Hyman Berman

Interview with Hyman Berman

Interviewed by Professor Clarke A. Chambers
University of Minnesota

Interviewed on September 22, 1984
at the Home of Hyman Berman

Hyman Berman - HB
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is your friendly interviewer, Clarke Chambers, again. This morning, I'm talking with an old friend and colleague in the Department of History, Hyman Berman, who came to the department in 1961 and has played an active role in college, university, and departmental affairs since then. It is September 22, 1984, the autumnal equinox. We're sitting on the back porch of his home on Seabury Avenue [Minneapolis]. It is a lovely Saturday morning. The trees are beginning to turn and here we are.

Hy, with everyone I've interviewed so far—it seems to be a nice lead in—I've inquired about family background, education, why labor history? Then after a certain meandering, we do get to the University of Minnesota. You can start anywhere you want.

HB: I'm, I guess, fairly typical of a first generation academic in terms of immigration history experience. My parents were immigrants to the United States. My father and mother both were working-class people, garment workers, who eventually became active in labor and radical movements, and were black-listed, and went off into the chicken farming area. Consequently, my early childhood was very interesting but also very uprooting, moving from the asphalt jungle of New York to the bucolic innocence of the pine barons of New Jersey. Of course, even on the chicken farm, we were not very far from the goings and comings of radical trade unionists and radical laborites. Being bounced on the Sidney Hillman's knee was an early experience . . .

CAC: Heavens!

HB: . . . things of that nature. Of course, that's something that took place a half a century ago. I'm reminded how close knit the world is when, last summer in Beijing, the People's Republic of China, I was lecturing at the Association for International Understanding to a group of mixed audience that included some old Chinese revolutionaries. After my lecture, an old man in his

early eighties, came over to me and said that he was in the United States in the early 1930s. He was, in fact, working in New York in the garment industry. He was sent by the Chinese Communist Party to be its liaison in the United States and he was a staffer in the Committee for Chinese Democracy or something of that nature; but, he had to earn a living because they weren't able to pay him. So, he went to work for Sidney Hillman in the Amalgamated [Clothing Workers' of America] as a kind of organizer for the Chinese sweatshop workers in New York's Chinatown. He said, "Do you think I was grateful to Mr. Hillman? No. I joined the leftwing opposition to him." I said, "It's understandable." Then, we started talking some more. I said, "You may have known my father." He looked at me and he turned pale. He said, "You're not Dave's son?" There, in the middle of the People's Republic of China in Beijing . . . He, apparently, was another one upon whose lap I was bounced. Of course, the immediate situation in China, the attitude towards me, changed overnight after he reported to the Chinese officials. From then on, I was no longer Professor Berman but Comrade Berman.

CAC: [laughter]

HB: That's the kind of background . . . a sense of this. My parents were not educated people, that is to say, not formal education but they read quite a bit. Their aspirations for me were always to move out of the working class but to retain a kind of ideological commitment to the working class. However, in the last years of their life, they became disillusioned with the international events, particularly the Soviet Union and never really found a new ideal to take the place of the old, which became tarnished. It was this kind of background that got me involved in . . .

CAC: Did they stay in the chicken farming business in New Jersey?

HB: No, towards the end of their lives, they gave it up. The farm was sold for a housing development on the Atlantic shore of south Jersey. They moved back to northern New Jersey, to Patterson, where my brother lives, and both of them died in the last decade up in northern New Jersey.

CAC: Did you have other siblings? Did you have an older brother?

HB: A younger brother who never went into the academic world. He remained a kind of middle management person in the garment trades, and still lives in New Jersey, and his family is in New Jersey.

CAC: There were the two of you?

HB: Just the two of us, yes. I went to City College-New York [CC-NY] where I took my undergraduate degree. It was the only place that we could afford to go at the time. My undergraduate training was interrupted by a short stint in the United States Army, two and a half years. Then, when I returned, the G.I. Bill of Rights enabled me to go on to graduate

work—once I finished undergraduate work, at Columbia University—otherwise, I could never have been able to afford Columbia University.

CAC: Someday, that story will be written. I think the academic world was turned around by the G.I. Bill.

HB: Absolutely, no doubt about it . . . no doubt about it.

CAC: The Morrill Act is one of the great turning points in higher education.

HB: Yes, yes. I'm sure that I and others like me would have found a way even without the G.I. Bill.

CAC: Some would but not . . . just think of the masses of people who did that.

HB: Absolutely. The major breakthrough, the major growth in higher education after the early 1950s was made possible largely by the G.I. Bill. We would not have had the kind of influx of academic workers without the G.I. Bill.

CAC: It sure changed the sociology of the history profession, which was pretty gentile down to that point. I would guess it was a gentile department you went into at Columbia, if not at CC-NY.

HB: CC-NY was not quite so gentile. We had people like Richard Morris, who was from an earlier generation having the same kind of working-class career pattern that I did. In fact, about two-thirds to three-fourths of the department were that way.

CAC: That gave you an earlier identification in the academic world than most people around the country would have. CC-NY would have been drastically different.

HB: CC-NY was different, probably, from any other department in the country at the time . . . probably Brooklyn College in the same way . . . the city universities and branches. Richard Morris was a person whom I early identified with. In fact, Richard Morris is the one who really pushed me into going into the academic world.

CAC: At some point, he went to Columbia?

HB: That's correct and I followed him. When I got to Columbia, he said, "You're not interested in Colonial History or legal history?" I said, "No." So, he pushed me onto Harry Carman. Harry Carman, despite the fact that he was at Columbia, has a very interesting career development. He, too, comes out of a different kind of setting than the gentile scholar/teacher. He is—was, he's dead now—an upstate New York farmer, not from an upper class farm but from a hardscrabble farm, who made it the hard way. We got along very, very well.

CAC: Known colloquially as the Apple Knockers?

HB: Yes, the Apple Knockers. There was Henry Steele Commager, who was more or less out of the gentile tradition; but, there was Allan Nevins, who was not out of the gentile tradition.

CAC: You worked with three among others?

HB: Yes, with these three. Then, among the younger people whom I worked with was Richard Hofstadter and Bill Leuchtenberg. It was a kind of transitional generation. Another individual who had a profound influence upon me was not an American historian but Salo Baron, the distinguished Jewish historian who still, today, at the age of ninety-two is completing his *Social and Economic History of the Jews* now into the twenty-ninth or the thirtieth volume. As a matter of fact, he has put in for a multi-million dollar grant request from the National Endowment of the Humanities for the upgrading and filling in of the documentary history, which we worked on together some years ago. I think he's probably going to get it.

CAC: What nice continuity.

HB: Columbia was a different world for me, despite the fact that there was some kind of a transitional bridge there through people like Carman, and Morris, and even Nevins. It was a different world. Graduate support did not exist.

CAC: Was Carman himself guiding people in labor history?

HB: He was guiding people in labor history because the only labor historian that was at Columbia was not in the History Department. Henry David was in the School of Business for that short time that I was there and Eli Ginsberg was in the School of Business. Eli Ginsberg, Henry David, and Leo Wolman were all in the School of Business and the Economics Department.

CAC: You worked with that as kind of a supporting field?

HB: Right, exactly. Leo Wolman was kept out of my exam committee because of tensions that existed not between me and Professor Wolman but between Professor Wolman and my father. Professor Wolman was the one who, as Sidney Hillman's right hand man, read my father out of the union when he was the leader of the leftwing opposition.

CAC: [laughter]

HB: This was known. Although, I took work with Leo Wolman, he was kept off my committee. [laughter] This was Harry Carman's doing, of course. As I started saying, the graduate support did not exist at Columbia in the way, in fact, we had graduate support for our students here. There was an alternative to graduate student support beside the G.I. Bill and that is, teaching in

the extension division, not at Columbia but at the City College. Night school teaching was my apprenticeship.

CAC: Very good.

HB: That's a fascinating thing. People that came through the night school at City College subsequently became distinguished members of my profession. I had, in Freshman History, as students the first or second term that I taught there, people who later went on . . . Peter Sugar who is professor of history at the University of Washington in Seattle, and Leonard Dinnerstein who is professor of history at Arizona, and quite a few others as well.

CAC: What courses were you teaching at night school?

HB: Oh, God! we had a standard course that had to be taught. It was almost like the New York City high school system. They had a set curriculum. Everything was set. It was world history from, we used to call it, cave man to Truman. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

HB: It was essentially what we call History I and History II. On occasion, if I were a good boy, they'd give me an American History course to teach; but, that was usually kept for the elites.

CAC: How many years were you there as a graduate student doing this?

HB: When I completed my undergraduate work, before I went on to graduate school, I was hired on at City College to be a reader/grader . . . my first year of graduate work; so, that was for one year. Then, when I went on to the second year of graduate school, I was called back to teach one course. I did that from about 1951 to 1956, five years, throughout my graduate school.

CAC: You got your degree in the mid to late 1950s?

HB: I got my degree in 1956. I got my degree fairly late in 1956, that is, to say it was in May or June. So, the 1956-1957 school year was a lost year in terms of . . .

CAC: I should say for the listeners, there's a train going by; so, if there's a buzz, that's what it is.

HB: We are on the main line of the old Milwaukee Road.

CAC: That, too, will pass. When I interviewed President [O. Meredith Wilson], I discovered when I played the tape back there were airplanes going over all the time and I never heard them and I was sitting there with him.

HB: [laughter]

CAC: In 1956-1957 . . .

HB: That was a very interesting year. I taught at the City College. I was hired to give social science courses to cantoral students at the Hebrew Union College, Jewish Institute of Religions, School of Cantoral [unclear] in New York. I was doing some work for Eli Ginsberg and for Henry David, research and so on.

CAC: On the documents book that then ultimately came out?

HB: No, the documents book came out later, worked on later. This was on other things. I must have had about four or five jobs . . . not one but four or five.

CAC: You were married by that time?

HB: Oh, yes. Betty then was working at the Columbia History Department. She was working as Salo Baron's secretary. In 1957, I had two job offers and I accepted both. [laughter] I was very, very close with Helena Varishovsky, professor of medieval history at City College. In fact, we worked together in revising that History I curriculum, the medieval curriculum, for the City University . . . that part of my Jewish history background gave me the ability to do that, to work with her. She was very friendly, very close with Hannah Arendts, part of that German/Jewish [unclear] in the upper west side of New York. Through her, I was kind of drawn into that crowd. Hannah Arendts' husband was professor of philosophy at Bard College. He invited me up to Bard College to talk to a colloquy of some sort. Apparently, there was an opening in the History Department of Bard College and my name was put forward for it as was Erwin Unger. Erwin, and I, and Betty, and Erwin's wife, whose name I've forgotten, rode up on the train together, all four of us together. It was crazy. As fate in life would have it, I was offered the job and tentatively accepted. I must say it was tentative acceptance. It was a one-year job.

CAC: In the mid 1950s, there were lots of one-year jobs, just like in the 1980s.

HB: I accepted it with the proviso that if I got something that was tenure track or that was more than one year . . . I thought they understood that. Within a week of accepting, Brooklyn College called me. John Hope Franklin offered me the job at Brooklyn College and it was a three-year job. One-year job . . . three-year job. The three-year job may be tenure track; it may not be. They weren't quite sure. I called up Bard and told them. I said, "What would you do?" This was the president of Bard—I've forgotten his name—because he got involved in all of this. He said, "Speaking personally, as president of Bard, I'd want you to come up here." I said, "Yes, but what would you do if you were me?" He said, "I can't advise you." I accepted Brooklyn College and taught there for three years. It turned out that it was not a tenure track position.

CAC: You were able to teach labor history there or not?

