

## William Hueg

- Youth and education 1-
  - Cornell 2, 5-6
  - farm experience 3-4
  - Master's degree - Michigan State, 1954 4, 7, 9
  - special extension agent, New York 5
    - dairy industry 7
- Hueg comes to the University of Minnesota, 1957 8
  - outreach by TV 8
- Hueg - Ph.D. from Michigan State 10-11
- Hueg comes to University of Minnesota - Extension position 10
  - agricultural high schools - Morris, Crookston, Grand Rapids, Waseca 12
  - Fenske, Ted - death of 14
- Hueg becomes assistant director of Experiment Station 14
- Hueg - legislative representative for St. Paul campus, 1963-75 16
  - "Special" appropriations for agricultural research 16
  - Amberg, Ray - chief lobbyist 17
  - increase in research funds - legislative, government, and foundations 18-19
  - relationship with Gerry Shepherd 21
  - curries favor with regents and legislators 21
  - accountability 23
  - environmental issues 25
- Hueg - deputy vice-president Health Sciences 26-27
- Magrath, C. Peter - administrative style 28-29, 31
- Institute of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics 29-
  - Magrath, C. Peter and Koffler, Henry 31-32
- Agriculture-Economics at the University of Minnesota 33
  - Farm management Department 34-35
- Institute over College of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics 36
  - Berg, Sherwood 36
  - College of Biological Sciences 37
  - administration reorganization 37-40
  - McFarland, Keith 38-39
  - Linck, Al 38-39
  - Sauer, Richard 40
  - Agricultural Extension 41
- Advisory council, 1949 44
  - agri-business 45
  - legislative support 46
- National Science Board 47
  - Hueg appointed 49
  - research agendas 50-52
- Morris campus 53
  - Youngquist, Bernie 53
- Waseca campus 54
- Crookston campus 55
- Change in state legislature 56

legislative relations 58-59  
Regents' reserve 59  
Wilson, Meredith and legislature 60  
Moos, Malcolm 61-62  
Ruttan, Vernon 61  
Magrath, C. Peter 62  
Keller, Kenneth 63-64  
Sunflower industries 65  
Soybeans 66  
University of Minnesota's world outreach 67  
    Russia and China 67  
    land systems 70  
    Chile 70  
    Russia 71  
    Morocco 72  
Flax 74  
Agri-Extension 75  
    research - regional 75  
Land-Grant tradition 77-  
    Experimental Station, 1887 79  
    Extension 80

**Interview with William Hueg**

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

**Interviewed on January 3, 1995  
at the Home of William Hueg  
Dodd Road, Mendota Heights, Minnesota**

William Hueg                   - WH  
Clarke A. Chambers         - CAC

CAC: I'm interviewing this morning, William Hueg, Bill Hueg, who was with the university, as so many of the persons I've interviewed, for a long time and had very influential and significant positions. It is the 3rd of January 1995. It is a bright cold winter's morning and the interview is being conducted in his home on Dodd Road in the west side on St. Paul.

Bill, as I suggested before we turned this machine on, it's really engaging to find out how people got into what they did, what turned them on, where they came from, as the saying goes. You say you came from *New York City*, right? And you made your whole life in farming? Start up.

WH: Okay. My dad was in the contracting business. I was born in Brooklyn only because my grandmother lived there, and in the old philosophy of families, my mother went where the family doctor was; and that was fourteen miles away from where I finally ended up living in Hollis, on Long Island, in Queens County and that's why I say it was *New York City*.

CAC: Sure.

WH: My whole education was the *New York City* school system. I went to PS 118, public school, that is. Then I went to Andrew Jackson High School. I was in the charter class. I graduated from high school then in 1942. My mother was a avid amateur horticulturist and I suspect that's how I got my interest in plants. My dad had a fifth grade education but had—as they would say today—street smarts. He knew how to work with people. He knew how to put money together. He knew how to praise or give heck when it was appropriate. I used to think I got more heck than praise.

CAC: That was a good motto for, eventually, a vice-president to have.

WH: [laughter] Eventually, I kind of concluded that my dad and I would be much better friends if I did not associate with him in work. It's something we never talked about. When it was time to go away to school, there was that question whether I would go to college. I would have been the only one if I did go . . . in our family, both sides . . . but my dad couldn't see that that was necessary. My mother was a good trooper on that and so I went away to school. I went to Cornell. My dad never asked what I was going to be majoring in.

CAC: Did you know you chose one of the best ag schools in the country?

WH: But I didn't go into agriculture.

CAC: So that wasn't an incentive?.

WH: That was not a criteria at the moment. I went there. I enrolled in the College of Liberal Arts. The tuition was \$400 a semester. [laughter] I don't even know what it is now but I know it's plenty expensive.

CAC: A bit more.

WH: Yes, a bit more. Everything was fine. I indicated that I had an interest in botany. In the meantime, I should have said, in 1937 my folks bought forty acres of land up in the Hudson Valley. I suppose, lying down in my heart was this idea that the country was so beautiful because I could see Long Island; although Long Island in those days, in the 1920s, 1930s, even into the early 1940s, was not overly populated. There was still lots of agriculture there. There is still quite a bit after you get way out.

CAC: Right.

WH: I went to Cornell. Everything was fine. I came home that first Christmas and my dad always had a big party for his business associates. One of his subcontractors was a Jewish man—an unfortunate name to my mother—his name was Louie Lipshitz, a very common Jewish name in the East. A standard joke in our house was "Oh, Mary"—that was my mother's name—"Louie's changed his name." My mother would get excited and my dad would say, "He changed it to Ed."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: Ed Lipshitz, the son, was a Cornell graduate in electrical engineering; so, Louie got me off in a corner and started to ask me about this professor, that professor, and so on. I finally had to say, "I don't know any of these people." "Well, you're at Cornell?" "Yes." I had to allow that I was not in engineering. "What are you doing?" I said, "Well, I've indicated I'd like to be

in botany." With this, he called my father over—used a rather common expression—"Hey, Will, your kid is screwing you." Of course, we didn't discuss it then but by the time I went back the second day of January 1943, it was quite obvious that I was on my own. So, I had to find out where I could get my tuition. I had a lot less than \$400.

CAC: Ah.

WH: I happened to be living in a rooming house. There were six other guys there. One of the fellows, when I walked in the door, said, "My god! you look like you died over the holiday."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: And of course, I thought I had, Clarke. When I told him the story, he said, "Not to worry." Two days later, he took me up to meet the dean or the director of admissions of the College of Agriculture. Of course at that time, I didn't have a clue as to what that was going to lead to. I went there. The one question he asked, if I'd worked on a farm. "No, sir." Well, yes, I'd helped neighbors but nothing very significant. He said, "Would you be willing to work on a farm?" My answer, as I recall, was, "If that's how you get in this place, yes." That's really what started it because I had wonderful families initially to work with, graduates of Cornell who took the responsibility very seriously at that time. I say this only because everybody thinks it's so strange, but at that time, maybe, 30 percent of the student body in Agriculture were from the city. The others were from rural background. This is New York now. New York is still a very important agricultural state in 1994.

CAC: Sure.

WH: And I expect in 1995. [laughter] That was the thing. Now, who gets the credit? I had an advisor who I'm sure I drove up the wall because I think I've always been inquisitive, and I wanted to take everything, and obviously there was a curriculum. I indicated that I was interested in dairy, I guess, but I really liked people. I didn't want to teach school but I thought extension sounded interesting where you're out there seeing right at the . . .

CAC: You knew enough to know what extension was as a kid, as a young man?

WH: Yes, I learned this while I was at school and then having worked at these couple of farms.

CAC: Right.

WH: Dr. Turk was his name. Finally, at the end of my sophomore year, he suggested, "You really don't know what you're getting into. So, I'm going to suggest you drop out of school for a year." I've always had to kind of explain this because it was wartime, as you'll recall.

CAC: Yes.

WH: I had been in an automobile accident and was kind of beat up; so, it took almost until before I got married, the first time, that I got a 4-F status but I was not eligible. That's neither here nor there. He suggested that I go to work at a place called Merridale Farms. These people were importers of jersey cattle. This was in Delaware County, just 100 miles out of New York City. The owner was a man by the name of Ayers Publishing Company in Philadelphia. During World War I, they made a fortune from butter. They had imported cattle from the Jersey Island. The manager—as I found out later—was the son-in-law who came from the Island of Jersey. I could tell you hours of story here but I won't. I think probably, Clarke, that was the clincher because I didn't stay there one year, I ended up being there two and one-half years. Then Dr. Turk called up and he said, "If you are serious about getting an education, you better come back to school or you'll end up just being a cowboy."

