know that this was an accommodation to Mr. Palucci to give him a deduction and I thought, this is not an appropriate thing for the university to be doing, to be playing games with a contributor so he can get a big deduction while they accept a gift for which they have no use. I sat there thinking, my gosh! they shouldn't be doing this but I thought, I don't want to vote no at my very first meeting.

CAC: [laughter]

EA: I remember kind of the trauma of sitting there thinking what I should do. Well, I sat quietly, and it came to a voice vote, and I guess I said and audible, "Aye" and it went through. But afterwards, I asked a couple of the officials, "What in the world is a university doing getting involved in deal like this?" I said, "They ought to be ashamed of themselves." Someone said, "Well, Elmer, sometimes things like this are done in hopes that relationships will be established that will come to favorable fruition later on."

CAC: Yes.

EA: I don't think it ever did in the case of Jeno Palucci. I know Jeno well and I don't think well of him. I came to know him quite well as governor and in other relationships that had to do with Voyageurs [National] Park, and so on. I don't criticize him too much. There are colleges in Florida that really finance themselves on gifts of yachts. They receive yachts. They sell yachts and make money in the yacht business.

CAC: [laughter] No chance for yachts in Minnesota.

EA: No, not much at least.

CAC: The university falls right into real serious problems they weren't braced for in the late 1960s, that is, the black students' movement, the occupation of Morrill Hall. There's the anti-Vietnam war movement among students. Did that reach the regents and your relationship with President Moos?

EA: Oh, my goodness! I should say. The highlight of Malcolm Moos' Administration was his relationship and empathy with students and their concerns and their objections to things. He was at his best when he was dealing with students and kind of understanding them enough so they didn't feel they had to have such outbursts as occurred in some campuses. There was one great success and one unfortunate situation that I particularly remember. At one time, the governor felt that the National Guard should be on campus as a protection and it was kind of directed by the governor, that the National Guard was going to come on campus. So, President Moos arranged for a meeting with the head of the National Guard. The main issue was that if the National Guard were to come on campus, they were to come unarmed. The head of the National Guard was saying, "Our people can't go unarmed anywhere. They have to be ready for protecting themselves." Moos said, "I just won't tolerate the National Guard coming on this campus armed." I was at the meeting; so, I remember it very specifically and he prevailed. He just became heated and said, "They're not going to come on this campus armed! We're not going to have any shooting incidents on this campus." It was later that there was that tragic one in Ohio.

CAC: Yes, Kent State.

EA: That was a high spot. I was so proud of President Moos and his firm stand. Then, we had a kind of flamboyant mayor of Minneapolis who sent police on the campus of the university at one point and they manhandled students in an unnecessary way; so, that was kind of the low point of the relationship between the public and the students in that troublesome period. There was also an issue that related to Eastcliff that relates to those times.

CAC: I didn't know that.

EA: I remember on the Board of Regents having a visit with Malcolm Moos that something needed to be done at Eastcliff, that it was a ceremonial center, and it wasn't properly equipped for what it was supposed to do, and it was deteriorating physically, and it just needed attention. We needed to have a committee to really set up a program and finance a proper rehabilitation of Eastcliff. So, he agreed to the committee, and we set up the committee, and we got an appraisal and an estimate. It was going to cost quite a bit of money and I remember him saying, "Elmer, we can't. I can't in good conscience with all the disturbance there is and the concern of the students and the general society instability." He said, "I can't go with an item to the legislature for Eastcliff; so, please, forget it." So, we forgot it. Then, along came Peter Magrath and we went through the same thing with him. [laughter] He said, "Elmer, when we can't do

adequately first for salaries of the faculty . . . We're going past years now with no increase at all; so, actually their real income is going down." He said, "I can't see us spending a lot of money on Eastcliff when I haven't the money for salaries; so, please, forget it." So, we forgot it. Then, Ken Keller came along. [laughter] We said, "We just have to do something about this. It just cannot go on any longer. The place is just going to crumble." So, Ken Keller bit the bullet and, of course, it became a big fracas.

CAC: Yes.

EA: I remember with some amusement how nobody wanted to touch that. Ken Keller had the courage to do it and a lot of the things related to cost related to union relationships between the university, and the legislature, and organized labor; so, there would labor groups standing by while other groups were doing work. It was costly but the only real mistake Ken Keller made was to order too fancy a desk for himself. That caught the public attention and that did him in.

CAC: Let's go back to the Moos Administration for a while longer. One of the reasons I'm doing oral history is that formal records give lots of resolutions, and budgets, and formal actions but how things really get done, it's hard to . . . You were there from 1971 to 1975.