HB: No, no, no. Again, it was the typical city college. It was the world civilization course and, on occasion, when I was a good boy, I was given the U.S. history survey to teach.

CAC: I suspect there's a pay-off down the line with persons like yourself who had to teach in their apprentice years very broadly and didn't rush right into a special kind of course. It gives you a kind of perspective that a lot of us don't have. I had some of this; but, many did not.

HB: Absolutely. You did and many of our colleagues of our generation got that. As a matter of fact, it came in handy at Minnesota because when there happened to be a shortage of someone to teach the third quarter of the European survey in the late 1960s, I was asked if I would do it and I did it. I don't know how successfully but I did it. It came in handy. After three years at Brooklyn College, I accepted a position, reluctantly, at Michigan State University, in the American Thought and Language Department, not in the History Department. That was the only thing that was available at the time.

CAC: That's as close to American Studies as Michigan got.

HB: That's right. I was there for less than three months when I received the invitation to come, and be interviewed here, and kind of fill in in the Social Science Department. It was kind of a transitional thing. I accepted; so, that one year at Michigan State, I bought and sold a house in one year and all that.

CAC: That brought you here in the fall of 1961?

HB: Yes.

CAC: Harold Deutsch was chairman?

HB: Harold Deutsch was chairman and Dan Cooperman was chairman of the Social Sciences.

CAC: You went right into the Social Science program then?

HB: Yes. Half of my course load was in the Social Sciences and half was in History.

CAC: That was by terms of the appointment?

HB: Yes, by terms of the appointment.

CAC: Share some observations (a) about the History Department and (b) about the Social Science program as you came into them in the 1960s.

HB: Let me share these observations by going back to 1956, 1957, when I was in the job market. I first heard of Minnesota then. The placement officer at Columbia University was

Shepherd Clough, overall, and Bill Leuchtenberg was the junior member of the department; therefore, they put him in charge of the market [unclear] placement to help Shepard Clough, who was the senior man. I had an interview with Shepherd Clough and he said to me, "You are teaching part time at City College?" I said, "Yes." He said, "That's very, very good. In fact, we're putting your name forward to City College, Brooklyn College, Queen's College . . . no where else." I said, "Why?" He said, "Your kind can't teach anyplace else."

CAC: Ohhh. As a very junior . . . how do you respond to that on the spot?

HB: I didn't. I just shrugged my shoulders, and walked out, and went across from Fair Weather Hall to Hamilton Hall where Harry Carman, who was then dean of Columbia College, had his office and walked into Harry's office. Harry wasn't there but his secretary, who subsequently became his wife, was there. I started crying. I said, "I didn't do all this in order to get this kind of treatment." She was upset. Wherever Harry was—I subsequently learned that Harry was in Washington, D.C. with his good friend Dwight Eisenhower—she called him in the White House and told him what happened. The next day, I got a call from Harry to come and see him. I went to see Harry and he said, "There are bigots even in our profession. Don't pay too much attention to them. I had the same treatment when I was going through graduate school. The anti-Catholicism kept me out."

CAC: I remember—to comment on that subject . . . sometimes these interviews turn to conversations—even at the enlightened University of Minnesota, there was some question about whether a Roman Catholic could teach the Reformation because it was ours. It wasn't his.

HB: [laughter]

CAC: But having raised the question, I think we thought it was funny and went ahead and hired the Roman Catholic. At least the question was raised. Whose history was that?

HB: I was present at that. The [unclear] aspect of it is very interesting. Again, looking at it at the hiring phenomenon, trying to break in and getting a first job . . .

CAC: This is a time when the job market is not good. There's that slump in the mid 1950s.

HB: The job market is very bad in the mid to late 1950s and it doesn't turn around again until the early 1960s. We were at an AHA [American Historical Association] meeting, I think in Washington, and Bill Leuchtenberg said to me, "I've got a job interview for you." I know I'm rambling here.

CAC: No, that's fine. Sometimes, the best things are rambles.

HB: "Oh, great. Where?" I said. He said, "It's not the greatest place in the world." I said, "Yes? Where?" He said, "It isn't something that I'm proud of either." I said, "Where? Where?

Come on, tell me." He said, "It's William Beadle State College at Madison, South Dakota." I said, "Who?" He said, "William Beadle State College in Madison, South Dakota." I said, "Beggars can't be choosers." He said, "This is the person to contact for your interview. Contact him." I picked up the phone, and called the guy, and got a time and place to meet him at his hotel room, of course. When it comes close to that time, I started wandering up to his hotel room. I got to his hotel room and there's a mob of people there, maybe twenty to thirty. He probably had told everybody to come at the same time. He was going to save time. He opens the door, looks at the crowd, closes the door, a few minutes later opens the door, gets on a chair and starts shouting, "Anybody here who does not have a PH.D. in hand, leave." Half the people leave. "Anybody here who doesn't have a Ph.D. from . . . "—then he starts naming the prestigious universities, Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Wisconsin, Minnesota; he does mention Minnesota. I remember that—"leave." So, another half of the people leave. That still leaves about twelve or thirteen of us left behind. I'm looking at this and apparently what I was thinking was articulated . . .

CAC: [laughter]

HB: . . . I wouldn't be caught dead at William Beadle State College in Madison, South Dakota. I turned around and start leaving. I turned around and five other people are following me. I didn't even stay for the interview.

CAC: He wanted self selections. That was probably another . . . implicitly made him happy.

HB: Yes, of course.

CAC: That's a believable story.

HB: When I got the invitation to come to Minnesota, John Hope Franklin had then left Brooklyn College and was at the University of Chicago. I've forgotten whether it was on the way back from the interview here or some other occasion, I happened to be with John Hope in Chicago and told him, "I'm going to Minnesota." His reaction was the same as Harry Carman's when he heard this. Both of them said, "I don't believe it." I said, "What do you mean?" They said, "That's one of the most bigoted departments in the profession."

CAC: They wouldn't have perceived that to be true of themselves.

HB: No. Harry Carman put it this way, "That is a Judenfreien department except for one man who is a Unitarian."

CAC: That's Larry Steefel.

HB: That's right.

CAC: I was a member of the department then. I can't remember the details of the search at all.

[break in the interview as greetings are exchanged with another person]

CAC: That reputation was well-known but not to you and not to me.

HB: I had no knowledge of it whatsoever. This should be off the record, perhaps.

[break in the interview]

HB: After receiving the invitation to come join the faculty at the University of Minnesota, both Harry Carman and John Hope Franklin, when they heard this, were astonished, largely because they both had the impression that the History Department at the University of Minnesota was a relatively bigoted department and was Judenfreien or without . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

HB: . . . Jews. They were behind the times because, by the time I arrived, there already had been two Jewish members of the department hired, Burt Stein in Indian History and Josef Altholz in English History. In the first years of my being in the department, I did learn why both Harry Carman and John Hope Franklin felt that way. There was a residue of gentile Anti-Semitism and bigotry that still persisted in the department among the old guard. I think that in the 1960s that was overcome.

CAC: That became obsolete, yes. The department I came into had two women; but, I'll tell you, that was by chance circumstance. If they weren't despised, they certainly were thought of as real second-class. Of course, both of them were established scholars, and publishing scholars, and fine teachers; and still there was a certain sense that they weren't quite up to it.

HB: Yes.

CAC: All right. [laughter]

HB: [laughter] This is the social history of the profession as well.

CAC: Right. I think like English departments, history departments were as gentile and patrician as any across the board. Sociology always was a more open profession and open to different points of view. I'm not just talking of race and gender.

HB: When we come into this whole area of the sociology of the profession, the late 1950s, early 1960s were also a time of transition in our profession, a tremendous transition. I was sitting with

Allan Nevins and a few other graduate students when Walter Prescott Webb was giving his presidential address at the American Historical Association. It obviously must have been a New York meeting of the AHA because, as a graduate student, I couldn't afford to go anyplace else. I subsequently checked back on his presidential address to see whether my impressions were correct or not—they were. Among the themes in his presidential address was the inability of non-white Anglo-Saxon protestant persons having a sense of American history.

CAC: Twenty years later, Carl Bridenbaugh would say a similar thing as a president.

HB: Right.

CAC: It was not as cheerfully received that time.

HB: I was sitting . . . and it was Allan Nevins who was uncomfortably shifting his weight in his chair as he heard this. He kept looking at me and he said, "Oh, fuck!" In effect, Allan Nevins said that he was read out of the profession, too, because he wasn't a Ph.D. He was a newspaper man. Nobody paid any attention to him.

CAC: He's a real maverick.

HB: Of course. He said, "Don't pay any attention to that. Don't pay any attention to that. Those guys don't even think that immigrants deserve any attention whatsoever."

CAC: Allan Nevins would not have had the same openness to women, for example? He would think in terms of class and of national backgrounds.

HB: Absolutely. As a matter of fact, I don't recall any women in Allan Nevins's seminar or in Harry Carman's seminar.

CAC: The women come into graduate school in the 1960s in large numbers.

HB: Although, there were women in Salo Baron's seminar . . . a couple of women who went on to more or less distinguished careers in Jewish history.

CAC: Part of that is the G.I. Bill. After all, the G.I.s were 98 percent male.

HB: Yes.

CAC: So, the opening was really by class and national background.

HB: Exactly, and the women, of course, who were in that same ethnic background were marrying these graduate students and supporting them through graduate school by working full time—in addition to the G.I. Bill—or having children. They were not moving into the academic

world at the time, not because they weren't capable of doing it, because they didn't think it was the thing to do.

CAC: Well! . . . [laughter]

HB: [laughter]

CAC: How about the Social Science program as you came into it? [laughter]

HB: I came into it at a time of really confusing and almost debilitating transition. In 1961 when I came into the Social Science program, Dan Cooperman was chairing it. It, probably at that point, had just about lost everyone of its tenured faculty members. The only tenured core person in the program that remained was Mordecai Roshwald in contrast to the Humanities program which had a fairly large cadre of tenured faculty.

CAC: [Mulford] Sibley was still there and he was one of the founders.

HB: The thing is that what the Social Science program was doing then was essentially what we have, under Fred Lukermann, decided to do in terms of our Ethnic Studies programs. Tenure people in line disciplinary departments . . .

CAC: I see. You're talking about core appointments?

HB: Right.

CAC: Core appointments were gone. Ben Nelson . . .

HB: Ben Nelson was gone. He was at Stony Brook [State University]. They were all gone except for Mordecai.

CAC: [Andreas George] Papandreou?

HB: Papandreou was off fighting the revolution, trying to get back into power. Although, they left before I came, Nelson and Papandreou . . .

CAC: [unclear] was staffed by people who really had their core appointments in a line department?

HB: Exactly. This was a transitional kind of period, the 1961 to about 1968 period. In that transitional period, I taught, in the Social Science program, maybe one course or two courses a year; but, most of my teaching responsibility was in the History Department. The first year, it was half and half; but, after that it evened out. I found the Social Science program, when I first came into it, both an exciting and a depressing place. It was exciting in the concept. I thought

it was a good concept, the interdisciplinary concept. The execution was horrible. It was done largely by untrained graduate students who were taken on to support their graduate work, who were as interested in developing a course as one would expect. The graduate student is busy trying to complete his own or her own—mostly then it was his—graduate work. The idea was great. The execution was awful. Right from the start, I was very unhappy with the Social Science programs, not its reason for being but the means in which it was being carried out. Consequently, in the mid 1960s, [E.W.] "Easy" Ziebarth appointed a blue ribbon committee to look into the whole interdisciplinary program approach. Mainly, it was triggered by—it's my understanding; I haven't spoken to "Easy"—crises in the Humanities program. I can't tell you exactly what the crises were; but, they're ongoing crises. The Social Science program was well thought of by the college administration, by the blue ribbon committee, and all that. I was asked to serve on this committee that was chaired by Don Smith. Harold Deutsch was a member of the committee, the only historian on the committee. It was a fairly high-powered committee. The deliberations of that committee led, in fact, to the dissolution of the Social Science program; although, it was designed really to dissolve the Humanities program.