CAC: So, he kept track of you all this time?

WH: Yes, because he used to make the rounds of these various farms.

CAC: Sure.

WH: That's how I happened to be there.

CAC: With the interviews I've done, the presence of some kind of a mentor who keeps track is a crucial force in developing a career.

WH: He was the first one. As he said, "You really give us all in this department a very hard time because you are inquisitive . . ."

CAC: But every professor likes that.

WH: Yes. "And you're anxious to do things but we also recognize you're not going to be here forever." And how many times I've said that to students over the years, "Hey, you don't have to do your life's work in the period of time that you're here."

CAC: Right.

WH: Before we're done, I'll have to give you his first name. I'm got a mental blank on it right now. The interesting thing is that when I went to do my master's at Michigan State—that's many years after—his brother was head of Soils at the time.

CAC: Hmmm.

WH: He, then, was on my master's committee, Lloyd Turk. We had quite a little interaction. I came back to school, probably got to take a lot more courses than a lot of people did. I had to work. I worked in a girls' dormitory in the kitchen. That was another interesting experience.

One year, we put on a little play, all pantomime, from the tape of *Oklahoma*. Believe it or not, I was as tall as I am now; I was Ado Annie.

CAC: [laughter]

WH: I can still sing that in the falsetto; although we didn't have to, we did it all in pantomime.

CAC: Right.

WH: The nice part about that job was you could kind of look over the girls, and see who you might like to start dating, and try not to drop too much gravy on them as you were waiting on the table. [laughter] When I, then, started to go look for work, I had decided then to go in extension. At that time now, this is 1948—keeping in mind now, I went in in 1942 but I had this hiatus of a couple years— . . .

CAC: Sure, a better way to do it.

WH: . . . so I was coming up on twenty-four years old when I graduated. I had wonderful grades . . . well, wonderful . . . high Bs and some As. That was the marking system there.

CAC: But you knew you liked it?

WH: Yes, I did like it. Because I was going into extension, I went out for six interviews, Clarke. Boy, talk about knocking your ego down. Everyone of them, when I would get in the car with the Extension supervisor who took me out for these interviews—three or four of us would go but only one got the job—and back driving to Ithaca, he would say, "Bill, they really liked you. You came across but they're afraid that a kid that grew up in the city, how is he going to advise us?" Now, this, of course, has changed. I suspect, Clarke, this is when I started to talk about agriculture as a science based business.

CAC: Ah ha.

WH: That's kind of been my motto for my whole career.

CAC: Sure.

WH: By the luck of the gods, as they say, Cornell started a program called Green Acres. They had recognized Cornell . . . New York was one of the early states in using artificial insemination and so they had a genetic base far in excess of what they were getting in production. So, somebody coined the idea that the biggest disease in the state of New York was hollow belly, that in fact, the cows were not getting enough to eat; and this then is how I got a job. I went

out as a special agent—I had five or six counties as I recall—to set up demonstrations on the new techniques in growing forage crops. Alfalfa was relatively new for the majority of the state.

CAC: Really?

WH: It was across the central part of the limestone belt where the now the throughway . . .

CAC: What were they using for feed before?

WH: Just clover and timothy but cutting late, like have the 4th of July celebration and then harvest. A young scientist had come there. Tom Reed was his name. He had part of his education in England and worked at Rothamsted, the old agriculture experiment station, the model that was used in the United States to establish experiment stations here. He came up with this idea that the time of cutting, which had to do with the physiology of the plant, had a tremendous amount to do with the quality of the forage. I've been preaching that and I continue to. I'm going to be seventy-one next week. I've used it in my own farm with great success. The better farmers and the better dairymen in the United States use this and it is absolutely amazing. We're talking protein levels that the cow can use in the range of 24 percent of a total amount. Of course, we use entirely different techniques for feeding than we did then. We put up alfalfa as high moisture, 50 percent, usually in a silo but in bunks if the herds are big enough, bunker silos, flat storage. I've really been kind of a part of this. It started in the 1940s. I worked in Extension two and one-half years and finally got a permanent job in Herkimer County, New York, which is right in the center. That went very well, but then some of this stuff was starting to get written up and I was invited to come to the technical school . . .

CAC: Good.

WH: . . . at Alfred which was part of the State University of New York system. There were six technical colleges and this was the one in southwestern New York. I went there as the agronomist and, again, as the gods would have it, we were on a semester system. I signed a contract saying that within five years, I would get a master's degree. That was the requirement now. The bachelor's was fine but now it had to be a master's—this is 1950. They changed to a quarter system so I ended up one quarter not having something to teach. That one year, I went around recruiting students. It was good but that isn't what I wanted to spend my life doing; and so I asked my boss, Eddie Foster—he was the head of the ag group—"Could I consider going back to school?" Immediately, he said, "Yes." I went up to Cornell thinking that's where I should go but everybody I talked to, including I talked to Turk, said, "You know the New York system. You've not only been a graduate of the college, you've worked in the system now for five years, I would suggest that you go someplace else."

Another man who had some influence on me was Dr. Hartwig. He was in Agronomy. He was a graduate of Michigan State. I really had thought now because I was on the forage side, I would work with him and he said, "That would be wonderful but . . ." you know, the same

story. He gave me the name of guy by the name of Carter Harrison who was a professor, plant physiologist, at Michigan State College, it was at that time. The cow college, they called it, like some people do in St. Paul.

CAC: Sure.

WH: He and I hit it off very well. Now, as a little aside, this summer, I had to go to Michigan to visit dairy farms and I spent an evening with Carter Harrison and his wife, Ruth. He's ninety-four years old.

CAC: Good grief.

WH: Mentally very alert. He's legally blind. He has macular degeneration. They've set him up that he can still review manuscripts; so, two days a week a graduate student comes and picks him up at nine-thirty. He says, "I get there just in time for coffee. Then, I have to go down the hall and then I read for awhile. Then they take me home for lunch and I have my nap." We just had an absolutely wonderful visit.

CAC: [unclear] chance, Bill. Here you are at two of the best ag schools in the country, Cornell and Michigan State.

WH: And so it is . . . Carter has had a very strong influence. When I was first invited to go into administration here—that was by Dr. Todd Sloan in 1962—I consulted Harrison on a lot of things. I wanted him to be aware of what I was doing. I had to hold the phone at arm's length away because he had a very adverse opinion of administrators and rahr, rahr, rahr. Finally, he said, "I suppose, if somebody's got to do it, you probably would be a pretty good one. I'll bet you'll be tough as hell."

CAC: You're ticking off an awful lot of mentors. Is that a style in agriculture, do you think? I hadn't heard that kind of a story of support from very many people.

WH: I think it is.

CAC: Is it part of the field?

WH: Yes, I think this is maybe one of the strengths we have. I don't know, Clarke, whether it continues.

CAC: Often you get a person or something but to have a whole series of them is quite exceptional.

WH: I think at least one of the contrasts that I made, at Michigan State—certainly at the University of Minnesota—is that the teaching, all of the teaching, not only the graduate but the

undergraduate teaching, is done by full professors who have a half-time responsibility for research because of their affiliation with the experiment station and/or half-time in Extension.

CAC: Yes.

WH: I don't know whether that's continued. I sense it's less and less. In other words, as I go now to the St. Paul campus, I see certain departments that have gotten fairly large—Agronomy, for example—they have teaching assistants.

CAC: It keeps a person in direct contact with students?

WH: Yes. I hope they don't give that up. I think that's one of the real strengths. I know when I first came to Minnesota in 1957 and I would talk to county agents because that was the people that I worked with . . . I was really a teacher of teachers. I think very few extension specialists thought of themselves in that way but I did not think it was my job to go into X County and do the job for the county agents.

CAC: Sure.

WH: It was to give him background and material. That's how my career shifted, actually, when I came to Minnesota. I did more field scale demonstrations and research, and then in the winter time, had a series of meetings. Then in 1960, I figured, this is nuts going into every county—eighty-seven counties in the state of Minnesota—there's not time; so, I set up the TV series. The first one was at Alexandria for seven weeks. They had county agents and vocation ag teachers sign up for this with their students and/or . . .