EA: There were two, three things that were very disappointing. In the first place, in trying to be fair to Mac Moos who was a fine man, he really didn't want to be an administrator of the university. He wanted the university to be kind of a forum. He loved the fact that he went down to give a commencement address at Notre Dame, and he wanted to be a voice of education, and he had ceremonial ideas. He not only didn't want to preside at the Senate, he didn't even want to attend the meetings and we thought it just impossible for a president at the university not to have a close relationship with the faculty. He just didn't want it and he didn't have it.

CAC: There was no way the regents could persuade him to another view?

EA: No. One of the most disappointing experiences, while I was regent at that time, came in the appointment of a person to head the General College. At a regents' meeting, it was reported who had been the top person in the Search Committee and that the president was recommending the appointment of that person and wanted regent approval. When one of the regents spoke up and said, "Well, that isn't my understanding as to who was the top choice of the Search Committee." I think I was chair at that time. I said, "It ought to be pretty easy to get a copy of the Search Committee's recommendation. Who has it?" Well, it came forth and it showed that another person had been the first choice of the Search Committee; so, here was a deceit of the Board of Regents by somebody. I must say, to this day, we never really ever did find out who was really responsible for reversing the report of the Search Committee so that by the time it got to the Board of Regents it was not true. It was reversed in the recommendation. But the person who was said to be recommended had already been spoken to and it was going to be embarrassing; so, the Board of Regents went along with the president and with the one that he was recommending but we never knew for sure who was responsible for that deceit. That was

a great disappointment and it shows that there are some things that go on behind the scenes that aren't so nice. There was another case that bothered us very much and that was the Rajender case.

CAC: Ah.

EA: I was on the Board of Regents when that came up. It was perfectly clear to the Board of Regents that there was discrimination, that this woman was very qualified, should have been appointed, wasn't appointed, and it would seem pretty clear in a department that was all male that they just didn't want a woman. The regents argued with the president about that incident, not wanting to confirm. There, again, the president was pleading that he'd lose stature with the faculty and life would be miserable. I remember telling him at the time, "This is too much to expect a Board of Regents to do this." That led to the Board of Regents feeling there had to be a change and the change, in the resignation of President Moos, was brought about; it wasn't initiated by him. I was president at that time and we finally felt that we needed somebody who would be actual, an operating president, not a figurehead who wanted to use the university as a forum for lecturing, and speaking, and so on. I remember very well Dan Gainey had retired from the Board of Regents but was a very close friend of the president. The president felt he could outlast this move of the Board of Regents, that he wasn't going to resign and he didn't have to resign. I remember a few days before a Board of Regents' meeting, Dan Gainey called me up and he said, "Elmer, just how serious is this business of Mac Moos leaving?" I said, "Mac Moos doesn't want to leave but he has to leave for the sake of the university and all I can tell you, Dan, is that if he doesn't give us a letter of resignation by the board meeting, there's going to be a resolution to relieve him of the presidency and it's going to pass." The next day, I had a letter of resignation. So, we had to bring about the resignation of Mac Moos. That's the fact of the matter and history ought to deal with facts. It was very traumatic for me because I thought Moos had done very well in some areas but the times required leadership of a kind that he was unwilling to give . . . so here a friend of mine, I had to engineer leaving the presidency of the university.

CAC: I won't say several but a couple of the interviews I've had suggest that the selection of John Ingve leaving the legislature and coming to the board was in some part a move by the legislature knowing that there was a vacuum of leadership in the university because of the events that you're talking about and there was a need to get a closer, more active, Board of Regents in regard to the president. Is that . . . ?

EA: I don't think that was so very true but the attitude of the legislature is always the same. They feel the university is trying to mislead them and they want to get somebody on the board that will get after the university.

CAC: I see, so there is [unclear]?

EA: Back in my time in the legislature, the legislature put Carl Neumeier on the Board of Regents who was a state senator. He'd been defeated; and so, when he was out of the state senate, they elected him to the Board of Regents. I remember Carl Neumeier, who was an able, keen, lawyer and a very fair-minded man but a very tough-minded man, and he got on . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

CAC: We're talking about the legislature and the regents.

EA: Carl Neumeier became a great friend of the university and supportive of it before the legislature. I can still see remember one kind of off the record meeting with some legislators and Carl Neumeier . . . one of the legislators saying, "Carl, what did they do to you over there?"
[laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EA: They thought he had failed in his mission completely.

CAC: This is a recurring . . .

EA: Going way back to when [Bill] Middlebrook was finance vice-president . . .

CAC: Ahhh.