CAC: Historians are used to irony; but, how does that work out? What happened?

HB: I suspect it worked out in this way. The Social Science program was doing a good job in what it was doing but, perhaps, it shouldn't be doing what it was doing. In other words, Social Science I, II, and III are fine courses that were developed in the late 1940s and early 1950s and, perhaps, should be revamped, and, perhaps, should be changed somewhat. But this isn't the problem. The problem is the Humanities. They were a bunch of crazy nuts running around screwing things up, not doing things right. We've got to solve that problem. That is the real problem. However, pragmatically, the Humanities program had half a dozen tenured faculty members in the core.

CAC: I see.

HB: Social Science had one. By then, Dan had already gone on to the Sociology Department.

CAC: So, Roshwald was the only one left.

HB: Yes. Consequently, it was decided not so much to do away with the Social Science program but to revamp it, restructure it. This is the last I heard of it because I went off to Berkeley to be a visitor at Berkeley for the year 1967-1968. That was the year in which the committee report is finally drafted, I think. I wasn't on the committee at the time because I was on leave. The year I was in Berkeley was, of course, a traumatic year in Berkeley . . . in academia generally; but, in Berkeley it was really a crisis year. To offer a seminar in labor and radical history in Berkeley in 1967-1968 was an experience, a magnificent experience. The historiographical debates turned into discussions of daily tactics. I had trouble bringing it back to meaningful historical things. [laughter]

CAC: I was there in 1961-1962 to take [Richard] Drinnon's place in Twentieth Century U.S. History and early in the year, I made the mistake of passing off not a very funny witticism. I remember I was in the men's room with somebody and made jocular reference to my cousin Whittaker [Chambers] who was, of course, not a cousin at all and everybody would have known that; but it was in the context of some kind of discussion about these kinds of political affairs. In the stall in the men's room, there was a graduate student who sold the news to Herb Caen for fifty dollars that the University of California had teaching Twentieth Century History a cousin of Whittaker Chambers and he printed it.

HB: [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] It created a great scandal on campus, I'll tell you. Here, I was just an innocent visitor. That involved provosts and everybody else calling up Herb Caen and he made a very nice retraction; but, my god . . . !

HB: Herb Caen is also known as a humorist. [laughter]

CAC: Berkeley had its trouble for a longtime.

HB: In 1967-1968 when I was there, I was inadvertently involved in one of the protests of the provosts against the radicals. I was returning from lunch, going back to Dwinell Hall from Telegraph Avenue, I think, and I ran into a group of pickets of one kind or another. Pete Camayo, the Trotskyist leader, who later ran for president for the Socialist Worker Party, was there. He pointed at me and he said, "There's a police spy." Me . . . a police spy? Then, they started coming at me until one of the protestors starts yelling, "No, it's Professor Berman. He teaches labor history. He's one of us."

CAC: [laughter]

HB: They were starting to pummel me. I was able to get out. At the next meeting of the faculty senate, the chancellor of Berkeley used that as an illustration of how visiting professors get pummelled, and how we must get back to a system of order, and so on.

CAC: Ah, for the ivory tower.

HB: Yes. I was sitting there saying, "It was a mistaken identity." [laughter] I was at Berkeley that year when a phone call came from Lloyd Lofquist who was then associate dean. There was a search committee that consisted of Cooperman, himself, Paul Murphy, Frank Sorauf, and May Brodbeck . . . five. They unanimously asked if I would take over the direction of the Social Science program. I said, "What Social Science program?" Lloyd said, "You're right . . . what Social Science program. It can be anything you want to make of it within the framework of interdisciplinary social sciences." I said, "Let me think about it." To take over a program that is non-existent is really . . . thank you for the honor; but, what's the honor? That evening, I got

a phone call from "Easy." Lloyd apparently told him my reaction, that to take over a shell that's about to disintegrate is not something I'd like to do. So, "Easy" said, "There are many opportunities, many things you can do. You'll have my backing." I said, "I don't know what I want to do." He said, "Why don't you think about it?" A few days later, Stuart Hoyt and Maureen [Mrs. Stuart Hoyt] were in the Berkeley area for some reason.

CAC: He was, by then, chairman?

HB: Yes. They stayed with us and Stuart said, "I come partially with a mission from 'Easy' to convince you to take it on." I told him, "Look! I have nothing philosophically opposed to taking it on but take on what . . . for what purpose? If it were an ongoing program that needed leadership and direction, yes; but, it's a shell of nothing." Stuart said, "That means you can make something out of it." It was during that next few months—because I didn't agree to do it for a couple of months—that I saw the Berkeley experimental programs in operation. I worked with some of the innovators at Berkeley and saw what they were doing.

[break in interview as Hyman's daughter, Ruth, arrives to speak with him]

CAC: Let me interpose to make one observation for the record. I don't think that many colleges or universities would put together a blue ribbon committee such as Sorauf, and Brodbeck, and Lofquist, and Cooperman to do this. They're towering figures in their field at that time.

HB: Right.

CAC: That's, I think, one of the encouragements for these kinds of programs you're talking about.

HB: Exactly.

CAC: I've touched base with this a hundred times. You're really working with first-class people.

HB: Yes, absolutely. That, of course, was the reason that I finally succumbed to the siren songs and agreed to do it. I did agree to do it with the understanding that the basic I, II, III was phased out and that what we would make of it would be innovative programs in the Social Sciences that could, in fact, be phased out because they are failures or become integrated into the curriculum if they're successes. That was the idea. Remember . . . put it in the time frame. This is a time of massive upheaval in the halls of academia, massive upheaval in the nation itself. This is a period of radical if not revolutionary reevaluation of the role of higher education in our society. Perhaps, it was too frantic and frenetic a period—I agree it was—but, it called for some sense of experimentation and renewal. This is what, at least, the Social Science program was attempting, under my direction, to carry out. How successfully, I don't know.

CAC: They kept a Social Science rubric even though really you were into a much broader experimental kind of program?

HB: Yes.

CAC: That's interesting.

HB: We had an advisory committee, again, a very powerful advisory committee. It consisted of these very same people who were on the search committee, Frank, May, Paul, Lloyd, Dan Cooperman, and periodically expanded to include Roger Page and people like that.

CAC: But, rarely anyone from Economics—I'm thinking of the great departments—or Geography? You're talking about Sociology, Political Science . . .

HB: History, Philosophy. Economics . . . on occasion there would be someone there.

CAC: We kind of think of Economics as one of the queens of the Social Sciences.

HB: Right, but they were off on their own at that time and have continued to be off on their own. There was very little interaction with the Economics Department for whatever reason. I won't speculate as to the reason. On occasion, there would be Ed Coen, or Harlan Smith, or people like that. Even Walter Heller, on occasion, would cooperate on one thing or another and Leo[nid] Hurwicz certainly but not very actively. As a department? No. It was a misnomer because not only did the Social Science program have people from outside the Social Science division, we had people from the College of Agriculture, from Business Administration, from the Institute of Technology creating new courses and new approaches. Some of them were crazy, the touchy-feely kind of syndrome we were in at that time. But, we try everything. If 5 percent would work, and be integrated into the curriculum, and become successful, that would be a good track record. No one would agree with me that 5 percent is a good track record. They'd look at the 95 percent that didn't and say, "It's a waste of time, waste of money. No." It wasn't a waste of money because most everybody was doing it as overload. It was the cheapest program we ever had.

CAC: It gave persons who wanted to design new things a real chance to initiate them . . .

HB: Exactly.

CAC: . . . in that context, 1969, 1970.

HB: The only cost of the program was a quarter time or half time, depending on certain circumstances, and a secretary.

CAC: Were the courses related to Southeast Asia incorporated here or was that elsewhere?

HB: That's correct. That was here. In fact, if you look at the evolution of new courses, new curriculum, new departments, new programs, from 1968 to 1974, a period of six years, everyone of them, including Ethnic Studies, Urban Studies, Criminal Justice—some failed, some succeeded—all came through the so-called Social Science program.

CAC: Would this include American Indian and Chicano?

HB: It included American Indian, Chicano . . .

CAC: Women's?

HB: Women's. It started with the black. This was the instrument that was used in the College of Liberal Arts.

CAC: What relationship then did you have with the various programs in University College?

HB: Also very close. We were tied in with the University College. We worked together with them on the development of the whole University Without Walls concept. We worked together with them on the crises courses that developed during the upheavals of 1970 and 1972.

CAC: The Living Learning Center?

HB: The Living Learning Center, right.

CAC: How about the Experimental College, itself? I have a feeling that they were perhaps more . . .

HB: No, the Experimental College was way off in left field, right field . . . I don't know which field. We tried to work with them; but, we discovered that the Experimental College was just a kind of radical politicization of certain needs of certain faculty and students and we could not really work out any kind of meaningful relationship. We would insist always on some kind of academic standards. This made us persona non grata with the Experimental College people.

CAC: Were you on loan half time? Did you have relief from teaching for this?

HB: Theoretically, it was a half time position; therefore, I was relieved from half of my teaching load in the History Department. It didn't work out that way. I'd say on the average, I taught maybe one course—we were then on a three-course load— . . .

CAC: Yes, I remember.

HB: . . . and I'd be excused from one course. I'd really be functionally excused from one-third, not one half.

CAC: That's an interesting comment because I'm guessing that it is true of other people cooperating in the program. You said they were mostly on overload and my guess is that an awful lot of the experimentation took place, as you're saying, for nothing or for very modest sums for backup TAs.

HB: Backup TAs. We were able to get some funds through the Educational Development Fund funnelled to innovation; but primarily, it was done as overload, as labors of love by members of the faculty that were interested in change and innovation. In the short run, I think it served a very important safety valve function. In the long run, I think it led to some modest curricular innovations.

CAC: I wish there were some way to trace that—to make it a conversation again for the moment. I have a sense that what went on from 1968 to 1974 influenced not only the substance of the curriculum—I think you're right that things start there and then they spin off—but, I think it made a difference in style of teaching, pedagogy if you wish. It certainly made a difference to me. I taught differently in the 1970s than in the early 1960s . . .

HB: Same here.

CAC: . . . in part because of this.

HB: Yes, yes.

CAC: It was a much more participatory model.

HB: Much more.

CAC: But, in the histories that are written—now I'm speaking to historians who may down the line listen to this—that's going to be missed and neglected . . . that you look at the formal substance of what courses were started; but, the style that was going on is much more difficult to capture or remember.

HB: I agree with you entirely. Earlier in the conversation we've had, I was kind of laughing at the touchy-feely approach; but, it certainly had an impact. There's no doubt about it. The kind of personalization of instruction, the participation of students in the instruction, the, except for very large classes, need to pull in students in the conversation, the break down of the lecture method . . .

CAC: I don't know when it was—I wish I did know—I had a crazy student . . . not literally; he just was eccentric . . . who would come to class. It happened to be in American Studies. He wasn't going to accept anything that anybody said that didn't make sense to him. He would sit

up on the back of his chair and he would point his finger at a fellow student and sometimes at me and he'd say, "Zap!"

HB: [laughter]

CAC: The first time it happened I thought, oh my god! what have I gotten myself into. I'd say, "What do you mean by that?" He'd say, "That isn't helping the discussion any and I'll tell you why." It helped turn around the class. They got excited. A lot of them didn't like this kid causing trouble; but, by gosh! by the end of the quarter, there was more participation going on than before. I'm sure lots of us have had that . . .