CAC: That was another form of outreach?

WH: Yes. In this way, I was able to contact far more people.

CAC: Yes.

WH: You did it in a concentrated way, in a logical way, in an orderly way. Then in 1962, when I left Extension, it was a year and one-half before my position was replaced. It was not retrenchment; it was just kind of put on the back burner, for whatever reason. I was still doing some Extension, but the point is, the agents were left with a handbook that they could continue to use. I tried to update it . . .

CAC: In the meantime, you got your degree at Michigan State?

WH: I got my master's degree. I got that in 1954. My responsibility was to go back to Alfred because they had given me that period of time. There were two different periods that I went away but I got my full salary and so I had that obligation to go back for a year.

CAC: Sure.

WH: Carter Harrison, before I finished my master's, said, "You going to come back?" I was twenty-nine years old . . . I'm not coming back. I love it at Alfred. I had bought in with two of my colleagues into an 1,100 acre farm, all tax forfeit land. I was producing birch with tree foil as seed crop . . . thought I was a millionaire. I came home from church one Sunday and my then wife, Vina, said, "You're going to have a call from Dr. Harrison and his only message is 'Tell Bill to listen.'"

CAC: Hmmm.

WH: So, I listened. He said, "You're going to get an invitation from the department head tomorrow. Listen. Come out, and be interviewed, and see what happens." The story is that Michigan had just signed with the Rockefeller brothers to go into Colombia, Medellín . . . interesting . . . Medellín today has all the wrong connotations.

CAC: You bet, yes.

WH: It was a very agricultural community and we were to help them set up a training program there. They looked back through the records. Who had the courses that Herb Pettigrove taught? Now, my master's was a B-plan master's, not a thesis master's; so, I took courses, wrote star papers, etcetera. That was a wonderful experience because I went into areas that I hadn't even thought I'd be interested in. I was the only one that had taken his courses. He taught an undergraduate course but they had a short course program there that went over a period of two years for people who would go out and run country elevators, seed supply, fertilizer, etcetera.

CAC: Right.

WH: My end of it was to do the grain grading because as they had to buy the grain from the farmers . . . that they didn't underpay or overpay.

CAC: Sure.

WH: I was also given the responsibility of setting up a seed laboratory to show different kinds of equipment. This was wonderful because I was, as I said, in the birchwood tree foil business but used somebody else to process our seed here. Now, we got industry to cooperate, and give us equipment, set it up—prototypes and also large stuff. When I was back there this summer, I visited that. I mean it's a fantastic program today.

CAC: You went to Colombia?

WH: No, I didn't go to Colombia.

CAC: I see.

WH: Pettigrove went to Colombia. I went back to Michigan State and worked on my Ph.D.

CAC: Okay.

WH: I taught, and did my own research, set up this seed laboratory, did field inspections of seed and then to Dr. Harrison's—who continued to be my mentor—chagrin, I took on the crop's judging team. He thought I was nuts. This is how I came to Minnesota.

CAC: This is early versatility?

WH: Yes and this is how I came to Minnesota . . . Dr. Laddie Elling was the one that was the coach for Minnesota. Laddie had just, maybe, had his degree two or three years, and we got talking one night at supper, and so he was interested. Then the next year, I came and was here at the Minneapolis Grain Exchange and he said, "How you doing on jobs?" I said, "I've been out. I've interviewed four places." He said, "Do you know, there's an Extension agronomist position open here?" I said, "No, I didn't know that." "God," he said, "I'm sure we sent this to all the universities." To make a long story short, I went back to Michigan State and found out that, yes, the position announcement had been sent. The department head wanted me to stay at Michigan State and so had told the secretary, "Stick it in the drawer." Laddie, working with Will Meyers who was the head of the department, and Roland Abraham who was at the time was assistant director of Extension, arranged that I would come back. I went through three days of interview. These were in the days when you didn't have big search committees, and this, that, and the other thing. [laughter] I went around and saw everybody. I can recall one situation, meeting J. O. Christianson who was head of Plant Pathology, kind of a crusty guy.

CAC: He did a lot of radio work, didn't he?

WH: Yes. Laddie introduced me to him and I said, "I'm very pleased to meet you." He says, "Why?" I said, "Well, my mother said when people are older, you should say that."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: He and I ended up being pretty good friends. The other one was Joe Macy who, of course, was the dean. He was the last I saw. Joe said, "I've read your credentials. I like everything except where you're from." Now, in those days on my vita, I had "born in Brooklyn" because that was still [unclear]. I thought holy god! that was a mistake. It turns out that he grew up also in the Hudson Valley—I had indicated that my family had this home in Green County which is across the river—so that was his point.

CAC: Bill, I'm going to interrupt. How do you account for this versatility of a young kid? You're taking on all kinds of different things all the time. Is it part of the curiosity that you were talking about earlier?

WH: Yes, I think so. If my wife was sitting here, she'd say, "He still does."

CAC: So, it's a personality character trait from the very beginning?

WH: Yes.

CAC: My best graduate students have that same kind of range and are always asking the questions. Some of them do become kind of smart alecky, too.

WH: Yes.

CAC: Yes.

WH: Carter then kind of leaned on me to work with my fellow graduate students, his students; and he'd say, "Would you go and have lunch with so and so? My god! he'll be here until he's a hundred years old."

CAC: [laughter] [unclear]

WH: He told us, too. I had two years to get my course work, my own research done, and so on, because Pettigrove was on a two year assignment. I came to Minnesota in June of 1957 with all my course work done—Spanish out of the way; I still had German to do—all the data collected for my thesis; but under the rules at Michigan State, Carter had to have somebody go over and back register me in courses that I'd already taken, so I didn't get my degree till 1959. I wrote my thesis while I was here.

CAC: What was your thesis, Bill?

WH: It dealt with plant population in forages and how that impacted on quality. Then I continued to do that work. I came here as Extension agronomist. That first year, I took all the county meetings because I wanted to get acquainted but, again, hollow belly was a problem in Minnesota. Minnesota was a big dairy state. It was fourth at that time; we're sixth or seventh now and that's another story. [laughter] That's what I'm working on today to keep me out of mischief, trying to get us back into the [unclear]. That was an agreement I had with Roland Abraham when I came. I think I was the fifth or sixth Extension specialist who had a Ph.D. or potentially had the Ph.D. At that time, they used to just take good county agents, bring them in here, get them a master's degree, and then they became specialists.

CAC: Yes.

WH: I said, "I've put too much time and effort in this. I want to do research." Well, Extension doesn't do research. I found out that you could so I went out begged, borrowed and stole money—I didn't steal any—but I convinced people that there is a need for field research; and although at that time, we had ten branch experiment stations, that was pretty much controlled by the local superintendent and the people in the departments. Now, interestingly enough, I was an agronomist but my first appointment at the University of Minnesota was not in the Department of Agronomy, it was in Extension. I was housed in Agronomy. I could tell you stories there that I've had lots of fun with, especially when I moved into administration, where I would come to a staff meeting on Monday mornings when Will Meyers would have them and the guys would just kind of raise up in their chairs and they would say, "You're Extension. You're supposed to be out on the road. What are you doing here?"

CAC: [laughter]

WH: I said, "Look, if I'm going to represent you guys . . ." "We don't need you to represent us! We can do it ourselves!"—which they didn't do very well. For five years, we just had a ball and when I say "a ball," it was kind of attacking some Brahmins, if you will, people who had said, "You don't do it this way." They, of course, had all been Minnesota trained, all their degrees, and I felt pretty feisty, you know. You end up where you have the responsibility of handing out money to people; and so I used to put some of those guys under pretty tough . . . and I don't think I was vindictive, I just think that they got away with murder for years, got the money, did very little—but we weren't talking a lot of money either. That's kind of how it all came about.

CAC: Is Crookston and Waseca in the picture here, now you're in Minnesota? How do they relate to St. Paul?

WH: All right. At that time, Morris, Crookston, Grand Rapids, and Waseca were Schools of Agriculture. They were high schools.

CAC: High schools, you bet.

WH: This, of course, goes back to James Hill. He was enamored by the idea of the *Volksschule* in Germany and northern Europe.

CAC: That was a good model for a long time.

WH: It was. Bernie Youngquist who lives in your building . . .

CAC: I interviewed him.

WH: You did, okay. His thesis was on What is the future of these schools?

CAC: Right.