EA: They used to be so upset with Middlebrook because they'd ask him a question and he'd give the longest answer without saying anything. They were just so upset with him. They always felt they could never really find out what was going on at the university; so, the legislature has always had a kind of love/hate relationship, that they have a hard time getting their hands on the university. I remember the time when they were discussing Middlebrook in the House of Representatives, and were so upset with him, and Mrs. Middlebrook was up in the gallery listening on behalf of her husband. Finally, the terrible things they were saying about her husband, she couldn't stand any more; and she stood up in the gallery and shouted down to the House down below, "That isn't true. That isn't true." They had to usher her out of the gallery.
[laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EA: The relationship between the legislators . . . and they're well meaning and they have their missions, and their constituencies, and their concerns . . . but I don't remember particularly in the case of John Ingve that John Ingve came on with any special mission from the legislature though the legislature always is hoping it can have a little more influence . . .

CAC: Okay.

EA: . . . and sometimes they over reach. I can remember back in the days when the communist issue was very strong.

CAC: Ahhh.

EA: There was a fellow named Faye Child in the state senate who just was sure of all the associations of different faculty members, that they were really communists and it was a terrible time when Fay Child was witch hunting the university for communists. Then, they didn't want people to have the right to speak on the campus; so, the whole issue of academic freedom would come into play. So, the relationship with the legislature is never easy. They have a great concern about their responsibility but, sometimes, it gets too political and gets away from the fundamental thing . . . the great work at the university, the scholars, the research, the teaching, the public service, the archival function. The university is a tremendous institution in the state. The fact that it's located in the metropolitan area is a big factor in leavening the whole community because in states like Michigan/Ann Arbor, Iowa/Iowa City, the university tends be a little more removed and, maybe, doesn't have the impact. But the University of Minnesota has incredible impact on the state of Minnesota. So, everybody has to work as hard as they can to have a good relationship because it's so important. There have been some tough times.

CAC: From a faculty point of view, I think many of the people I've talked to considered the resignation of Gerry Shepherd, and his whole staff in the academic vice-president's office, as a trigger to move forward more rapidly the removal of Mr. Moos.

EA: Well, I don't recall that.

CAC: Okay.

EA: I know Gerry Shepherd well. I don't recall that that was a factor. Our factor was maybe more just a matter of confidence between the Board of Regents and the president. We felt two things, that he didn't really wish to function as we felt a president had to function. We felt the president ought to preside at meetings of the Senate, and ought to participate in the discussions, ought to have an interchange with the faculty and the faculty should have great input into the administration of the university—all of that was lacking. Then, when there were two big mistakes—one the Rajender case and one on the recommendation of a Search Committee—the Board of Regents felt that the main function of the Board of Regents is to support the president and if it can't do so, the president's got to go. Their choice of a president is the main function of the Board of Regents. A danger of a Board of Regents, somewhat visible lately, has been too much micro-management of the University of Minnesota. Rather than having a relationship with the president, let the president run the University of Minnesota and if he does it and does it well, he has the support of the regents, and [the Board of Regents] works with the president on matters

of major policy, and works with the legislature to see that the legislative intent is carried out. I think the role of the regents is a matter of considerable concern and discussion.

CAC: You've served on so many boards in the corporate world, and the voluntary community sector, and on the Board of Regents. I spent some time, when I started this project, looking at the agenda and minutes of the Board of Regents, going back into the 1960s and kind of quickly through the 1970s and 1980s. I tell you that's an overwhelming thing to do, to understand from the outside. You look at the docket, it just goes on and on. Could you say something about how dockets on the Board of Regents are managed? Did you caucus regularly, confer informally regularly with other members of the board and with the president's office in making things move along?

EA: The docket was pretty much up to the administration. The matters that came before the regents were pretty much administrative things that needed regent consideration and action. We used to sometimes think that the administration may try to intimidate the Board of Regents by loading so much stuff . . .

CAC: Yes.

EA: . . . on us that we couldn't cover it all; so, we'd automatically go along with the administration out of sheer collapse from the load. But the fact of the matter is that no one can really know the entire University of Minnesota, not the president, not anybody. It is so big that it has to work through many structures. Anytime there's a weakness in any part of the structure, then, of course, the people at the top get criticized. Why didn't they know about this? Why didn't they do something about it? It's just so big nobody can know everything that's going on, I don't think. It is enormous; so, there has to be great organization, great trust of people, great confidence. In an institution as big as this is, in any aggregation of human beings as large as this is, there's bound to be slippage, there's bound to be weakness, there's bound to be frailty; so, a certain amount of unfortunate incidents are bound to occur.

CAC: Yes.

EA: All you can do is when they come to light, treat with them as best you can. Yes, to be a regent is more than a full time job. Nobody . . . I don't think any regent could ever . . . I couldn't. I tried. I really worked at it. But nobody could really read everything that came your way and know everything that people expected you to know.

CAC: But you can set priorities.