HB: You're right, this is something that can't be documented. I think the styles of teaching changed and changed tremendously. We did team teaching in the Social Science program. We did small group seminars and small group discussions. One of the first things we did with the black revolution breaking out locally, the north side riots and so on, was we pulled together black and white practitioners of social harmony and we put together kind of a human relations course that was open to . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

HB: . . . people from the School of Social Work, people from the community. Gisela Konopka was, of course, very, very actively involved in this. It was my introduction really to black Minnesotans. I had never really had any contact with these people before. It was through that course that we had team instructors like Josie Johnson and Bill Wilson and . . .

CAC: Earl Craig?

HB: . . . Earl Craig—he was then a graduate student; but, he was pulled into this—and Ron Edwards.

CAC: This is before the Department of Afro-American Studies?

HB: This is 1968, 1969. It is the first year that I'm directing the program and it's the first effort at doing something outside of the ordinary on the question of race relations in response to the Civil Rights people and the black revolution.

CAC: I taught one of the those things. It met at night in different departments.

HB: You were involved in it.

CAC: Very modestly.

HB: A number of historians were involved in it. Allen Spear was involved.

CAC: Much more so than I. I just think it would be fun, if you have records from that program, to see the number of persons and the variety who did one course or more.

HB: Oh, it was quite a few. I don't have the records, of course, because they were all turned over, when the program was liquidated, to the archives; so, I hope that they are somewhere there.

CAC: I remember one course I had. It started out black and then the students said, "What about Indians?" In the middle, the third or fourth week, it became another course.

HB: Exactly.

CAC: Wow.

HB: The kind of flexibility . . . it was only a two-credit course, if I remember correctly. Who cares what the credits were? It was really a fascinating thing. It was in the midst of this that the pressures for a black studies department came upon us; and I got involved in it largely because of the human relations course and also because of the fact that a group of us were trying to put together a kind of interdisciplinary graduate program in comparative ethnic studies.

CAC: Oh, my.

HB: This is one of the things that Rudy, and I, and a few others . . .

CAC: That's Rudy Vecoli.

HB: Yes . . . Rudy Vecoli, and Harvey Sarles in Anthropology, and Fred Lukermann. We were very much interested in doing it. We thought this was the next direction . . . even on the graduate level, there would be research opportunities, and training, and so on. It should be an interdisciplinary matter. There was nothing in the Social Science, so-called, new directions that precluded working on the graduate level. It was for this reason that the Graduate School dean, Dean [Bryce] Crawford, agreed, at my suggestion, to appoint this committee to look into. It was in the midst of our deliberations—discussions more than deliberations because I don't think we got very far in deliberations—that the black students demanded, and rightly, they should have demanded, some kind of curriculum access. What they wanted, of course, was a black studies department, which was part of the national pressures going on at the same time. Cornell was exploding at that time, and Berkeley, and other places. Whenever they came to the powers that be, that is to say to the dean or to the president, the dean or the president would always say, "We have a committee working on it. Professor Berman, the chairman of the committee, is working on it." That kind of satisfied them for awhile till Rosemary Freeman . . . do you remember her?

CAC: Oh, my, yes.

HB: Rosemary Freeman finally decided to find out what the hell this committee is all about. She came to me, and she asked me, and I told her that it was a committee to look into the development of a graduate program in comparative racial and ethnic studies. She made that famous remark—I thought a famous remark—"We ain't interested in comparing nuttin' with nuttin'." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

HB: Horace Huntley and . . .

CAC: Anna Stanley?

HB: . . . Anna Stanley and some of the other black students all decided that confrontation was necessary to get anything done. Obviously, I'm not the person to confront because I didn't have the power; so, they went, and sat-in, and confronted Mr. [Malcolm] Moos. It was then his second year, I think, as president of the university.

CAC: Oh, more than that. He came in 1967.

HB: This was December of 1968 and January of 1969; so, it was his second year.

CAC: Okay.

HB: It was the first year that I was with the Social Science program. I'm sitting in the office down on the second floor of the Social Science building one day and the phone rings, "Get over to the president's office immediately. Drop everything and come over to the president's office." I got over to the president's office and I see chaos. The students are—black, white, mostly black but some white—surrounding Moos. "We demand black studies now," etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. Moos said, "Oh, here's Professor Berman. He will tell us exactly what is going on." What the hell am I getting myself into here? [laughter] Anna Stanley, Rosemary Freeman, Horace Huntley said, "We've already spoken to him!" Moos said, "Let's listen." I said, "We, as a committee, are close to making a report recommending the establishment of . . . " etcetera, etcetera, etcetera. "That isn't what we want," they said.

CAC: [unclear] focus there was still on the graduate comparative?

HB: Oh, yes.

CAC: So, there were two things they didn't like, one was comparative and one was graduate.

HB: Then Moos said, "Hear Professor Berman out. Why graduate?" I thought I'd try to be rational. I said, "Look, a black studies department is a desirable outcome down the road a piece. We have no pool of academic talent to mount such a department. The focus on graduate

education is really the way to go because then we will get a pool of talent to move into one." That made no impression, obviously. I thought it was rational. They thought it was rationalization. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

HB: The outcome, as you know, was that they were dissatisfied and they sat-in in Morrill Hall. They occupied the building, closed it, and Moos left. Since I was the last one they spoke to, Moos asked that Don Smith, and I, and the Student Affairs people act as a team to negotiate with the black . . . Earl Craig . . . Mahmoud El-Kati [Milt Williams] was with them, the person we were negotiating with. We spent a good deal of time negotiating with them. The outcome, of course, was that we agreed to appoint a committee to look into the establishment of a black studies department—although, if you look at the agreement, you'll see that the department was left vague . . . program, department. The occupation was an occupation that lasted for a day and a half, almost two days, I think. We were, all of us, over there for that whole forty-eight hour period on an off. I snuck out, and came here to get a little sleep, and then get back there. We hammered out an agreement . . . thought we hammered out an agreement. Don Smith said he was going over to Eastcliff to present it to the president for his approval. I shouldn't say anything negative about Mr. Moos; but, I guess for the record . . . Don Smith came back after speaking to Moos and said, "I can't get a word out of the man. He's dead drunk. We'll have to assume we have his approval." I said, "Assume? We know we have his approval if he's dead drunk. We'll tell him that if he doesn't like it, that he gave us his approval when he was drunk."

CAC: [laughter]

HB: The siege is over. One minor incident in the siege that I think should be mentioned at least is the media coverage. I saw one thing there that I've been using in discussions with media people ever since . . . how the media sometimes manipulates the news. The impression that the Twin Cities received or, for that matter, that the nation received of the black occupation of Morrill Hall was that it was chaotic and destructive. It was not. It was chaotic but not destructive. Why did they get the impression that it was destructive? A television news team from one of the local television networks . . . a news reporter, who later went on to become a state official, Sherry Chenoweth, didn't like the visuals they were getting so they came into the basement of Morrill Hall, and started taking things off desks, and throwing them all over the place, and taking pictures of it. I happened to pass by when it happened and I just was [unclear]. I shouted at them, "Get the fuck out of here." Nonetheless, that evening on the news came this picture of this massive destruction. It turns out that afterwards when they totaled up the damage, it came to under $10,000. I'm not condoning $10,000 worth of damage; but, I'm wondering how much of that $10,000 worth of damage was done by the television news teams and how much by the students. The occupation ended with this agreement and a committee was formed to look into the establishment of the black studies program, department, whatever. The Social Science program cooperated with them in every sense of the word and the end result was the

establishment of the department. Similarly, when the pressures came on for Indian studies and for Chicano studies, it was all done again through the Social Science program.

CAC: But, without the same trauma?

HB: Without the same trauma. We staffed it. The secretary we had in the program was the secretary for all of these things. It was through the associate dean's office and my office that we were able to work out the arrangements. There was one other sit-in that I think should be mentioned and that's the sit-in in the 232 Social Science building when Roy Roybal and the Chicano activists felt that we were dragging our heels, not going fast enough in the establishment of the Chicano studies program, department. They came to my office because I was chairing the subcommittee that was looking into that and they demanded rapid action. I must say that I told them that they were getting as fast action as they possibly can. If they wanted to turn the committee over to someone else, I'd be very happy to relinquish the chair and even the membership in it. They said, "No, that isn't what we want. What we want is immediate decision." I said, "Wheels at the university don't go that quickly. The last few years, things have gone very, very quickly at the university, much more quickly than ever before; but, nonetheless, you have to be patient." They refused to be patient; and they won because the next day the college did, in fact, have an emergency meeting of the assembly.

CAC: The black students were there to picket along with the Chicanos.

HB: Right. My cautionary view . . . we've got to go at this in a normal manner and strengthen the Chicano studies program once it's established. They wouldn't buy that. I suspect that one of the reasons that Chicano Studies is in trouble—as Indian Studies is in trouble . . . as Black Studies is in trouble—is that that gestation period that was necessary for maturing the development of these programs just didn't take place.

CAC: In the meantime, you also have on your staff a former unsuccessful candidate for the presidency.

HB: That's correct. That was another very fascinating, fascinating development. Again, it starts in Berkeley. All these things start in Berkeley . . . not everything starts in Berkeley. While I was deciding whether to accept the invitation to take on what everyone was telling me at Berkeley was a thankless task—it turned out to be an exciting but nonetheless thankless task—the presidential campaign of 1968 was raging. In the midst of it, after the disastrous Democratic convention in Chicago, my friend Arthur Naftalin came through Berkeley and asked me if I would assist the vice-president in the election campaign of 1968. I threw up my hands and said, "I'm backing Gene McCarthy and I'm in the anti-war movement and you want we back a warmonger?" Art said, "Take it easy. Take it easy. Don't get excited. I know you've been infected by the Berkeley bug. Just think about it for awhile. Do you want Nixon?" I thought about it for awhile and then Art said, "Look, when you get back to Minnesota,, there will still

be plenty . . . " I taught the summer session there as well as the regular session; so, I got back to Minnesota at the end of August or the beginning of September of 1968.

CAC: You were in California when Bobby Kennedy was assassinated there?

HB: Yes, yes. Yes. I was in California during the primary campaign. I happened to be in New York at the time of Bobby Kennedy's assassination because Rudy Vecoli and I were invited to advise the American Jewish Committee in the establishment of an ethnic studies oral history center, which never did occur; so, we happened to be in New York at the time. When I got back to Minnesota, Art put me in touch with Hubert [Humphrey]. I'd known Hubert before but never really on a kind of a face to face basis.

CAC: I think everybody in Minnesota thought they knew Hubert.

HB: Yes—I didn't know him. After a half hour or an hour of conversation with him, I came away with the impression that I'd better back this man or feel sorry for the rest of my life despite our obvious differences on Vietnam and so on. I agreed to Art's request and I supported him. I lost a lot of my friends because of it. One of the byproducts of that is that John Haynes was then my graduate student, and Hubert needed a good staffer, and I put John on the Wendy Anderson directed state campaign, which gave him another career so to speak. In the middle of the campaign, it dawned upon me that Hubert may not win. On the contrary, it looked like the thing was going to be disaster; but, Hubert made it very close, we all know. I said, "What can we do? What would be a good thing to do?" I started speaking to May Brodbeck and to Frank Sorauf who were members of the Advisory Committee of the Social Science program. "Wouldn't it be a good idea," I said, "if Hubert loses, to invite him to join, somehow or other, the faculty and either develop his own course or be a resource person for people in Political Science, History, etc. . . . at least give him a chance to both politically decompress and give us the opportunity to benefit from his experience?" Frank was very, very unhappy with that kind of suggestion. May was fairly happy. Paul Murphy was on the Advisory Committee then, too, and he thought it was a good idea. I got the approval in the Advisory Committee . . .