WH: He was the one who kind of set the tone. While Ted Fenske was alive, my guess would be, this would not have happened . . . to make the shift. Ted, as you may recall, had been long time superintendent at Morris . . . as a matter of fact, had asked me to go there. When my wife and I went there for the interview, we drove into Morris—she was a New York City girl also—she just said, "You can turn around." Rod Briggs, at that time, was superintendent of the experiment station.

CAC: Heavens, yes.

WH: And someone else had the school . . . I guess, Ralph Smith. The reason I was there for being interviewed is they were beginning to talk about Morris as an extended campus of the university but it would just be two years.

CAC: Back up just a second. How do you see the transformation of those high schools, secondary schools for agriculture? What forces were operating there in the 1950s?

WH: Let's put it this way, the major support for what became the College of Agriculture, or the Institute of Ag[riculture], Forestry and Home Economics, came out of the graduates of these old Schools of Agriculture and the School of Agriculture on the St. Paul campus. Those were the people. They became legislators. They became the leaders in agriculture across the state, across the region. Many of them went on and got bachelor's degrees, master's, and Ph.D.s. Some of them went to Washington.

CAC: Is the sense that they weren't fulfilling a proper function anymore, that there wasn't a need for that type [unclear]?

WH: When they were established, there was no vocational ag program in the high schools. So when I came here, an outsider looking at this, I thought, this is nuts. Here is a vocational ag program right in Crookston and two miles down the block is this high school—which covered all of northwest Minnesota.

CAC: Yes.

WH: Now, it had some advantages in that it was a six-month program. In those days, farm kids were still needed at home in the spring, in the fall.

CAC: You bet.

WH: They are not anymore. I mean, you put the crop in in a couple of weeks and you harvest it in a couple of weeks. It lasted too long. When you think of it, that Waseca was started . . .

let's see . . . anyway, it started long after the need for these programs. It was a political decision.

CAC: Our community colleges are state colleges later. There's a real investment in the local province.

WH: Sure. I can remember in the legislature, not Fenske now because he had died . . . Ted Fenske was on his way to the last high school commencement at Morris when he made the turn there at Paynesville—every time I go through Paynesville, I recall that situation—he just kind of keeled over and that was it. He was under tremendous pressure. He badly wanted to be the dean of the Institute of Ag, Forestry and Home Economics. He had been the associate dean. He was kind of Joe Macy's right hand man.

CAC: How old a man was he then?

WH: Oh, god! he couldn't have been sixty. He wasn't sixty, I'm sure.

CAC: Okay.

WH: Joe went all to pieces and that's how I got to work with . . . As a matter of fact, Keith McFarland, the director of resident instruction, and I were asked to go to the legislature to kind of keep things together. It was toward the close of the session in March.

CAC: This is March of what year now?

WH: This would have been 1963. I had just come in the experiment station the year before.

CAC: Okay.

WH: We were having a search for a dean. The end result out of that search was Woodie Berg. Sherwood Berg became the dean of the institute. He had been head of [unclear]. The schools of agriculture for the state of Minnesota were a very vital force for the agriculture of the state. It provided lots of leadership. When I came, I had the mental image of the schools in New York, you know Alfred, and there were five others that were part of the State University. The thing that really always concerned me was that the branch stations were here but they weren't really tied back to the St. Paul campus. There was, what do you say, almost a treaty arrangement. The superintendents were almost all-powerful and Ted kind of fostered that. But Dr. Sloan brought me into the experiment station, primarily, to build the bridge between the stations' research program and the departments. Why me? I remember asking that question.

CAC: You went from Extension to . . .

WH: To be the assistant director of the experiment station.

CAC: How many experiment stations?

WH: At that time, there were ten.

CAC: Okay.

WH: It boiled down to the fact that I had gotten to know department heads in the other areas because of interaction, and they thought that Sloan wasn't going to do it, that certainly Fenske would not because he saw that as a break up of his empire; and here was a guy that had come in from someplace else, had gotten to know the people of the state. So, it goes back to what you've already commented on. I like people.

CAC: This work in Extension gave you leverage all through the state.

WH: It did.

CAC: Yes.

WH: And I had ideas but I was perfectly willing to listen to other people's ideas. When Fenske passed away that made it a lot easier because I can recall saying to him, "Now, you know, Dr. Sloan wants me to bring the stations more into the total research program." He said, "Yes, I do." I said, "You're in favor of it?" He said, "You don't think you'd be in this job if I wasn't." I mean he was a crusty guy. Really the man had such a heart of gold but he had these cold steel blue eyes and scared the hell out of most people.

CAC: [laughter]

WH: The day I went in to tell him I was not going to go to Morris, I was scared to death. I thought he'd blow my damn head off, and instead he sat in his chair, and he said, "I've never been turned down by anybody." Again, we became very good friends. Then when he had to go through an interview to become the dean of the institute, that damn near killed the man. I'm not so sure that isn't what killed him. He said this to me, "Don't people understand me . . . what I've done for this place?"

CAC: How do you answer that rhetorical question?

WH: How do you at thirty-seven years old tell the guy, that you have to have considerable respect for, that you never tried to sell yourself to anybody; although, he'd been a governor candidate, I understand.

CAC: Heavens.

WH: He had been the governor of Kiwanis, I think it was. He was viewed by the faculty as one cold fish. The other thing is . . . I guess this is what you want?

CAC: Oh, yes. It's the informal part of all these things.

WH: When, finally, it sorted out that I would be the one then who would now do the work at the legislature . . .

CAC: You took that on real fast . . . by 1962, 1963?

WH: Well, 1963, but actually, it was not until the 1964 session that I really became involved.

CAC: But at representing the whole St. Paul campus?

WH: Yes, but also the university.

CAC: Including the experimental stations and the Extension?

WH: To be there. Extension would go. The experiment stations were started in 1887, and in the charter that established them, it says that the director shall come to the legislature and request the funds. The director will report to the legislature the use of the funds. So, when I came into this office that was part of my responsibility, to write up what the results were of what we call GAR funds, General Agriculture Research. I'll tell you, that fund continued as a separate fund until, maybe, five or six years ago.

CAC: A special legislative appropriation?

WH: Yes. The university has collapsed all of this in. Whether it was done with legislative approval or not, I have no idea because I'm out of the loop in that sense.

CAC: There used to be a good number of us as legislative specialists, so-called [unclear].

WH: Yes. There were forty-seven. Ray Amberg was the . . .

CAC: Hospital.

WH: But he was the leader of the lobby group, the legislative representation.

CAC: Ah! Okay. You had to be a team?

WH: We were a team.

CAC: Tell me how that worked. Ray was kind of the unofficial chairman of the group?

WH: He was official chairman. I'm sure Morrill had given him that responsibility.

CAC: All right.

WH: Then when Met Wilson came, that continued. Then after Ray Amberg left, [Stan] Wenberg was given that responsibility. When Wenberg left, Stan Kegler. I never saw anything but all I was told is "You don't do anything unless you check with Ray Amberg."

CAC: What others were part of that team then?

WH: Neal Gault was. He was dean of medicine.

CAC: Still dean and not vice-president yet?

WH: No, Galt never became vice-president.

CAC: Okay.

WH: He was always just dean. It was in 1967 then that they brought Lyle French in as a vice-president. Essentially, Wennberg was around the fringes. He was a part of it but it was always Ray Amberg. My recollection is—I've shared this just recently because I knew you and I were going to be talking—in 1963 when Keith and I were asked to kind of fill in this little interim period . . .

CAC: That's Keith McFarland?

WH: Keith McFarland. . . . sitting one night—and again, I'm not a patient soul and I'm still not—I thought my god! we made this presentation. What the hell is taking them so long, rahr, rahr, rahr. I'm kind of griping about this and Ray Amberg, he just says, "Come on, sit down here." So we sat on one of those cold marble slabs called a bench and he said, "Are you serious about this work?" I said, "What do you mean, am I serious?" "Well," he said, "if you're going to represent the St. Paul campus, you better be serious." Then he starts to tell me about Fenske. I said, "Is it Doctor Amberg?" He said, "Yes." Of course, he was the head of the hospital.

CAC: He was a medical doctor, sure.

WH: But he was a doctor but I didn't know. I said, "I don't know. Joe Macy has just asked McFarland and I. Keith's handling some things and I'm handling some things; so, I don't know whether I'm going to do this." "Well," he said, "let me give you a little advice. If you're the one, take it seriously because it is serious. Number two, don't ever let a legislator know you think he's a damn fool."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: "Number three, don't argue with him in a hearing."