EA: Oh, yes. I remember one time, one priority we set . . . and sometimes it used to be amusing. [laughter] We used to have things come up and we'd have some practical solution for something somewhere and someone would say, "That isn't according to the college constitution. That's kind of contrary to the college constitution." So, we said, "Oh, do the colleges have

constitutions?" It was kind of indicated to us that, yes, they did. "Well," I said, "maybe we ought to codify the college constitutions. Let's get a current copy of all the college constitutions in the president's office or the regents' office." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EA: Well, it caused an enormous furor because the fact of the matter is that they could find the doggone college constitutions. They were really ad hoc constitutions. It was just, again, thrown up as when somebody wanted to not go along with something, to say it's contrary to the college constitution. So, we had to blow that smoke screen away.

CAC: From another perspective, it was worse than that. In the early 1970s, when you were chairman of the board, departments were encouraged to have . . . I was chair of History in 1971 and we were encouraged to write a constitution.

EA: Yes.

CAC: So, we did!

EA: Sure.

CAC: And we [unclear].

EA: That was at the time when everybody was supposed to have one and it came out that they didn't have one; so, then we were trying to encourage that they have one. A great head of the Senate and a man I greatly admired in a lot of ways was Sam Krislov.

CAC: Oh, yes.

EA: He was chairman of the Senate, the faculty organization for years. I think he had more to do with anybody in example in persuading the legislature to fund the Law School building with which he wasn't directly related. Others who get a lot of credit, and worked very hard, didn't quite make it but Sam related to the legislature in terms they could understand. He went over and talked once and, I think, that made the difference. On faculty relationships . . . I used to keep in touch with Sam just trying to have an understanding of the faculty, and their role, and where they came from, and what they were thinking of, and what they wanted the university to be . . . and the splendid Regent professors. I think it was when we were getting ready to act on Moos, when we were getting pretty desperate and yet wanted to act prudently and so on, I think we asked the Regents professors to get together and consider what we were thinking of.

CAC: I think Russ Amundson and Al Nier were part of that group.

EA: Al Nier was a Regents professor at that time and I knew Al Nier personally. I think he was one I talked with and said, "Could you get the Regents professors together. This is pretty serious business. We think we have a serious situation and that it's our responsibility to see that there is a change. It's coming about very difficultly and will you help us?" I think the Regents professors, maybe on their own initiative but I think on the regents initiative, talked it over, and felt that we were right, and said something needed to be done. That was a difficult time. That was one of the hardest things for me personally. I think that's fundamental to the Board of Regents that they have to have confidence in the president and if they don't have that confidence, they just have to change.

CAC: But it's a very touchy matter for the regents to correspond, communicate directly with faculty leaders?

EA: We tried to do it as gracefully as we could so that when we got the resignation, it was treated as a resignation, and there was no adverse publicity, and we tried to provide as generously for Malcolm Moos as we could at the time, and did. So, we tried to be decent about it but it was difficult. Time goes fast.

CAC: Well, it's a lot of history. I'm going to look at my notes.

EA: I'll try and be briefer.

CAC: No, I think this is really an extraordinary addition of things that only you could provide. One of the things that your chairmanship is credited for, at least publicly, is the tightening of the committee system in the Board of Regents and the move toward open meetings.

EA: Yes, well, that was a longtime feeling of mine that if the regents were more open and used a committee structure and the committee meetings were open that there would be better understanding. I have a strong feeling that when there's good communication and clear understanding of the facts . . . If public understands, if everybody understands and accepts the same set of facts, then resolving issues gets much easier. It's usually difficult when there's a different understanding of what the facts are . . . that you have difficulties to resolve problems. I don't know how much credit we're entitled to but we did try to have open meetings and there were no . . . The only time, in my time, when we had difficulty with open meetings was in the choice of a president following Malcolm Moos.

CAC: Yes.

EA: Because what we wanted to do and what we set out to do was to recruit a president, not to just decide among applicants. We made that conscious decision.

CAC: I see.

EA: We're not just going to run ads, and get a bunch of applicants, and decide among applicants. We're going to look around at who would we like to have be president of this university and see if we can recruit them. In that kind of a context, confidentiality becomes all the more important. So, we had a difficult time considering some people or letting them let us consider them if there wasn't going to be confidentiality. We may have stretched the application of the open meeting law which was in effect at that time because there were some very top-notch people that we were trying to recruit but were having a hard time to keep confidential. I'd say that Peter Magrath was quite willing to let it be known that he was available. I remember going down to visit him. We went to visit people at their location, instead of just bringing them to Minnesota.

CAC: Good.

EA: We tried to show respect and regard for the people we were considering. Then, we included faculty in that search program. That, I think, was a little unusual up to that time. I remember going to Buffalo with the head of the Greek Department, classics department. What was his name?

CAC: Was it [Robert] Sonkowski at that point? Bill McDonald?

EA: Yes. Bill McDonald and I went to Buffalo to interview Peter Magrath. I remember coming back on the plane, he was very much impressed with Magrath. We were there overnight; so, we had two days. You know, you meet somebody and you meet them again the next day, things will be a little different.