CAC: Frank was chairing Political Science so they knew that he might end up there.

HB: That's right. Frank changed his mind very quickly after the election and he joined with the majority, in fact, made it unanimous that we invite Hubert to the Social Science program.

CAC: Not as a member of his department?

HB: Subsequently, I learned the reason for it. I think that's exactly the reason for it—unknown to us, of course. There were other negotiations going on after the election. Subsequent to that, I learned from Hubert himself and from others that there had been conversations between Moos and Humphrey, between [Lester] Malkerson and Humphrey. Frankly, these conversation were kind of cart before the horse conversations. They were conversations on the upper level without

any faculty input, which was a violation of our procedures right and left. I can understand why Frank and the Political Science Department were upset with that. There was no reason for them to do that since we were going through faculty consultation procedures. The Social Science program did, in fact, invite Hubert Humphrey to be a member of the faculty. When Moos heard this, obviously, he was very happy. He'd been rescued—but, of course, this was not done for the purpose of rescuing Moos. This was a plan that had been worked out before and was just coming to fruition at this point. Hubert Humphrey agreed, as you know, to join the faculty and he became and a member of the Social Science program. For the rest of his life, he called me his boss.

CAC: [laughter]

HB: A touching moment . . . a couple of days before he died, I got a phone call from him here. I wanted to go out to Waverly and visit with him. I just couldn't bring myself to. Remembering him as the vigorous man . . . A touching moment . . . the phone rang and I picked it up. It was Hubert's voice, weak. He said, "Hi, boss. I just wanted to check with you. How are things going?"

CAC: We know now that he was doing that all around the country.

HB: [whispered] That's right.

CAC: Jackson talked about that during his campaign, that he [unclear] to say, "Goodbye." He said "Goodbye" to all kinds of people.

HB: He went through his list. He had his address list.

CAC: It's remarkable.

HB: When Hubert Humphrey came onto the faculty, I lost even more friends than I lost when I announced I was supporting him for the presidency of the United States.

CAC: I should interpose for the record that Mr. Berman has lost very few friends.

HB: [laughter] They were temporary losses . . . temporary, I must admit, yes. Some, like my colleague and good friend—still very good friend—Allan Spear, just accused me of giving me a platform to a war criminal; but, it didn't prevent Allan Spear from being the first to request the services of Hubert Humphrey in his classroom . . . a fascinating kind of byplay. By the way, I pointed that out to him. I wasn't about to let that pass. [laughter] A number of people resigned from the Thirty-Niner's Dining Club after I invited Hubert to come as my guest.

CAC: Oh, heavens.

HB: The very fact that we would break bread with a war criminal, etcetera, etcetera. Some of them came back. His talk was fascinating at the Thirty-Niner's. He and Allan went at it. Allan was a member of the Dining Club then at the time. It was fascinating.

The first day that Hubert came up to the Social Sciences building, he came with the secret service, of course. We arranged to have an office for him. One of the interior design people at the university—I don't know what office building, [unclear] or whatever—asked Norman Sherman, "What style of furniture does Hubert want?" Norman replied, "South Dakota Renaissance." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] You had to have an office that he could get out of [unclear]?

HB: That's correct. We were on the second floor; so, it wasn't that bad a thing. It was a corner office and the secret service was very upset that it was a corner office. The exit route was very, very limited . . . the narrow corridors in the Social Science building.

CAC: It's a terrible building.

HB: Yes, it's a horrible building. To get out of his office and to the stairwell . . . he just couldn't do it if there was a confrontation. The secret service decided that the best way of handling that eventual emergency, if it ever came to that, was to get a rope ladder to get out of the window.

CAC: Those tiny little windows?

HB: I ordered a rope ladder using the limited supply budget that we had. I got a rope ladder.

CAC: [laughter]

HB: I don't know where it is. Then, we discovered that Hubert couldn't get through that window. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

HB: It was fascinating.

[break in the interview]

HB: All in all, I think that the vice-president's presence on campus was relatively successful. He was well utilized in classes the first quarter or so. Then, he developed his own courses. He taught a course in government and public policy on the undergraduate level. The enrollments had to be screened. They had some prerequisites and things of that nature. It wasn't just any ordinary student who could get in. Some people who took those courses are now prominent in

political life like Keith Ford, who was an alderman and now is a staffer in Perpich's Administration, and Jim Johnson, who is now running the [Walter] Mondale campaign . . .

CAC: Heavens.

HB: . . . and Tom Triplett, who is the director of planning for the Perpich Administration. These are just some of the people that come to mind. This was before there was a Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs. This was with an undergraduate rather than the graduate focus at Hubert Humphrey Institute. It was a fairly successful course. In the second year of his stay with us in the program, he became increasingly active politically; that is to say, he began . . .

CAC: [unclear] for the senatorship again?

HB: Right . . . asserting his prerogatives as national leader of the Democratic Party. It was just at this time that he had ongoing commitments to meet the classes. It was fascinating to see how he was able to juggle these things and handle it.

CAC: In the meantime, he had a sometime appointment at Macalester also?

HB: Yes, he was teaching a course at Macalester as well. Periodically, people would knock on my door, and I'd open the door, and there would be Birch Bayh, or Scoop Jackson, or Hy Bookbinder . . .

CAC: [laughter]

HB: . . . Pat Horwitz, the commentator. Unannounced, unheralded, they'd knock on my door and say, "I'm here to take Hubert's place today."

CAC: I see. How gorgeous. I never knew that.

HB: He <u>always</u> made sure that someone covered his class when he was out. It wasn't just anybody. It was a Who's Who of political performers . . . let's put it that way. He was calling in his IOUs I'm sure. It was fascinating for me to meet these people. Roscoe Drummond . . . do you remember him?

CAC: Sure.

HB: The *old* man, not the son . . . he was practically close to ninety. He came toddling in, "I'm here to take Hubert's class." I said, "Do you need some help?" He said, "No!." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

HB: This is how he handled it . . . very responsibly, very responsibly. We got to be good friends. He was here in the house many times and I was over to his house many times. The only really strained moment came when Hubert discovered that the Political Science Department had vetoed his appointment to the university. He asked me, after he learned this, "Is it true?" Obviously, at that point I couldn't say it was not true; so, I had to confirm it. He started getting angry with me. He said, "Why didn't you tell me?" I said, "Why should I tell you? What you don't know, don't hurt you." He said, "But, you should be honest with me. You should have told me." I said, "What difference would it have made?" He said, "I wouldn't have been so friendly with those S.O.B.s." He said, "I feel like a fool." I said, "I wouldn't pay much attention to it. There are academic standards that they insist upon and even though you are not going to teach graduate programs there and professional political science things, they still feel that someone without a Ph.D. should not teach in their department. That's their prerogative. They have the right to do that. I think they're full of shit but that's their prerogative. Don't get angry. Don't get upset. It's nothing against you. Any A.B.D. would be put in that position." He said, "What's an A.B.D.?" I said, "All But Dissertation. Isn't that your status?"

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

HB: He said, "Yes."

CAC: Criminal Justice Studies was part of this, too?

HB: Yes. Criminal Justice Studies was part of it as well. In the process of being kind of a midwife, so to speak, to these various ethnic programs and departments, I insisted, always, that the committees follow meticulously the procedural niceties . . . always the faculty participation and recommendations going according to the bylaws of the college and the university. All of a sudden, I was sitting in a Social Science curriculum committee, whatever it's called, and we get from on top, a proposal to rubber stamp the creation of a Criminal Justice Studies Department. I felt that this was just a slap in the face of everything that I'd been advocating to the student activists and to the faculty activists. Why should something come from above and get automatic and quick approval when . . . ?

CAC: You say from above . . . who really was initiating that then? Where did it come from?

HB: It came from the vice-president's office.

CAC: Mr. [Gerry] Shepherd's office?

HB: I don't know who.

CAC: What was their interest?

HB: There was some LEAA [Law Enforcement Assistance Administration] money, Federal Department of Justice money. This was, of course, a time of law and order concern, the first years of the Nixon Administration. There was professionalization of the police, considered a major objective, not a bad objective. There was this money, not money coming in for blacks, or for Indians, or for Chicanos, or anything like that; but, there's money, money, money, money. Therefore, they got together . . . Dave Ward of Sociology, Hal Chase, with some police types and came up with this . . .

CAC: Did Law School have any contribution to that?

HB: There may have been a Law School person involved in it; but, it didn't go through any of the normal committee procedures that we followed at that time in the college. It came before us in the Divisional Council. We had that kind of a procedure then. It didn't even go through the Curriculum Committee. It went directly to the Divisional Council. Lloyd is associate dean at the time and he brings it before us. I said, "This smells to high heaven." Everybody in the Divisional Council meeting always looked to me as being the person who's going to move for the adoption of a new program and here's a new program and they turn to me. I said, "This smells to high heaven. I have not seen any committee structure, committee organization, that brought this proposal into being. It comes down from above. I've been advising those who are desirous of having new programs and new departments to go through the process." Stuart Hoyt was a History Department member in the Divisional Council and he didn't know anything about it. He obviously felt that the position I was taking was a moral one and he started pushing, too. The Divisional Council rejected Criminal Justice Studies. Then, they started scrounging around and fighting around . . . created a committee . . . the normal process. Of course, since I raised the noise, I was made chairman of the committee. Then, it was learned that there were others in opposition to Criminal Justice Studies from the radicals. We held hearings. There was an incident with a television crew.

CAC: I don't know that.

HB: Don Kladstrup, who is now ABC correspondent in Europe, was then the WCCO-TV reporter. He asked for permission to televise our committee hearings. I told him that he can bring his crew but I can't give him permission or not. That's a committee prerogative. This is before the open meeting law. The first thing I did was ask the committee members, "Do you wish to have the television cameras here?" They decided, by a vote of four to two, not to have the television cameras. It was my duty to tell Don Kladstrup and the crew to get the hell out. They refused. I insisted. I threatened to call for the university cops. I said, "I'm powerless in light of the committee action to do anything but to ask you to leave or to adjourn the committee meeting and hold it at another time and place where you will not be informed." All of this was televised. It was all on film. That night Channel Four had that . . . my fight with Don Kladstrup. Dave Moore read the copy, "Professor Berman threw Don Kladstrup out." I didn't throw him out. There was no physical pressure used. I called up Dave and I said, "You're putting me in a bad position putting it that way." He said, "I know but . . . so what? Who

knows the difference?" [laughter] The committee's deliberations did, in fact, result in the creation of the Criminal Justice Studies Department. My opposition was not to the creation of the department but to the procedures used in the creation of the department.

CAC: I understand.

HB: Once it went through the process, I had no objections to it.

CAC: Your mentioning procedures puts me in mind of what was going on in a number of departments, including History, in the late 1960s, early 1970s. Along these lines of changing basic procedures, as a colleague, I know that you were active as well as others in that. Do you want to comment briefly about that?

HB: Yes. Let's start with the result rather than the process. Your colleague and mine, our good friend Dave Noble, makes a perceptive remark about the lost generation. He claims that he is the true embodiment of the lost generation. When he was a child, all the best on the table went to the father. When he was a father, all the best on the table to the children.

CAC: [laughter]

HB: When he was an assistant professor, all the decisions were made by the full professors. Now, that he's a full professor, all the decisions are made by the assistant professors. I think that's in microcosm, the reform that took place in our department in the late 1960s, early 1970s. [laughter]

CAC: You and I came into a patriarchal . . . we were talking about it earlier.