CAC: Ah.

WH: "But if you disagree, then go to their office, and talk to them, and talk to them, and talk to them until they agree."

CAC: That was good training. [laughter]

WH: Now, Clarke, that was the best advice an older experienced person could give to somebody who thought I got this . . . So then when push came to shove, more or less, Joe Macy was now out of the loop; he had retired. Whether he made the recommendation to Woodie Berg or Todd did, whatever, I ended up being the one then—because of the experiment station, I'm pretty sure.

CAC: Excuse me. The legislative assignment was really in addition to the other things you are doing?

WH: Oh, sure.

CAC: And it wasn't only the three or four months then of the session?

WH: Oh, no.

CAC: You had to visit these folks a great deal?

WH: Of course, that was again a strength because I had to be out in the state anyway. I would guess, that until 1975 or 1974, when I became vice-president, that I had been in every legislator's town, had visited them at their farm, or their place of business, or whatever it may be because that was just the nature of my job.

CAC: Of course.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

CAC: . . . the variety of the assignments you have, but chiefly now in 1963 until . . .

WH: Really, I did this until I retired.

CAC: In 1982?

WH: Or left it and retired.

CAC: You have lots of other things to do but the legislative assignment was a major one?

WH: To me, it was very important. Essentially, you see what I said there, we went from, in 1964, a research budget from all sources of about \$3.6 million to, ten years later, \$36 million from all sources.

CAC: How much of that was from state appropriations?

WH: By that time the experiment station budget from the state was, probably, \$16, \$17 [million].

CAC: Where do you make up the rest of it?

WH: From grants and contracts.

CAC: It's federal government grants?

WH: Yes, well, the Hatch Act was the basis of establishing and then I really insisted that our faculty—most of them wanted to do it anyway—write outside grant proposals. Traditionally, NSF, the National Science Foundation [NSF], would always say, "Send it over to USDA [United States Department of Agriculture]." Then I got on the National Science Foundation Board and got them out of the mode of thinking that our research was not . . .

CAC: Basic.

WH: We had a lot of basic but that it wasn't reviewed, that it wasn't peer reviewed; it was peer reviewed. There's a system within that where every three years a department is reviewed by outside scientists who come in, review the research, make recommendations, etcetera.

CAC: Were private research foundations part of that loop at all . . . Rockefeller, for example?

WH: Rockefeller. We had money from the Hill Family Foundation at that time, from many of the agricultural cooperatives, from the bull studs, the work of Ed Graham. The majority of his research on semen extenders . . . in the old days the semen was not frozen. Now, we freeze it. We even freeze embryos. But it was Ed Graham's initial work that was funded by these bull studs. The sources of money were varied. We had income from the branch stations. I think, if you would take all of the land that the university operated, the number of dairy cows we had, sheep, hogs, etcetera, we were probably the largest farmer in the state of Minnesota but we didn't market as a single unit. We marketed at Crookston. We marketed at Morris and so on. I can remember one time with Ray Faricy, who by this time had become the chairman of the Education Appropriations in the House, he was very concerned that every session I came into the legislature asking for more money. Let me back up here a little bit. We had always heard on the campus that Ted Fenske was a powerful guy with the legislature. He got anything he wanted. So, of

course, I didn't know anything about how the requests were put together. The first year, Todd said to me, "Kind of work up a budget that you think we ought to have in the Plant Science, and the Rural Sociology, and Ag[riculture]-Econ[omics] because he was handling the animals. He was doing the Poultry, and the Animal Science, and so on. So, I came in with a budget increase and really well documented, put together by people who felt that we needed to do more. It was something like \$170,000. He said, "Bill, we've never asked for more than \$50,000." I said, "Fifty thousand dollars? Todd, that isn't even inflation. What are we running here? I think it's our responsibility, you and me, the director of Extension, and so on, to go to the legislature." He said, "You don't go to the legislature before you go to the regents." I said, "Well, damn it! let's go to the regents."

CAC: Did you have to go through [Bill] Middlebrook, as vice-president for Finance, essentially?

WH: No, I thought it was [Larry] London. Was Middlebrook first? My contacts were mainly with London. No, because this was an academic program . . .

CAC: The stories I've heard from others earlier, suggest that Middlebrook for Agriculture was a key figure.

WH: That's interesting.

CAC: Now, maybe, he had withdrawn, retired, by the time you got into this.

WH: Yes, must be.

CAC: His influence was so enormous that that was the contact . . . not whoever the president was, whether it was Morrill or Wilson.

WH: Larry London was the one.

CAC: Larry London didn't have the panache that Middlebrook had.

WH: No. But it always seemed to me that we had to convince the academic vice-president. If you've interviewed Gerry Shepherd, you know Gerry and I used to do some terrible battles because Woodie Berg wouldn't battle. [laughter] One time, we went into Washington, and I didn't know he was going in, and he didn't know I was. We got our seats next to one another. I thought, geez! two and one-half hours, What the hell are we going to talk about? He suggested he'd buy me a drink and in the course of that conversation, he said, "I wish you and I didn't fight as much. But I understand why you do it."

CAC: He was a pretty assertive fellow himself.

WH: He was.

CAC: You bet. A good person.

WH: He said to me, "What irritates me most about you, you never let me finish what I'm saying." I said, "I know exactly what you're going to say."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: Geez! that really put a . . . I really did, I felt that was my job. Before regents' meetings, in those days—and this kind of leads into that citizen legislature . . . maybe, we can talk about that separately later—they had these House and Senate building committees and so they went to every facility that the university had.

CAC: Sure.

WH: Who had most of the facilities? We did. So, there was probably not a month out of the year, Clarke, that we weren't meeting with legislators. Okay, then the local regent, you know, they're not at each place. [Herman] Skyberg was the regent up at Crookston for years and Skyberg was a farmer. Then he was a good friend of Dick Fitzsimmons. And Dick Fitzsimmons was the chairman of Appropriations. I can remember Skyberg inviting Dick Fitzsimmons to his house just to visit with me because I had gotten to him and I said, "This is ridiculous. The things that we could be doing in Minnesota if we could just get the attention of the regents and the legislature."

CAC: The legislators you're naming now are outstate?

WH: Yes, outstate, but I would tell you . . .

CAC: And they are, primarily, Republican at that time in the 1960s?

WH: Yes, I would think so . . .

CAC: The party didn't make any difference?

WH: . . . but to me it didn't make any difference. You have to talk to them all. They all are part of making a decision.

CAC: I'm raising the question because others have noted that when the DFL gains majorities in the 1970s that things change as far as the university is concerned.

WH: We got our best support, I have to tell you, after the rural legislators lost some of their power.

CAC: I see. Let's pursue that.

WH: My analysis of it was because the rural legislators say, "Oh, well, you better get it now." I can remember John Olson saying to me one time, "You better get everything you want because when these other guys take over, they're not even going to give you the time of day." The change was, now they became professional legislators.

CAC: It happens at the same time . . . DFL majorities and the [unclear]?

WH: Kind of. They had staff. You were dealing in those earlier years with some people who had had business experience. Today, I think, some kid walks in off the street and decides he wants to be a legislator but, I mean, this is in the 1970s and they had some good people. Again, you can keep your own counsel on this but you really had to talk to all of them.

CAC: Sure.

WH: And I did. So, I spent a lot of time down there.

CAC: You could sell the issues that you were interested in with equal effectiveness in the urban legislators?

WH: Maybe, more so.

CAC: Why?

WH: I used the same examples myself. The farm kids fought with the faculty, with the professors at Cornell. We don't do it this way at the farm. The professor would say, "That's not why you're here." When I was at Alfred, I would go and make visits to my students; and their fathers would say to me, "You know, I didn't send my kid down there to come home and tell me what we're doing wrong." I'd say, "What did you send him down there for?"

CAC: [laughter]

WH: That was the same thing.

CAC: Yes.

WH: These very conservative farm legislators—loved them, they're wonderful people—when we asked for a building . . . I would agree the building cost too much but it was because of all the hands in the university that had to touch it. We had to build farm buildings at Crookston to code just like you would here in Minneapolis because that's the way Roy Lund thought it ought to be done.

CAC: Ah.

WH: He was Plant Service.

CAC: Right.

WH: I loved the guy. I used to tell him, "Don't ever cross the street when it's too dark" but we had a lot of good times together.