CAC: Yes.

EA: Coming back on the plane, Dr. McDonald leaned over to me and he said, "You know, Andersen, we were with that young man for two days and he didn't make a single mistake." He was very impressed with Magrath. And Magrath became the president.

CAC: Part of your search included Michigan and California, persons who were chancellors there?

EA: Yes. The chancellor at California was a superb person. I think, he would have been a wonderful president but he didn't really want to consider the job. We went out to talk to him and I think I may have talked to him a little forcefully saying something to the effect, "Really, as a person devoted to education, when somebody is as interested in you as we are, you kind of owe it to them to at least come and look at the thing." So, I was kind of pushing pretty hard to get him to at least consider us. [laughter] So, he said he would come. Then, I remember several things about it. One, he stayed overnight at the governor's residence and his wife came with him, a lovely lady. We were at the governor's residence before the governor had arrived

and I told him he was a pretty young man, a very fine young man—it was Wendell Anderson. I remember when Wendell came in to meet them, this lady, Mrs—was it Saxon?

CAC: Yes.

EA: Mrs. Saxon looked and said, "I don't believe it." Here, was this young Greek god who was the governor. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EA: She said, "I don't believe it."

CAC: We did pretty well with the Andersens, even if they don't spell their name right.

EA: That was one thing that I remember. Then, we had a luncheon meeting one noon with leaders of many kinds at which Saxon was going to speak. He was kind of being exposed to this group to see how they would react. [laughter] I remember so well, he said, "There's one thing I would feel about Minnesota if I were to consider coming here, and I don't know that I will," and he said, "but one thing is clear to me, you can't afford to have two universities in Minnesota." This was an obvious put down of UM-D [University of Minnesota-Duluth]. He said, "You can have one great university and you have a great university but you can't have two of them. I would not preside at trying to build two universities in Minnesota." Whew! The phone began to ring within a half an hour.

CAC: I bet, yes.

EA: Legislators, people of UM-D, people of northern Minnesota . . . don't have anything to do with that guy. I think he kind of returned the favor. I had put pressure on him; so, I think he came back saying, "Well, I'll tell you exactly what I think and I'm sure it won't go across very well." A great deal was said in the press, and the press always picks up the auxiliary things, and makes them out to be the main thing . . . that there was a fellow . . . that some anti-Semitism crept into that selection.

CAC: Yes.

EA: That was not true at all. It had nothing whatever to do with it. One regent may have said something that sounded like it and it frequently is true—I've known of other cases unrelated to the university—where some chance remark will be blown up as being the lifetime philosophy of somebody and forever blight their career because, at one point under certain conditions, they said something that maybe was misinterpreted. That was the case with the charges and the concern about anti-Semitism. Saxon was a fine educator and the regents liked him very much but he just didn't want to come. The thing that it did do, it certainly made the University of California . . . because at that time, he was president of one unit . . .

CAC: At UCLA, right?

EA: . . . at UCLA and then he became chancellor.

CAC: That's right.

EA: I think they suddenly came to and realized that they were overlooking the best man they had. Saxon was, I thought, a very fine educator but he didn't want to come. He made a speech that assured that he wouldn't be called.

CAC: It was a speech that many people have commented on who were there. It's just rip-roaring . . . the best statement, you know.

EA: It was true!

CAC: Yes, a pretty competent fellow.

EA: Oh, yes.

CAC: Of course, it's ironic that in California there aren't two universities, there are, what, six major campuses?

EA: Yes. He became chancellor. I remember the visit we had with him out there. I was on that visit. In fact, on that trip, Walter Heller was the faculty member.

CAC: Ah.

EA: And Walter was very impressed with him. We had good people and we wound up with Peter Magrath. Every president makes a contribution . . . different. Malcolm Moos made a wonderful contribution in relationship to students and really demonstrating that the heart of the university are the students and the focal point should be students. He did as well at that as any president ever did at a time when it was of compelling importance.

CAC: Yes.

EA: So, I can't say enough about the good things that Malcolm Moos did and I think the good things that every president does but nobody is perfect—not even presidents of a university. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] Well! let's go back then. That has been very useful. It's clarified points that I've picked up from other informants.

EA: Yes.

CAC: You came on the board in 1967. In 1968, you join the board of the Minnesota Foundation?

EA: Yes, I had always been interested in financial support, and raising money for good causes, and so on; so, it was just a natural. I went on the board of the Foundation as a representative of the Board of Regents but I stayed on the board of the Foundation for years after leaving the Board of Regents. In fact, after leaving the Board of Regents, I became president of the board and chairman of the board.

CAC: Yes.