HB: Yes, yes. We came into the patriarchal or the gerentocratic model of faculty governance in our department. The decision were made by a handful of full professors who kept entrée into their closed circle pretty well-restricted through various means and devices. The American historian in that gerentocratic circle refused to allow any new promotions to full professor; so that kept it, of course, a closed circle until you finally broke through, Clarke.

CAC: The reference is to Mr. [Philip] Jordan.

HB: Yes, my reference is to Mr. Jordan. This is the setting, of course, in which the reforms of the 1970s took place.

CAC: It's really the late 1960s.

HB: The late 1960s and early 1970s, yes. Perhaps, we went too far in the other direction. I don't know. I'll leave others to make that kind of judgment. What we did do was essentially democratize the process, make the process of appointment, promotion, tenure, merit pay,

curricular decisions, and other decisions in the department a kind of collective responsibility of the total department and, as a consequence, bring in full participation by all members of the department regardless of rank, stature, or what have you. Of course, functionally and formally, tenure decisions are still made by the tenured faculty; but, the committee of the whole of the department does, in fact, participate in the decision. Yes, non-tenured faculty participate in the tenure decisions . . . merit increases as well. The result—I don't have to mention this to you, you know it—of this has often lead to acrimony, and to conflict, and to division; but, in recent years . . .

CAC: And to long meetings.

HB: Interminable, interminable meetings. If given the choice what would I rather live under, a system of gerentocratic autocracy or democratic rule? I think my own political proclivities would lead me to choose the second rather than the first.

CAC: Obviously, you were in the majority company on that.

HB: Right. But, of course, I do recognize the costs and I do recognize the problems that this would raise as well. Like Dave Noble, like yourself, being in that lost generation, I, too, am in the position . . . when I was an assistant professor, all the decisions were made by the full professors. Now that I'm a full professor, all the decisions are made by the assistant professors.

CAC: It was that lost generation that took the initiative in creating new procedures.

HB: Absolutely. It was you and I, Stuart . . . I don't know why Dave Noble pulled out of things. Towards the end of the 1960s, he just withdrew from the department entirely. Before that, he was more active.

CAC: He had other priorities in his career and personal life.

HB: Yes, he did. He did withdraw. We were instrumental in putting those things through.

CAC: Let's back up just a minute now that we're onto History again and talk a bit about your teaching within History and the graduate students, the Immigration History Research [Center], etcetera.

HB: One of the first projects, if you want to call it that, that I was faced with when I came to the department in 1961 is that I came to find, that like myself, a new colleague had come into the department, Timothy Smith in History of Education, History of Religion, basically, that area and that somehow or other he and President O. Meredith Wilson had an ongoing relationship, which led to President Wilson getting a grant for the university to look into the impact of education on northern Minnesota, something broad and vague like that. I don't know how it came about but you, Clarke Chambers, and I were asked to join with Timothy in doing that, so-

called, Iron Range project. I don't know who decided that or how it was decided but we three agreed.

CAC: I agreed long distance. That was the year I was in Berkeley.

HB: That's right.

CAC: It was the same series of long distance telephone calls that you were describing earlier.

HB: The project was a fascinating one. I think it was a very worthwhile one even though the end result, in terms of the work we did, was limited to only a few participants in the conference or those who read the papers. Now, I think, the work is going to be published. It was, in many ways, seminal work that we did. The articles that we wrote, even though unpublished, were cited all over the place and still are cited all over the place. Out of that research project came, of course, the initiative for the establishment of the Immigration History Research Center. We discovered that we were encountering on the Iron Range the disappearance of a generation and the disappearance not only of a generation but of a generation's records . . . the generation being the immigrant generation, the generation that still lived, worked, and thought in their native tongues and the generation that had been the creator of cultural institutions, and fraternal institutions, and political institutions that were on the verge of disappearing. It was a generation of immigrants largely from Eastern and Southern Europe for which there did not yet exist, anywhere in the country, any widespread institutions of documentary preservation of their record. The German American Historical Society does exist. The Irish American Historical Society does exist. The American Jewish Historical Society does exist. There are large repositories of this kind of materials; but, there was no one collecting the work of the Finns, or of the south Slavs, or of the Italians, for that matter. It was this that we discovered. This was something that was lacking. I must say—give Timothy his due—Timothy had almost a missionary zeal when he thought something had to be done . . . single-mindedly; although, the three of us, you, he, and I agreed that this should be done, he single-mindedly, singlehandedly took it upon himself to really push and when Timothy pushed, he pushed. Eventually, an immigrant archival collection was organized and an Immigrant History Research Center was developed. The kind of relationship between the center, and the archives, and the library, and the department . . . these are things that we didn't pay too much attention to in the initial period of organization. We thought all of these would be resolved in time. They haven't been yet; but . . .

CAC: It's only been twenty years. [laughter]

HB: It was, I think, a major, major breakthrough in terms of archival collections and in terms of recognizing the role of ethnicity in immigrants in the development of American society. This was 1963, 1964, 1965 when there were a handful of people in the profession that paid attention to these kinds of questions. There was John Higham out there and a bunch of other people but that's about it. In connection with that we also developed the Immigration History Society. Timothy was involved in that, and John Higham, and I, and Bob Cross, who was then at

Columbia and then he went on to the University of Virginia. All we did at first with that was to get a network of people together who were interested and put out a newsletter. Early on Carlton Qualey took on the chore of turning out the newsletter, first out of Carleton College and then out of the Minnesota Historical Society. I was the first executive secretary of the Immigration History Society. Tensions developed within the department at the time between Timothy and myself and between Timothy and others; and as a consequence, there was a need to get a fresh and new, and neutral, and non-conflict ridden director of the Immigration History Research Center. That's when we turned to Rudy Vecoli, who was then at Illinois, to come and join us.

CAC: Timothy in the meantime had left for Johns Hopkins; so, it left a vacancy.

HB: That's correct. That must have occurred then in 1967, 1968 while I was in Berkeley. Again, one of the interesting things . . . I just remembered this; god! how things remain in the back of one's memory. Robert Levy in the Law School was visiting professor at Stanford Law School the same year that I was at Berkeley. We had a dinner party at the Levy's. Meredith Wilson, who was then at Palo Alto in the Behavioral Study Center, was also a guest at the dinner party. In the course of the evening, Meredith came over to me. It was early in the evening. We were just having drinks; that is, we were having drinks and Meredith was having water. As a Mormon, he doesn't drink. He came to me and he said, "I have some news for you." I said, "What?" He said, "Timothy is leaving Minnesota." I said, "Yes?" He said, "He's going to Johns Hopkins." I remember this. Then he said, "I felt honor bound and duty bound to get Timothy out of Minnesota." He didn't have to say more; I knew what he was talking about.

CAC: How interesting.

HB: That's how I place the time. We needed a new director at the time and that's why we went to Rudy. There were also tensions between Timothy and the library; but, these are tensions that everybody had. I'll never forget the long and interminable meetings as to how to set the collections. Should there be separate rooms for different ethnic groups?

CAC: Would the Ruthenians qualify for a separate room? I remember going to some meeting . . . I didn't know who the Ruthenians were and nobody does really.

HB: They are white Russians essentially.

CAC: [laughter] When you start making rooms, then you're in real trouble.

HB: Yes. I had just come back from a trip to Israel when one of these interminable meetings had taken place and I remembered the way in which the Hebrew University was able to handle that problem . . . they had rotating signs. I suggested at the meeting that we have rotating rooms. Whenever a visiting delegation comes you put up the sign, "The Ruthenian Room." [laughter] Of course, that didn't go over too well with Timothy or anybody else.

CAC: [laughter] There wasn't much chance for humor in some of those meetings.

HB: No. No.

CAC: Tell me about your outreach into Industrial Relations.

HB: As soon as I came to Minnesota, because I had labor history, Jewish history, etcetera, etcetera, I found myself having more and more, in addition to history graduate students, graduate students in Industrial Relations either on the master's level, or even on the doctoral level, or in Jewish Studies as well when that finally developed. Industrial Relations was an interdisciplinary program on a university-wide level housed in the College of Business Administration, as it was then called, until it was developed into strictly a graduate program with a research component. When it was done in the mid 1960s, a number of us who were not in Industrial Relations were asked to participate in the program. Labor History had, up until the time I arrived on campus, been a modest interest of the Economics Department in the university. They had a person, [Peter] Gregory, who taught Labor History, which wasn't really labor history but the history of certain unions—not even all unions. It was just that kind of thing. When I came, the Economics Department decided to drop it and let History handle it as they were becoming more and more analytical and mathematical and less and less normative and institutional. They were very happy to have the History Department handle this. Industrial Relations, as an interdisciplinary program, felt that History should be a central core to it. At least, the organizers like Herbert Heneman felt that way and, therefore, I was invited to participate with this new core of people. It was a fascinating group. Most of them were economists who did not go along with the new econometric models and were much more concerned about the social implications of economic decision making than some of the hard-nosed scientists that exist in the Economics Department.

CAC: And more involved in extension outreach, I would guess . . .

HB: Yes.

CAC: . . . to the labor leaders of the state?

HB: There's the intellectual academic and the graduate function. That's one thing. Then there's the outreach function. The outreach function of the Industrial Relations is the Labor Education Service and the Employee Education Service. It's this Labor Education Service and the Employee Education Service that's always been very closely tied to the real world. The Advisory Committee of Industrial Relations is an advisory committee that's a *who's who* of corporate and labor Minnesota. On that advisory committee sits, not only Dave Roe but also [James] Binger, the head of Control Data, the AFL-CIO. As an advisory committee, we meet twice a year, once in the fall and once in the spring, for a dinner meeting. There's always something of interest; but, usually a discussion of needs. Industrial Relations has always funded itself through legislative specials. In other words, it's through the external pressure on the legislature. Of course, that raises a lot of resentment in other parts, particularly in the College of Business

Administration or the School of Management as it is now called. A number of us from Economics, from Psychology, one from Sociology and one from History were right in on the foundation of Industrial Relations as a separate program. I've been committed to it ever since in an ongoing way. My most recent commitment was I chaired their curriculum committee two years ago and revamped their entire master's and Ph.D. program, trying to get more and more of a liberal arts component into it and succeeded. David Lilly, as a matter of fact, when he was dean of the School of Management, approached me about the possibility of offering a one-quarter course in Labor History for all incoming management students. He said that's the greatest course he ever had—not with me. Nothing ever happened with that. What did happen was that the School of Management moved more actively in a liberal arts direction. My ongoing commitment with Industrial Relations has been strong or weak depending on other commitments I have; although, I still participate in their activities and still have some graduate students. My Labor History seminar generally has about . . . out of ten or twelve students in the seminar, two or three are from Industrial Relations.

CAC: You dropped a comment briefly about being in Israel. You've also been in south Asia and you've also been in China?

HB: Yes.

CAC: Why don't we just pick that up quickly. I know it brings it closer to the present than most or our interviews have but . . .

HB: My international commitments and obligations began really very early in my stay in Minnesota. In 1964, the Graduate School—Frank Boddy was then the associate dean of the Graduate School—requested of the American Studies faculty that someone be sent to Osmania University in Hyderabad to mount the American Studies program there, at least to get it going and get the first teaching experiences there. They asked me if I would do it. It sounded fascinating . . . India and all that, the kind of old revolutionary romantic that I was. I thought it's going to be great! To make a long story short, I did go there for one quarter and helped set up the American Studies Research Center at Osmania in Hyderabad, taught a couple of history courses in the history department at Osmania University, and was used by the USIA [United States Information Agency] in ongoing things. This has to do with the university; it's the university connection . . . when I returned I was supposed to be the first, not the last, of our Minnesota American Studies people at Hyderabad Osmania. As an American Studies faculty, a group of us got together, a subcommittee, the usual way, to recommend the appointment of the next person to go to India. We unanimously agreed that Mulford Sibley would be outstanding. He would have been outstanding there. He fits in with the Indians perfectly, a vegetarian, a pacifist, just great. What we needed there was a boosting of the attitude toward the United States and Mulford would be just ideal for that and Mulford was enthusiastic.