CAC: [laughter]

WH: I think we were dealing with people that didn't have this background. They were really exhilarated by this *science* of a business and that's what I sold them. I told them about how we turn out varieties that, maybe at most, cost \$100,000 to develop; and in the first year that they're accepted by the farming community, they'll be on a million acres of land and that's like \$16 million. I don't have any of that stuff here. The reporting was so stilted so I came up with this idea, let's make . . . What's the economic impact? I changed the format of the experiment station form for people to ask for research. They had to tell me what the economic impact of this research would be and what the social impact would be. A lot of them wrote back, called up, What the hell are you asking me that for? I'm not a social scientist. I'm an agronomist. I said, "For this purpose, you'd better be because we're asking people. They've got lots of demands for the money. They need to know. I need to know." Then, to really put the burden, I said to the department heads, "I'm going to read all of the individual research reports but I want you . . ." I was finding out when they would come over and talk to me, here they are sitting here . . . Hell, I had that. I wanted to know what they, as the department head, were thinking were some of the important things. So, then they started to do this resume. Out of the resume, then I started to do this report to the legislature, about this thick, that had all of these things in.

CAC: And the urban legislators were as interested and engaged in this as the rural?

WH: Sure. Now, this bothered Wenberg to the extent that he'd say . . .

CAC: By now Wenberg is the chief among equals?

WH: He said, "Other parts of the university don't do it." I said, "They should." Why shouldn't the Medical School? They haul all this money out of here. Why shouldn't they make a report? I said, "Just because this was what it was back in the early 1900s, that isn't the kind of era we're living in." I set it up on crops, animal, and so on. You change the protein ration for hogs, for example . . . A pig today is no more like a pig was thirty years ago. It was genetic research but it was mainly nutrition.

CAC: Yes.

WH: They are lean. Why? Because we feed more protein than we do fat or corn, etcetera. Well, let people know that . . .

CAC: [laughter]

WH: . . . and what this means in economic gain.

CAC: Bill, you're starting out from scratch with that. There are very few people who understand agriculture at all and they think a hog's a hog for the last 500 years. That must have been a hard sell.

WH: It was. It still is. The state of Minnesota, the state of Wisconsin, both leaders in dairy, have let the dairy industry move to the southwest into the state of California. The state of California average per cow is over 20,000 pounds of milk. The average for our two states is about 14,500. The average for our herd is 29,000.

CAC: Both genetics and nutrition?

WH: Yes, but it's mainly the management, the nutrition. So, it's still hard. I have neighbors who just think the only reason we make it is it's some rich guy that lives in the city. The farm after fourteen months was on its own.

CAC: Does Stan Wenberg appreciate what you were suggesting and did the other units move all toward this way?

WH: I think he did. But the others basically didn't. Actually, at one time, this was I think, when Peter was the president . . .

CAC: This is Peter Magrath?

WH: Yes. Peter Magrath, I'm sorry. And of course, now I'm deputy vice-president, whatever that was. I remember we had a meeting there in the regents' room suggesting that we were going to open up the opportunity for other places to go to the legislature, like the IT [Institute of Technology], and so on. Dick Swalin was the dean then and Dick just said, "I don't need to go to the legislature for money. I have all the money I need." Dick called the [unclear] said, "I don't need to go to the legislature for money. We can get all the money we want from NSF." So, essentially, what they were saying, "The hell, if that's what those guys want to do . . ."

CAC: But then, they had other sources of funding?

WH: They did. Of course—you read the paper just as I do—the legislature thinks they provide all the money to the university. They only provide 23 percent of it. To me, that's where the big battle is in this day and age. I'm not sure we explained well the total sources of the money that the university got but we worked at it. Again, I'm out of the loop so I don't know what they're doing but when Nils comes in, or anybody comes in, with the notion that we're close to a \$2 billion budget . . . What the hell do you need more money for? What they really ought to say,

"Fellows, this is the money we have from you guys but we parlay it into this much from private gifts, through the foundation, from this, and this, and this. And the only reason we're able to do it is that we're able to keep a base. We keep the laboratories open. We do this. You've provided that for us. We thank you. But keep in mind, in addition to all the things we are, we're a major research university. That's an asset to the state of Minnesota."

CAC: I'm going to make a statement that has a question mark at the end. The Health Sciences, and Engineering, and the hard sciences—Physics, Chemistry, Chemical Engineering and so forth—did in fact from the late 1950s through the mid 1970s have as much as they needed for their research budgets from the federal government and associated foundations? That's a question. That is correct?

WH: That is correct. But it had strings attached which a lot of people fail to remember. I can remember trying to move some of our research, like in Ag-Econ. Agricultural law is kind of a special area because it has a very large dimension of biology in it. I mean, much of this environmental law is not made by people who have a biology background. It's made by people who have a law background and social studies, I'm not against social studies and these things, but if you're going to make laws that affect, impact a biological system—and that's what agriculture is—then by god! you better know what you're talking about. When [Carl] Auerbach was there and even Bob Stein . . .

CAC: That's the Law School?

WH: Law School . . . suggested, Why don't we have a joint program in Ag-Law? It didn't develop. About the time I was leaving the university, this young guy, Steve [Young] . . . it will come to me . . . goes to Hamline. I met him at a cocktail party. We got talking. They have Ag-Law now. The university could have had that program. It's a specialized area. It's a very specialized area but very critical. The very thing that you mentioned when you first came in here today, this whole matter of Kinnickinnic [River]. Okay, from your standpoint, that has to be preserved. I want to see it preserved but at what cost to the industry that's been there? So there's got to be a balance. The whole idea of enlarging livestock operations, that's a very big cost. The first thing you need to do is look at the environmental impacts before you even talk about buildings or anything else. You talk to farm people about that and they think their rights are being violated because for years, they did almost what they wanted.

CAC: It's still the prevailing ideology in Pierce County, let me tell you, as you know. It's your land, do what you want.

WH: Yes. That's dumb, too. We're going to get far more by joining the group than by sitting on the outside and fighting it because we are fewer numbers. Well, just this year, five houses have been built across from our farm. I tried to buy that land, not because it was good farm land, but just for protection. Now, the question, eventually, we're going to have to ask ourselves,

do we join them and go into the housing business, go back to what I tried to get away from seventy years ago, or fifty years [unclear] ago from my dad? [laughter] Who knows?

CAC: Have you looked into the land trust arrangement in the state of Wisconsin?

WH: Oh, sure.

CAC: Okay.

WH: Clarke, for whatever it's worth, I feel that I was one of the more fortunate people that worked at the university. Sure, I did my share of griping but when you think of the opportunities . . . I know when the position was created for deputy vice-president, this was not my idea, it was the idea of our Advisory Council who . . .

CAC: But there was by then a vice-president and then there's going to be a deputy vice-president?

WH: No. It was a vice-president for Health Sciences. Mr. [Malcolm] Moos was not in favor of this.

CAC: All right.

WH: His compromise was to be a deputy. Now, it was Peter Magrath who hired me and Peter says, "Eventually, I'm going to change that to a vice-president." I said, "You don't have to for me." I said, "You should understand why I was a candidate for this position." I had talked against it while the Advisory Council was pushing it. But it prevailed. They brought four candidates in. Mentally, I was going to stay until the thing got settled out and then probably go someplace else . . . that was my thought at the time. I was already embroiled in a battle with my wife, then wife, because I was married to the university. We ended up getting a divorce, eventually. That's hard to believe, twenty-two years ago.

I can remember, I went to Binghamton to be interviewed by Peter because he was the president there. At supper that night he said—it was just he, and Sandy, and myself in their house—"Tell me how you understand this deputy vice-president." I played dumb. I said, "What do you mean, how I understand it?" He said, "Why isn't it a full vice-presidency?" I said, "It's something Mr. Moos feels he got backed into a corner." I know he was. It was done by people . . . one guy who is ninety-nine years old now, Norris Carnes, who was chairman of the Advisory Council. Elmer Andersen got involved in it. He was chairman of the Board of Regents.

CAC: Why did they want it?