EA: There are two offices there. I served on the Investment Committee and still have a close association with the university Foundation. I was active in the campaign that was going to raise \$250 million and wound up raising \$364 million. There are interesting, interesting stories of generosity, and dedication, and commitment. I remember particularly Curt Carlson. I was on the committee that called on him to recruit him to be chairman of that campaign, which not only meant being chairman of the campaign but making a contribution that was worthy and would be a lead gift. I still remember when the mention was made of \$25 million. He sat and paused awhile, and thought about it, and we talked about different things. Finally, he said, "I think it's doable,"—25 million. Then, it was felt that if he lent his name and made such a contribution, that would be a tremendous support to the effort but he became an active campaign chairman. He made calls. He diligently followed results. He attended meetings. He was a working chair. It was an incredible performance, I thought. Russ Bennett was probably the right hand campaign manager under Curt Carlson but Curt Carlson was a dedicated worker—as he now is for the Carlson School of Management and now getting to be of fairly advanced age. Curt Carlson has been a great friend of the university.

CAC: I have an appointment to interview Russ Bennett next week; so, I'm looking forward to it.

EA: Russ is a marvelous, marvelous man, too, so unassuming, so self-effacing, and yet so incredible effective. He was really the campaign manager; there's no question about it. Carlson was the campaign chairman and functioned tremendously as such and those two worked together most effectively.

CAC: My question is going to be global one and I don't know how you can get part of it. The persons who contribute, corporations, philanthropists, foundations that give money to the university are sought after also by the Minnesota Symphony, the two art galleries, museums, for welfare matters, for health . . . I mean there's just an unlimited number of things that people can give their money to.

EA: Oh, sure. I know.

CAC: This is the question part of it . . . now the global sense . . . what kind of persons—and with what motives—are attracted therefore to commit to the University of Minnesota in this major way? I know they're all doing other things as well but Bennett, and Carlson, and you certainly had to set priorities and the university was high in that regard?

EA: No question. I think one is the feeling that it is so important to the state of Minnesota. It's such an incredible accomplishment that in this rather small, not very rich state, there has been such a dedication to education, elementary, secondary, university, but primarily the university. I just can't get over being proud of a state that would build such a great university with fairly limited resources. It meant sacrifice . . . all of education in Minnesota meant great sacrifice. I don't think it's quite as apparent today. Bond issues get defeated and levy referendums get defeated. I remember when Roseville was developing, and a fellow named Emmett Williams was superintendent of schools, and every bond issue he proposed was passed. I can remember a bond issue to build an addition to a high school that wasn't even completed yet; so, while one high school was being completed, there had to be a bond issue to build an addition to it because the population was growing so fast. There was enormous dedication to education. Farm families would pass bond issues for modern, wonderful schools when they still were going to the toilet in outhouses out in the farm home. They really sacrificed because they put education as a high priority and I think many first generation—as I was . . . my father was born in Norway—knew that the reason people came to this country was so that their children could have a better opportunity than they felt they would have in the old country and the vehicle was education. So, there were no motives other than that the university is important and if we're to have a great state, we just should have a great university, and it should have a wonderful hospital, and a medical facility, and everything. It should just be a great university and it was. It developed. I think there came a time when, relatively speaking, it went into a period of decline. I think now, a good period has been going on under Hasselmo of re-accessing priorities, trimming down the number of Ph.D. programs, and having the things that can be done excellently. But it still bothers me that as a society, we seem to have a greater priority for athletic stadiums, megamalls, and gambling casinos, than we do for the University of Minnesota. We just finished building a new community library in Princeton, where we have a newspaper, which has been quite a struggle. It bothers me that the libraries can only be open twenty or thirty hours a week when gambling casinos are open twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. That doesn't, to me, reflect greatly on the society.

CAC: Has the university attracted a given kind of person out of the corporate world? I mean, there's so many large corporations and one imagines they could all make this commitment but, as a matter of fact, it's a large but limited number?

EA: It's always people and I think it comes through with a personal experience and background of people that are leading the companies and it's a matter of priorities. If the priority is making money, then, of course, that goes for one course of action, which I think is a mistake. I never felt that the prime purpose of a corporation was to make money—and I won't get into that. That's a long speech.

CAC: Ahhh.

EA: Fortunately, Minnesota has had wonderful corporate leadership that was altruistic. John D. Rockefeller III, I think it was, came out to Minnesota once to look into this relationship of corporate, and business, and politics, and government working for common good because at that time there were more corporations in Minnesota contributing 5 percent of their funds . . .

CAC: Yes.

EA: . . . than any other state regardless of size. So, Minnesota has had a very dedicated, committed, enlightened . . . the whole state has been an enlightened, progressive state for many years.

CAC: Why in Minnesota and not Michigan, or Illinois, or Missouri, or whatever?

EA: I suppose, if I want to be real bias . . .

CAC: Please, do.