CAC: He was available.

HB: He was available and enthusiastic. We suggested that he go and, of course, the Graduate School approved and sent his name on to Washington. This was a contract we had with the State Department. Mulford got the leave of absence from the department and everything was all set. No visas coming through? No . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

HB: . . . asked me if I knew what was going on. I said, "No, I don't." It so happened that at that time, Charlie Frankel, professor of philosophy at Columbia University whom I knew, was assistant secretary of state for Culture and Education—I don't know what the exact title was. It was in his domain . . . this whole contract and the Fulbright and all of that. I said, "I'll call Professor Frankel and find out what the hell is going on." I got through, strange, to the assistant secretary of state without any difficulty. He said, "Didn't anybody inform you people?" I said, "No, we have heard nothing." He said, "Mulford's blackballed." I said, "What do you mean?" He said, "The cautious bureaucrats in the State Department saw Mulford's name—your name, okay, we put it through with no problem—and sent it to the Fulbright selection committee. The chair of the selection committee told me this and he shouldn't have, I don't think, because it was confidential stuff. The chair of the selection committee is Oscar Handlin and Oscar vetoed him. He called Mulford a kind of naive front man for the Communists." I said, "Charlie, do you agree with that?" He said, "No! I don't agree with that; but we're stuck with it."

CAC: What year would that have been?

HB: This was 1965 or 1966.

CAC: The Vietnam thing is creating real . . .

HB: Beginning to.

CAC: You bet it was. I think in Washington, they knew it better than the rest of us.

HB: Yes. Mulford got into trouble in Canada at the same time. He was somehow or other prevented from going into Canada and then Dean Rusk and Hubert went to his support because Hubert was then vice-president.

CAC: Is this the end of the Hyderabad connection then?

HB: It goes beyond that. One other person went. When we discovered that this was the case, we, as an American Studies faculty, those of us who were involved in this, decided that if Mulford doesn't go, nobody goes. That was our decision. We thought it was a firm decision

until someone did go. Bob Fulton in the Sociology Department went; but, in all fairness to Bob, he did not know.

CAC: I thought Joe Qwiat went also?

HB: No.

CAC: Was that not the Hyderabad?

HB: That was somewhere else. The only other person that went on this contract was Fulton and then we dropped the contract.

CAC: What a shame. As I've just said, I know lots of these things; but, I've never heard that story.

HB: The press did pick it up by the way. Bob Lundegaard did have it in the [*Minneapolis*] *Tribune*; but, it's been long forgotten. Before Bob Lundegaard became a film critic for the *Tribune*, he covered the university.

On the international side of it, I lectured in Israel not for any long period of time but on and off. I've also been invited to the People's Republic of China and according to John Hope Franklin, who initiated efforts in China and was the first American historian to give a single lecture in China . . .

CAC: Heavens. I didn't know that.

HB: . . . I was the first American historian to give a whole series of connected lectures on a single topic in China since, what the Chinese call, the liberation, since 1949. This was in the summer of 1981. It had nothing to do with me personally but had to do with the fact that the University of Minnesota had a long pre-war, pre-liberation relationship with Chinese students and scholars. We were able, apparently, to get this kind of connection reestablished after the end of the cultural revolution. When a Minnesota delegation went to China, Ted Farmer, our colleague in the History Department, went along as a member of the delegation and gave them a roster of the department. They went down the roster, and discovered my name and my interests, and they invited me. That's how the China connection began. I've been subsequently back to China a second time under the auspices of more or less a political scholarly group, the Chinese Association of International Understanding. This spring, I'll be going as part of the University of Minnesota/Munich exchange. I'll be lecturing in, I think, labor history at Munich.

CAC: One of the interesting things—I've done twenty-five to thirty interviews—there's hardly a person that hasn't had an international connection. We think, here we are in the landlocked Siberian province of Minnesota and that outreach is just something and over many, many years and to all corners of the world.

HB: Exactly. That's fascinating.

CAC: Very fascinating. It's the kind of thing—I'm talking now to people who might listen to this tape later on—that might be missed. You might have the Office of International Programs. You'd have three paragraphs on that; but, there's all this work in so many different settings.

HB: The international component is really something that I find really fascinating and really one of the rewarding and renewing experiences.

CAC: Yes.

HB: The Indian connection was cut very quickly, unfortunately, because of not only the action of the State Department but also the action of the Indians themselves. I discovered later on that my name was used in political debates in the Indian parliament as being a kind of front man of the CIA [Central Intelligence Agency]. They were under their paranoid problems as well. The justification for that was that I had associated while in Hyderabad and Secunderabad with members of the Indian Communist Party [CP] both the Maoists and the Stalinists. Why would I do that if I [unclear] a CIA person? The fact that I'm interested in Communist revolutionary activities at a scholarly level didn't dawn upon them. The fact is that most of my contacts were with CP people. This is one of the areas of professional interest that I have.

The China connection is an ongoing one—at least up until now, unless the pendulum swings the other way either in Washington or in Beijing. We have had, in the Department of History, now through the China connection, visiting scholars from the Nankai University Department of History so far the last two years, one every year. We'll have another one the following year . . . none this year. We had the chairman of the American History Research Section come to Minnesota for a month or two through Professor [ ] Wade, the chairman of the History Department [unclear] now be vice-president of Nankai University. This ongoing relationship is a good one. I know this is going beyond the scope of your oral history project . . . Professor Yang Shingmo, and Jang Ula, and then the Chinese Association for U.S. History, which is the national organization for the study of U.S. history, are planning for an international historical conference on the impact of the American May Day on international working class movements on the hundredth anniversary of May Day in May 1986.

CAC: My heavens, how marvelous.

HB: I'm part of the planning committee for that. If the Reagan Administration is still in power, we probably will not get any federal funds for that; but, if there is a Mondale administration, maybe we will. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] We're talking about outreach, you also have now reached to the first Perpich Administration.

HB: Yes. We spoke very quickly about the, so-called, Iron Range project that Timothy Smith, Clarke Chambers, and I were involved in. One of the byproducts of the Iron Range project was a close personal friendship that developed between a, then, young Hibbing dentist, member of the Hibbing school board, and myself, a man by the name of Rudy Perpich. We became close personal friends. When he later was elected to the state senate and came down to the Twin Cities, we saw each other quite frequently while he was living in the Twin Cities. I got to know his family, his father, his mother, his brothers. As his brothers were going through the University of Minnesota, they would be always find a shoulder to cry on in my shoulder, or a bit of encouragement from me, and occasionally even a good meal; so, we remained fairly close. When Rudy Perpich became lieutenant governor, I worked to some extent with him in the Bicentennial celebration things trying to caution him not to be so enthusiastic about painting every biffy red, white, and blue. We had this good close relationship. When he became governor there was the infamous transfer of power between Wendell Anderson and Rudy Perpich that cost them both an election in 1978. I got a phone call from Rudy the day after or the same day that Wendell Anderson told him that this was going to happen and Rudy asked me whether I'd be willing to assist him in any way he wishes when he's governor. I said, "Of course. What do you want me to do?" He said, "The first thing I want you to do is get some corned beef and pastrami tomorrow over at your house and Lola and I will come over and have lunch." I said, "Fine." He came over, the dog barked at him and I said, "You can't bark at the first Iron Range governor in Minnesota history."

CAC: [laughter]

HB: We sat down and Rudy asked me to do two things for him in the transition period. One was to get together, in so far as possible, a congenial advisory group from the university faculty to assist him on economic matters, which is something he knew very little about, and on other policy matters; and the second he asked me to do was to be on beck and call, part of the kitchen cabinet, historian in residence. I said, "Fine," not knowing that it would result in two full time jobs or more than two full time jobs in the two years that I was with him. In the course of that conversation, I said, "I'd better check with the university administration before I do anything like this and with the department." You were chair at the time? No, who was?

CAC: Stuart Schwartz.

HB: Stuart didn't give a damn one way or the other, which is the way he ran the department.

CAC: [laughter]

HB: He said, "As long as you teach your courses, I don't give a damn." I called Peter Magrath and Peter, being the political animal he was, immediately saw the potential of damages [unclear]. I went over across to Eastcliff and he wanted to know more about Rudy Perpich, what kind of a person he was. I told him. The first crisis—I don't know how detailed you want to me go into this—occurred just before Rudy Perpich's inauguration. Ronnie Brooks, who was brought in by

Rudy to be a person of ideas and so on, a staff person, wanted the inauguration to be a kind of catalog of new directions of the administration. I argued, "No, the inauguration should be 'Who am I, Rudy Perpich, the new governor?'" Rudy asked me to draft his inaugural address which I did and Ronnie Brooks was just up in arms. Rudy decided that that's the way he was going to go, simple [unclear]. It worked out very well because the inaugural just was short enough that it was printed in full in the *Tribune* and the [*Minneapolis*] *Star*, the [*St. Paul*] *Pioneer Press* and [*St. Paul*] *Dispatch*, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *Time Magazine* because it was the first Catholic governor of the state, the first Iron Range governor of the state, the first working-class governor of the state; and I put it all in the inaugural address, and the role of education . . . kind of a heart rendering . . . Even Gus Hall in the *Daily World*, who, by the way, is an old acquaintance of Rudy Perpich from the Iron Range, found it necessary to comment and his comment found its way to the *Pravda*. The *Pravda* comment on my inaugural address was that, "No, Rudy Perpich is not the first important person to come out of the working-class. Leonid Brezhnev was a steel man." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

HB: The inaugural address, I think, went very well and got good response all over the world except for the *Pravda*. Subsequent to that two years, I did many things for him. We came to the realization that the governor's visibility is great. He is, in fact, a person that's out there that people are interested in and that the media is interested in; but, the governor has limited opportunities to present new ideas except do budget messages and stuff like that. We devised a scheme whereby there would be special messages through the legislature. There was a special message on history, a special message on the arts, a special message on criminal justice and that was great. I had a ball putting those things together. The way he did it . . . take the history one. We'd get together, in the governor's residence in the basement, a group of interested people. For history, we had the chairman of the major history departments around, local and state historical societies, etcetera. Rudy himself considers himself an historian. We'd sit together [unclear] and have kind of a brainstorming session. What would be the desirable thing? What would we like to have? What would we like to see? We'd get a catalog of stuff and they'd leave. Rudy would think what would you want really out of all of this? Is there anything that's not listed there that you would want? We'd pare down that and he'd say, "Okay, it's yours." Then, I sat down and wrote the history message. The emphasis of the history message was, again, on ethnicity, class, things of that nature that fitted into his experience, that history should not be a kind of esoteric and upper-class elitist experience; but, it's everybody's . . . Iron Range Interpretative Center, stuff like that. The arts . . . we did something that was unusual in the arts. We put a proposal through that a small but nonetheless continuing proportion of the state construction budget be set aside for art enhancement in new buildings—it was 1 percent and now it's up to 1½ percent—in addition to the increase in the appropriation for the state arts board from $1 million to $4 million, which is not [unclear]. These were the fun things. These were really fun things. There were some traumatic experiences as well, when, for instance, I had to step between Peter Magrath and Rudy Perpich to keep them from coming to blows with each other.