WH: Because they felt that agriculture was that important and it ought to have a stronger status, more involvement with the central decision making . . . had the contacts out here and so on. My

feeling had always been if Woodie Berg had done more battle with Gerry Shepherd and if I hadn't had to do it, and so on . . . Gerry was still the vice-president; so, I'm sure he had a big part in saying, "Well, damn it, if we're going to have this, at least not a full vice-president." Peter says—so we talk about this—to me, "How do you feel about deputy?" I said, "I'm not a military person but a lieutenant colonel isn't called lieutenant."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: And most of the time, Clarke, I have to tell you, I was introduced as Vice-President Hueg.

CAC: Sure.

WH: When Peter first came, I spent a lot of time . . .

CAC: There's no thought of there being an aesthetic balance between the vice-presidents for Health Sciences and the St. Paul . . .

WH: There were. Sure, there were by the part of our Advisory Council people. The academic vice-president is not an equal. If you ever wanted to see battle, all you had to do was sit there and watch Lyle French and Gerry Shepherd spar with one another—and more so when [Henry] Koffler came.

CAC: I see.

WH: Lyle was Lyle. He kept his own counsel pretty much or with the president. What do I want to bother with these people for? Then it bothered him when Wennberg would say, or Kegler would say, "Damn it, Lyle, you're out of line." But I got told that, too. [laughter] It was an interesting time. I think of this often, here was Nils . . . what was his job? . . . vice-president—which was a no job. I can remember sitting in Peter's office . . .

CAC: [unclear] miscellaneous portfolios?

WH: The job was created because Peter Magrath brought Walt Bruining here because Walt Bruining was his friend at Nebraska.

CAC: I see.

WH: Then Walt helped Peter in those beginning years. He was as abrasive as any sandpaper in the world but he was a smart guy, and he knew computers, and he ends up at Control Data. At that time, it was discussed, drop the damn position. We have too many administrative positions now but Peter insisted. So, it was Bob Stein. Then it was Nils. Or it was Nils and then Bob Stein. Then Al Link. They are no jobs. It's a no job job.

CAC: It's good training ground for persons who wish to be something better and higher? I mean, Mr. Stein was not lacking in ambition and neither was Nils.

WH: Oh, no, no. Or Al Link. Al went out to Colorado. That was part of my problem, I used to tell people what I thought and some people like to hear it, or accepted it, or dealt with it but . . .

CAC: But you took your chances?

WH: . . . but Peter did not like you to suggest that he couldn't make decisions—which he couldn't.

CAC: Yes.

WH: I've never kidded myself why I left the university. Actually sitting right here on that couch with our good friend [Ken] Keller, I said, "If I'd known Peter was going to go in six months, I'd have been a little more patient." And he said, "But there's no guarantee I would have kept you as vice-president." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

WH: Ken and I were good friends. He did it just to see what would happen, I'm sure . . . but he may not have, you know. I never kidded myself . . .

CAC: How widely was it perceived that Mr. Magrath was having difficulty making sharp decisions in a reasonable time?

WH: Oh, I think most of the deans. We used to have these weekly dean meetings . . .

CAC: Weekly?

WH: Yes. I think it was weekly, maybe, it was every other week—more than we needed. We kind of came to the conclusion the best part was that we got pretty sandwiches because the agenda was nothing. We had, every Tuesday morning at the St. Paul campus dining room, vice-president meetings. No agenda.

CAC: Mr. Magrath presiding?

WH: Presiding when he got there but he got there when he damn well felt like it. One morning, I wrote him out a little slip and I said, "Peter, on average, this has cost the taxpayers of the state of Minnesota this much." He just stuck it in his pocket. When it was over, he took me off in the corner and he said, "Don't you ever write me thing like that." I said, "Well, I'd like to suggest to you, if it's important that we all be here, you be here. And secondly, that we have

an agenda. I don't want to sit here and talk about NCAA [National Collegiate Athletic Association] and all this crap." Then I stopped coming to his meetings, and I'd get a telephone call, and I'd say, "I'm sorry, I had to be out in the state." "Yes, but you know we have these meetings." I said, "I'm sure the meeting went fine without me." Then, I got to the point where—because he had to touch everything—I said, "This is something I'm going to do. If I don't hear from you in ten days, I'll proceed." So, I proceeded on most of them because I never heard from him. I was my own worst enemy in relationship with him because he could not come back to you but he did in the paycheck and things like this. Now, this sounds like sour grapes. It isn't. It's something that was going on at the time. I don't know how he dealt with the others. It wasn't my place to worry about it.

CAC: Sure.

WH: I was not one to sit on the bench and say to Kegler, "Geez! I don't like this. I don't like that." Kegler would make his comments but he always did it in kind of a humorous way; so I think Peter never was quite sure whether it was Kegler's cynicism or . . . and it was a little bit of both.

CAC: Half in jest and whole in earnest.

WH: Yes.

CAC: In the meantime, as deputy vice-president, you have also to govern the St. Paul campus, Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics?

WH: And the branch stations and Extension.

CAC: Did you have Mr. Inside to help you with that or an assistant?

WH: I had initially Vern Freeh.

CAC: Yes.

WH: Let's now go back to 1971 when we created what we called the New Institute. Woodie Berg was involved in that.

CAC: Which is Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics at that time?

WH: It had always been but now this was kind of an over arching entity.

CAC: Let's talk about that now.

WH: Agriculture was such a big part of the total in those early years. Home Economics did not have strong leadership. Forestry, okay, but not great. Frank Kaufert, wonderful, wonderful guy but Frank wasn't out to build a big institution. He had wonderful relations with industry. Louise Stedman was not a strong administrator. When I became the director of the experiment station in 1966, one of the first things I did was to ask Louise to appoint somebody up there to kind of handle research. Initially, of course, she was insulted. She could do that. She couldn't. Lois Lund was the one who was first asked. Then she went on to Ohio to be the dean there. There were areas there . . . they had this Family Social Science. They had always had good nutrition research.

CAC: Yes.

WH: We had just now put together the Food Science . . .

CAC: That whole same design program was pretty strong, too, in the country.

WH: Yes, but it was not a lot of research and there was a lot more that could have been done. To make a long story short, we expanded that. Louise was out of the picture. We did away essentially with then the old College of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics. We set up a College of Agriculture. We set up a College of Home Economics and a College of Forestry.

CAC: All right. Administratively?

WH: Administratively equal but the experiment stations still running their research program and Keith was happy about that because that was not his strength. Keith is a teacher, a counselor, etcetera. So, he was very happy with that arrangement. In Forestry, Kaufert had a good research background. He had worked for Dupont. He had all kinds of patents so he was pushing that. In Agriculture, I had an assistant director who worked then with the branch stations when I became the director. You know, hindsight . . . I probably never was completely fair to him because I still had that interest. He would come in and report this to me, and that, and so on; but I would try to stay away from these places but the superintendents wanted me to come. I had to do the legislative end yet. Eventually, I did away with that.

Now, I get asked to be the vice-president. As I've already said, I was not a candidate but when I saw the four people that they brought in, I thought, okay. So, I put my pride in my pocket, called up Alec Hodson, who was the chairman. I said, "Alec, is it too late to change my mind?" "No, but," he said, "let me have twenty-four hours to think about it." What, of course, he wanted to do was to talk to the committee.

CAC: Sure.

WH: He called me up at my home—by then I was living in an apartment out there north of the campus—and he said, "Would you have breakfast with me tomorrow morning?" [unclear] He

said, "Everybody is very pleased. We're scared to death that if you get the job, you will go to Morrill Hall and just raise all kinds of hell." So I had to sit there [unclear]. I said, "Well, I understand . . .

CAC: Why. [laughter]

WH: . . . why because that's what I have been doing but I think you understand why." "That's not the issue. Will you control yourself?" I said, "I guess. Let's see what happens. I'll tell you right now, I will." I think I did. Only once did I take Henry Koffler apart. [laughter] I apologized a hundred times over. It was just one of those situations. But that was the only time.

CAC: Would it be fair to say that Henry was part of the problem with Magrath?

WH: Yes.

CAC: That the decisions were not being made at either place?

WH: Yes. Giving all benefits to everybody, I think when Peter first came, he was very ambitious. He and I spent that first eighteen months going around the state, getting him introduced to people and so on. As a matter of fact, in the way of an introduction, I had our artist there in Information draw up this little cartoon. Here was this little guy with a white hat and here's this big guy with a black hat standing there holding a gun. You could put up there legislature, or people of the state, or whatever, and Magrath was saying, "This here is my deputy." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

WH: We had a lot of fun with it. He seemed to enjoy it. Then he got this Guillaume Barre

CAC: Yes.