EA: . . . I would say, "Obviously they had so many Scandinavians." [laughter]

CAC: Yes! [laughter]

EA: No, I think a tradition gets going and it feeds on itself.

CAC: So, there was a Minnesota tradition?

EA: It was a Minnesota tradition for education, for enlightenment, for progressivism, and political leadership was progressive—and Wisconsin similarly. I think it came out of the populist movement. It came out of the farm/agrarian movement where farmers were fighting to get fair prices. There was a participatory need of people that found expression in political leadership, and it spilled over into corporate leadership, and there's just a tradition in Minnesota of progressivism that isn't as apparent right now really as it has been. But it was in both parties and there was a tradition of honest politics and bipartisanship. Minnesota has been just a tremendously, wonderful state. I've heard so many people say, "It used to be hard to recruit people to come to Minnesota but it's much harder to recruit people out of Minnesota," because Minnesota is really a special place and the fountainhead has been the university, the leavening force of thousands of faculty members in a . . .

CAC: Yes.

EA: . . . Twin City community . . . that's a tremendous thing providing a built in support for art, for music, for theater, for everything. So, I think the university in the impact of its personnel

and faculty and the impact of being in the major corporate center of the state has had an influence on the entire state as compared to what it might have had had it been located outstate somewhere.

CAC: Some people have noted that there has been in Minnesota a unique leadership of corporations that are attached to a family tradition, the Cowles family with the *Star/Tribune*, the Dayton family, the Pillsbury family, etcetera, and that with the change of corporate leadership where people come and go and come into Minnesota from the outside, that that has come to be a lesser force. Can you comment on that?

EA: One of the wonderful things about that is that some of those families had other connections. They didn't attend the university. Yale is very strong in Minnesota. Yale raises more money in Minnesota than any other part of the country outside of the New England area.

CAC: Heavens.

EA: People give to Yale from Minnesota in lumps that I know of, of millions at a time. So, Yale is big in Minnesota but some of the key leaders of the university Foundation have been graduates of Yale, some of the Daytons, some of the Pillsburys. George Pillsbury is a graduate of Yale. Ken Dayton, I think, was a graduate of Yale. Don Dayton was. So, the families have had a tradition. They're caught up in Minnesota where their Minnesota tie becomes almost more important than some of their collegiate or other ties. There have been family traditions that are very strong. But there's also been a political tradition.

CAC: Now, is the family tradition subverted when families no longer control those corporations? I don't think there is a Dayton in the Dayton Company now.

EA: The Dayton Hudson Company? No, there is not. The Dayton family is not part of it. Oh, of course, it makes a difference. If ownership, if control of a corporation goes outside of the state, it makes a big difference. In United Way drives, they're referred to as foreign corporations, which in legal parlance, if they're not sited in Minnesota, they're foreign corporations even though it's another state not necessarily another country. Foreign corporation contributions to the United Way are always a struggle because corporations tend to give better in their home base than they do where their branch locations are. I remember being chairman of a drive in St. Paul once and recruiting one of the toughest minded persons I knew, Marie Slowik who was a great woman, to be chairman of the foreign corporation part of the drive. I said, "Marie, we've got to make our quota this year. We've gone two years not making our quota. We've got to make the quota this year. I don't care what you do to these people but you've got to get them to contribute. Get on the phone, say what you've got to say but you're the one person I know that can really talk turkey to these people that they've got to help." She did and she made her quota. So, yes, it makes a big difference who manages and controls a corporation and it's one of the unfortunate things in Minnesota . . . Now, I'm in journalism and newspaper publishing and it concerns me that one sale after another of important journalism units in Minnesota go to interests outside the

state. They may be expert journalists, and they may do well professionally, and so on but when the chips are down, their heart isn't in Minnesota. You take Rochester, and Willmar, and Worthington, and Mankato, and St. Paul, and Duluth, and Bemidji, in almost all of these major towns, the newspapers are now owned outside of Minnesota. St. Cloud . . . Gannett [Publishing] is a fine company but it's not . . . That whole situation also leads to turn over of management. Management doesn't have the luxury of long term planning. It's quarter to quarter; so, the whole corporate mode of operation these days is different and not conducive to great loyalty to local states. So, it's tougher to get financing for everything.

CAC: Your own capital contributions are scattered and I surely don't know about all of them but I know that the James Ford Bell, the arboretum library, the endowed chair in the School of Management for Business Ethics . . . these are three at least of your major contributions and I'm sure there are many others. How do you go about selecting those favored things? I personally would agree with all of them.