CAC: On what issue?

HB: What's on Rudy's mind is on his tongue. He never really thinks through what he's about to say. I think of the initial meeting between him and Peter Magrath, or one of the early meetings, and his son was about to enter St. Thomas. Rudy said to Peter Magrath, "I wouldn't send my son to the university because the university . . . " blah, blah, blah, impersonal, [unclear], bad . . . all the clichés about the horrors of the university. Peter took the defense of the university, as you'd expect a president of a university to do. Rudy assumed that Peter's coming to the defense of the university was an attack upon him. Peter felt that Rudy's was an attack on him personally. Before you knew it, they were standing at each other about ready to come to blows. I stepped in and said, "Hey, come on."

CAC: That's a nice story. This outreach also reaches into the Minnesota Historical Society?

HB: Yes. In 1975, when I left the Social Science program or the Experimental courses, whatever it was called at the time, the Minnesota Historical Society was in the process of building up its labor collections. One of my former graduate students had been or was then working for them, George Tselos, for the purpose of building up the labor collections. We were able to succeed in getting the Minneapolis Central Labor Union files to the Historical Society. We were working on the State Federation files and things like that. As a consequence, I became more and more involved in Minnesota Historical Society activities and kept a study there, worked with them in the development of their archival collection but also their public programs, and their education outreach stuff, and things like that. In recent years, I think, more or less, an informal relationship has developed. I am informally, at least, the liaison between the society and the Department of History at the university and we're hoping that this will become much more formal in the foreseeable future.

CAC: You've held a title there, too?

HB: Yes. From about 1978 or 1979 on, the society gave me a title of senior fellow. This gives me a niche there, and an office, and a telephone, and a name in the state directory, and things like that.

The relationship with the governor is an ongoing one. When Rudy became governor for the second time, he did ask me to do more or less what I was doing in the first term; but, I was four years older. I knew what I did the first two years. I couldn't bring myself to do two full time jobs nor did I wish to take leave of absence from the university to do this. I was involved in the China matter, an ongoing responsibility to the university. The second set of reasons is that the four years that Rudy was in Vienna, he had moved perceptibly to the right; and although, he, in the first term, was to the left of me, now, he was to the right of me. I take the view—I told him this—that the relationship between political leaders, and business corporations, and with labor unions should be cordial but at arm's length. He takes the view that it should be close. I'm not suggesting, in the classic Marxist sense, that there is a class struggle, particularly not between

government and business. If I were a Marxist, or a neo-Marxist, or whatever . . . if I were any of that, I'd point to what Marx says that the government is, in fact, the executive branch of the ruling class. So, obviously, Rudy is doing the right thing there; but, am I a Marxist? No! I'm a liberal. I'm an unashamed and unabashed liberal at a time when it is unfashionable to be one. I'm a New Deal liberal.

CAC: A left leaning New Deal liberal.

HB: Yes, but I'm [unclear].

CAC: Sure.

HB: As a consequence I do feel not that the corporations are them against us but the corporations have an agenda that's different than mine. I agree with Ronald Reagan, greed makes the corporations run.

CAC: [laughter]

HB: As a consequence, we should keep them at an arm's length relationship. That's the kind of ideological gap that grew between Rudy and me that makes it less likely that I would be writing messages for him.

CAC: These comments lead directly into the movement on campus for a faculty union.

HB: Oh, yes.

CAC: You were involved in that actively?

HB: Let me put it into context. I was involved in, first, raising the question whether there should or should not be collective bargaining on campus. Again, place it in historical context. This was in the early to mid 1970s when the growth years at the university, higher education, had come to an end. We were moving into the first phases of retrenchment and reallocation. The first retrenchment and reallocation was 1971.

CAC: Right.

HB: The inflationary spiral was heating up significantly. The mid and late 1970s were high inflationary years. Conditions of work and rewards for work—essentially, we are, in fact, employees—were not keeping pace with the rest of society and with ourselves. We were losing. There was nationally a consideration of whether faculty should go into a more formal mode of university government and of collective bargaining. Collective bargaining would be that new mode. I raised the question on campus with others as to whether it should or should not be the mode of operation here on the University of Minnesota campus and raising the question certainly

came at a right moment because others thought that the question should be raised. The American Federation of Teachers [AFT] became involved and we decided to form a University of Minnesota Federation of Teachers [UMFT] group to explore the possibility of collective bargaining. The more we explored it, the more the administration became hostile. I was on friendly terms with most of the administration until I started raising this question. Then, all of a sudden, they started not only raising objections to it—I thought it was an intellectual exercise we were dealing with—but they were beginning even to violate my rights as a faculty member. I took them to court. I beat the pants off from them.

CAC: Tell me a bit more on that.

HB: All right. The university administration through its Industrial Relations man, [Ray] Richardson, who, by the way, is a graduate student of mine, decided that the UMFT and those faculty members who were involved in the UMFT should not have access to the university mailing facilities, nor could we use any classrooms or public facilities at the university, nor could we have access to faculty names. But, the AAUP [American Association of University Professors], which was also involved in the collective bargaining search or concern, was given mailing privileges, access, and privileged access. I thought I'd try to resolve this in a gentlemanly way, and I went to Moos, and he didn't know what the hell was going on; so, I went to a few other people in the administration. They told me to go fuck off, essentially. [unclear] file suit and in the Hennepin County municipal court, Judge [Donald] Barbeau, issued an order, the most devastating one I've even seen. First of all, the university regents and their attorney argued that the university was not subject to the state collective bargaining law, to the Public Employee Labor Relations Act [PELRA]. I remembered that when PELRA was passed in 1971 and then modified in 1973, the regents had, in fact, put the university under the umbrella of PELRA for the purposes of negotiating with the teamsters, the janitors, and things of that nature. In the course of the . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[Tape 3, Side 2]

HB: . . . proceedings before Judge Barbeau, the university was arguing that they were not subject to that, therefore, the university can give the privilege of mailing, rooms, to anyone it wished and withhold it from anyone it wished. We had a lunch recess, and I told the law clerk for the AFT lawyer to go and look at the regents' minutes for approximately such and such a date, and to come back at two thirty in the afternoon with a copy of them. When he came back, he had found it. I was put on the witness stand. This was pre-arranged. Neil Peterson was the attorney for AFT at the time. He was a staff aide of Hubert Humphrey, and a good friend, and we had it all set up. I had the documents right in my hot little hand. He said, "Professor Berman, among other things . . . beside being president of the UMFT, whatever that is, you're also a professor of Labor History and also professor of Industrial Relations, are you not?" I said, "Yes, I am." He went on, "What do you think, now, as an expert of the university's contention

that they are not subject to the Public Employee Labor Relations Act?" I said, "It's interesting observation they make. I think, under the Chase case in the 1920s, the university probably has a leg to stand on arguing constitutional autonomy and all of that; therefore, under normal circumstances, I would say that they have a good legal position that they are not subject to the Public Employee Labor Relations Act." Judge Barbeau looked at me as if I was crazy. I'm arguing against my own case! The lawyer said, "Do you realize what you're saying Professor Berman?" I said, "Yes, I realize what I'm saying." He said, "Council, do you realize what you're asking?" "Yes." "Professor Berman, is the university subject to the Public Employee Labor Relations Act?" I said, "By action of the Board of Regents, they are." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

HB: Richardson and Thomas, [unclear], and the university attorneys just collapsed. The bottom fell out of their case as soon as I [unclear] this. Judge Barbeau said, "Do you wish to enter any kind of motion at this point?" To which Neil Peterson said, "Yes. I move for immediate decision on this case." "Any objection?" "No, objection." Three days later, one of the most devastating opinions, orders, came out of Judge Barbeau's chambers. We were never harassed after that, never harassed after that. It was a traumatic experience for me to bring the university, at least the administration of the university, which I love, to court; but, if they're wrong, I'm going to do that.

CAC: Whatever happened to the union and your relationship with the union?

HB: My relationship with the union ended very soon thereafter. In 1974, two things became clear . . . first of all, that unionization is not what the majority of the faculty want and I'm not about to push anything that the majority of the faculty don't want or to put it another way, I kept telling my colleagues that I'm beginning to get sick and tired of doing social work for the affluent—I'm being facetious in that. The American Federation of Teachers was, in fact—this is what bothered me most—spending dues money of elementary and secondary school teachers who were not as well paid, not as well treated as university faculty, to organize university faculty. If they were doing that for the purpose of organizing teaching assistants or something like that, it may be justifiable. The question I raised, is collective bargaining a viable alternative for university faculty was, in fact, answered to my satisfaction in 1974, no.

CAC: Except on the Duluth campus later.

HB: Except in certain higher educations institutions, yes . . . the University of Minnesota, no. The second thing that really developed was the fact that—I knew this all along—the coalition involved in the collective bargaining question on the side of collective bargaining was a peculiar coalition. It consisted of unreconstructed Stalinists, all the way to moderate Republicans; but, the activists involved were, in fact, from the left. In 1974, when one of the members of the executive board, Professor Erwin Marquit of the Physics Department, announced, first, that he had joined the Communist Party, USA, and, secondly, that he was the Communist Party's

candidate for governor of the state of Minnesota, I felt that even the question of collective bargaining on the campus at the University of Minnesota was no longer a viable question. When the *Minnesota Daily* reporter asked me whether Professor Marquit's announcement that he was a member of the Communist Party and was about to run for governor was, in fact, going to help the collective bargaining effort of UMFT. I said, "Only if it became known or announced that the president of the AAUP had joined George Wallace's American Party and that the head of the ad hoc group looking for no collective bargaining was a secret member of the German American Bund". They didn't put the second point in; but, the AAUP part they put in the *Daily* article. Erwin Marquit thought I was redbaiting him, and as a consequence, our personal relationship became strained and has never really healed. There were other reasons as well. Anybody who could be a Stalinist at this day and age, I question his political judgment if not his moral stance; but, that's beside the point. That, I think, from my point view, ended collective bargaining as a viable alternative at the university.

I must say, I made a terrible mistake when I turned over the leadership of the UMFT to a man who I thought would be able to keep these crazies out . . . to Burnham Terrell and to Louis Toth—both very good people—but, it didn't work out that way. The AFT pulled out and the MEA, the Minnesota Education Association, came in and the UMFT became the UMEA [University of Minnesota Education Association] and had a broader constituency; and it became almost a generational split on campus, at least in the our department. In the History Department, it was that way. It seemed that the younger colleagues who came out of the 1960s and the Vietnam War experience were involved in the UMEA efforts, which is the second round of collective bargaining efforts. I was not involved in that. I stayed out of that. I must admit that all parties, the UMEA, the AAUP, and the faculty association, all three, attempted to get my support; and only on one instance did I give the support and that was to the faculty association when they asked for postponement of the election on procedural grounds. Fred Lukermann got me to do that because he knew I agreed with that; but then, when it came out in the press, it came out that I was against collective bargaining, which was not the case. I was still ready to debate the issue [unclear] frankly. As a practitioner of oral history . . .

CAC: [laughter] At both ends.

HB: . . . at both ends, I must say that this is to the best of my recollection and to the best of my memory.

CAC: We'll take that. One of the joys—you have done a lot of it yourself—is as historians, we know from documents, apart from the spoken word, that they aren't all that accurate either . . .

HB: No.

CAC: . . . and what you do is get different views, and different views, and different views on similar things and if you build up enough of it, somebody may be able to untangle it.

HB: Yes.

CAC: It's not easy; but, it's a hell of a lot of fun.

HB: Isn't it though? [laughter]

CAC: I've had a very good morning and I thank you very much.

HB: Thank you.

[End of Tape 3, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

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