EA: Well, it comes from many things. It comes from needs that come up but one thing, for example, I've always been interested in nature from childhood. I won't begin a long biography but that was one thing. I've always loved books; so, to have an interest in the arboretum library was certainly a natural one because it was horticulture, it was gardening, it was natural history, and it was books. Then, I've had a very strong philosophy about how a corporation should be run and what the priorities should be; so, corporate responsibility to me is a very big issue, not nearly enough understood, not nearly enough preached, and not nearly enough followed. Part of it is that the purpose of a corporation is not to make money. That comes incidentally to doing other things well. So, that led to endowing the chair. I think people tend to put their money where their heart is and the kinds of things that interest them and that they think ought to be done. Mine has tended to center around books, and nature, and the environment, and education and, then, opportunity for everybody. I was very active many years ago in getting special education programs going in Minnesota with Maynard Reynolds.

CAC: Yes, he spoke of that in his own interview.

EA: Maynard Reynolds and I worked together in the 1955 to 1957 interim on an interim commission laying out a program for special education in Minnesota and in the 1957 legislature, we passed every single recommendation that put Minnesota in one fell swoop number one in the nation in special education; so, that every child would have . . . whatever potential would be developed and amazing things would happen to show the potential there is in every human being. That gets me into a feeling now where crime and so on is such an issue, that punishment isn't going to do it, you have to tap the potential for good that's in every person. I was visiting just this week with a longtime friend, a black man, who was on my staff as governor and he was reminding me of something I had forgotten. He said, "Do you remember, Elmer, that you took me to the Hershey, Pennsylvania, Governor's Conference as your head of the Civil Rights Commission?" I said, "Of course, I do." He said, "Do you know that I have checked and found that I was the first person of color ever to accompany a governor to a governor's conference as

a professional person." He said, "They came as chauffeurs and they came as servants but they didn't come as professional people." The self-esteem that gave him thirty or thirty-five years ago has stayed with him, that he was somebody special.

CAC: That's a good story.

EA: That I think so strongly, that everybody is somebody special and you don't bring out their best by starving them or punishing them. You bring out their best by convincing them they are special and then opening up ways of opportunity for them. The McKnight Foundation has been running a marvelous program where they seek to get people off welfare by loaning them money that they may need. One of the things they need in order to get a job, in order to get to a job, is a car, transportation. McKnight has done wonderful things getting people off welfare by just setting up a fund that makes it easy for them to borrow a little money.

CAC: Right.

EA: They get trapped in poverty and can't move; so, I believe so strongly in people, and I believe in opportunity, and I believe in the essential goodness of everybody, and the essential potential for evil in everybody. The secret is providing the environment where people are encouraged to be at their best instead of at their worst. When Russ Fridley was up at the minimum security prison, which was a great tragedy [unclear] . . .

CAC: It was, yes.

EA: . . . I asked him at the end—I visited up there several times—"Russ, what have you learned out of this experience?" He said, "Well, I'll tell you one thing, Elmer, I've certainly learned a lot about the underclass in America. People who get trapped in poverty do desperate things to get out, get in trouble with the law, get further entrapped, and just get lost." That to me is the biggest challenge of our day today is the growing gap between those who have and those that have not, a growing underclass that is desperate, hopeless, trapped, and a public trend to, instead of wanting to invest in them, to want to make life even more miserable for them.

CAC: Governor, I wish you would run for the U.S. Senate next year. [laughter]

EA: I'm running for cover. [laughter]

CAC: That platform would be won.

EA: Well, you know, I disappointed some of my Republican friends. I interviewed [Rod] Grams when he was going to run for the congress against [Gerry] Sikorski and I thought we needed a good Republican candidate; so, I was anxious to interview him. We sat here and visited and I was just so shocked because when I tried to find out what ideas he was interested in, what he read, what he worked at, what boards he had served on, what causes he had been involved in

. . . nothing, not anything. The only thing he came up with was membership in the Lions Club, which I thought was good enough, but not qualification to be in the U.S. Congress. When he was going to run for the U.S. Senate, I thought we ought to have some gender balance; so, I worked for a Republican woman and she didn't get the nomination. He got the nomination. I wasn't going to have it on my conscience to vote for him; so, I supported Ann Wynia.

CAC: An old neighbor?

EA: Yes, an old neighbor . . . good person.

CAC: Well, we've covered lots of topics.

EA: Maybe, enough.

CAC: And we're kind of ending on a high note. Are there other things—this is going to run out in a minute on this side . . . we could get another thing—other memories of the university?

EA: Oh, I think we've given enough to be of some contribution to somebody who is going to try to write a book. Life is a flow, you know, and there are ups and there are downs and there has to be ultimate confidence in the spirit of America, in spirit of people, and the essential goodness of everybody, and the desperate need to try to bring out the best of everybody, and to live beyond oneself. Life's fulfillment comes not in achievement. I had a teacher once who taught me the line from [Robert] Browning that "Ah, but man's reach should exceed his grasp, Or what's a heaven for?" [*Andrea del Sarto*]

CAC: Ah, right.

EA: I think that we should always, always be reaching for something . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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