WH: And he changed. He absolutely changed.

CAC: I see.

WH: Then he left his wife. In my mind, he became . . .

CAC: But Koffler was not filling his role?

WH: It was, maybe, the first argument Peter and I had. If Henry Koffler thought this place was important enough, why the hell didn't he leave Purdue, come here right away? He dinged us for six months. He stayed there six months and so we had Al Link, my close colleague. He had been assistant director at the experiment station for a time. The faculty just took over. That's

my look at it. More than once, Henry said, "I'd like to make this the Harvard of the Midwest." Clarke, what's wrong with the place as it is? We're supposed to serve the people of the state. That's our job—my opinion. I think we're finally getting there, see? But oh, god! it's been torturous. I think back, it was in the 1960s . . .

CAC: Why do you think that keeps cropping up? It came up with Mr. Keller again.

WH: What's this?

CAC: The metaphor of being a Harvard of the Midwest or being the great research . . . I thought our mission was quite different. Neither of us are faulting research but it's questioning the perception of the mission of the University of Minnesota.

WH: Yes. Of course, if we want to get into that . . . we're off the institute but we'll come back to it. My feeling is that there's enough good higher education in the state of Minnesota that we could back off of some things.

CAC: Oh, sure.

WH: Of course, that was the idea when the Higher Education Coordinating Commission came in but it was doomed to failure just by the people they had at the leadership.

CAC: Well, it had advisory powers only, right?

WH: Advisory powers but a strong person could have made that difference. In the meantime then, we take our state colleges and make them universities. We take our junior colleges and make them community universities, so everything got upgraded. Now, even the old technical institutes are technical colleges.

CAC: This is all happening in the 1970s?

WH: This happened in the 1970s and the 1980s. At the time—you remember—I think it was 1978, or so, that Peter had this study group look at the future directions of the university. It may even be that our friend Gerry Shepherd started it. In there, we said that there were certain areas that we should just be willing to give up. For example, why should we do Remedial Mathematics? Why should we do Remedial English when we have all of these other opportunities for people to do it?

CAC: Sure.

WH: It's much easier for the kids. Now, are we interested in students? Are we interested in our own pocketbook? Well, it's a little of both. My feeling is, we are still there, and maybe, that's one of the reasons that the legislature is not as generous. They are more generous to the

state universities. They are more generous to the community colleges. That's understandable. They are out there. I think, maybe in this respect, we are our own enemy, kind of like "Pogo" says, you know, "I look around and it's a me." [Walter Crawford Kelly cartoon] That's a battle, I'm sure that's going to go on forever.

CAC: Sure. Let's back up a moment, if it's okay with you and talk about the institute internally a bit more.

WH: Sure.

CAC: I have the sense as a lay person that Ag-Econ in Minnesota was always a premiere department.

WH: And still is.

CAC: How does that happen and how does it persist? How does a department build that kind of strength and then maintain it? I mean, you were vice-president. That was your . . .

WH: Yes, but when I was directing the experiment station, I maybe had more influence on it than I did even . . .

CAC: I see.

WH: . . . because you made research money available. I think one of the strengths was that when O. B. Jesness first came here . . . I don't know when that was. It was ancient history.

CAC: Many years ago.

WH: He built a relationship with what was the Department of Economics. I use the analogy of that with what happened between Botany, let's say, and Ag-Botany and/or Agronomy, or so on.

CAC: Okay.

WH: They did things together on a faculty basis but there was not . . .

CAC: But not administratively?

WH: But not administratively. There was not a lot of encouragement. The closest we came was to having a joint curriculum in Plant Physiology. That was part of the strength of Al Link and his interest in that. Then the experiment station put money into other parts of the university. That was our first foray into that. It was an area I felt comfortable [with]. I'm a plant physiologist. But we didn't have too many models after that. But in Ag-Econ, we had no problem of having somebody in Economics signing on to a research project with somebody in

Ag-Econ. The statistics would be the same. There's a lot of statistics, as you know, in Economic [unclear]. Well, instead of not working with the folks over on that side . . . So, I think it's partly that but, mainly, right from the beginning good people were brought into the Department of Ag-Econ. They had high standards. They had high standards for their students, I believe. Then they produced lots of graduate students and went out and populated all the other departments and, of course, that's part of the answer, too. Agronomy has done that.

CAC: As an historian, let me probe just a little bit there. There's no reason you should know this . . . my first writing was in the field of agricultural history. That was taught by John Hicks and Murray Benedict out at Berkeley in this field. I learned from them that the best economists in the country, nationally, were probably agricultural economists—going back to the 1890s and the first part of the twentieth century—and if you want a good government economist, it was in the bureau of agricultural economics that one went. It really wasn't until the 1940s and 1950s . . .

WH: That commerce.

CAC: Yes. Was that an accurate perception?

WH: I think it was, yes.

CAC: This must say something then about the whole profession apart from its department here at . . .

WH: The interesting thing is—at least at Minnesota—Ag-Econ grew out of the Agronomy Department. It was . . . Who had the bank?

CAC: The bank?

WH: St. Anthony Park Bank. Who was the last president there? Andrew Boss. There's another story . . . it's all in the history of the College of Agriculture. He came as a farm boy to the School of Agriculture, stayed on as the plot supervisor, eventually ended up being the head of the St. Paul campus.

CAC: This is Andy's father?

WH: It was his grandfather.

CAC: His grandfather. Okay.

WH: One of the things that concerned him was that farmers did not have a good business sense. They had kind of an idea that you got to make money but they had no idea how to keep records. So, he set up record keeping and, eventually, he then created the Department of Farm

Management—that was the forerunner of Ag-Econ here—about the time that George Warren was setting up the Department of Farm Management at Cornell. What their relationship had been, I would have no way of knowing. I know that Cornell still has a very strong Ag-Econ Department but a very heavy part is farm management. Minnesota has, in my opinion, has kind of let go of some of the strength that they had in farm management at one time and now they're more over into the policy, marketing, and those areas. That's not all bad either.

CAC: That would have happened nationally as well, wouldn't it?

WH: Yes. Cornell, Wisconsin—at least in the dairy area—do some of the best record keeping and we're providing information. After all these years, we still haven't agreed on what are the factors that go into establishing a price of a hundred pounds of milk. I keep saying to farmers that I work with, "We're not going to get a higher price. We have to lower the cost of production." Okay, now, what are the factors that you put in? I know what I put in but Cornell does one thing. Wisconsin does one and we're trying to get a common meeting place so that when we go nationally, we can say, "Your goal should be \$7.50 to \$8.00 a hundred. If milk is at \$12.00, you can't help but make money. If it gets to be \$7.00, you're in trouble. I doubt that you can lower it much."

CAC: Management was taught here within the Agriculture and Economics?

WH: Yes, initially, it was taught in Agronomy but then it was obvious that it should be a separate department.

CAC: It still is?

WH: And it still is, yes.

CAC: Okay. Would this be thought of as more of an applied economics?

WH: Oh, yes. When I came to Minnesota, the Department of Ag-Economics was a Department of Agriculture and Applied Economics. Today, it's just the Department of Ag-Economics.

CAC: Okay.

WH: Of course, we've always kept Rural Sociology separate here. In a lot of institutions, they are together.

CAC: [George] Donahue was in the Sociology Department?

WH: Sociology but he kind of was the titular head of Rural Sociology. Our college never approved the establishment of Rural Sociology as a separate department. In my time, I think as vice-president, we tried to bring together the people in Sociology and Rural Sociology who were

common denominators and put them as a department; but when it came to the transfer of money, Liberal Arts says, "No way." So, it never happened. So, bless it! That's all you can do. Again, the analogy would have been the old Food Science Department—which, initially, was in Haecker Hall—it wasn't even that, it was Dairy Science, and then it became Food Science, and now in 1966, we made it Food Science and Nutrition. We married the nutrition people in Home Ec and Food Science and what . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: . . . structure and internal strengths of the Institute of Agriculture, Forestry and Home Economics?

WH: Woodie Berg was the dean of the that organization. He asked several of us—Vern Freeh who was a special assistant to the dean at that time but also the Office of Short Courses and a representative from Extension—there were, maybe, ten of us, to kind of put together what we thought a modern over-arching institute should look like. Now, there was some general reorganization going on in the university but I think we were looking at this, primarily, to position ourselves. You may recall there was some attempt to bring certain parts of the Minneapolis campus to the St. Paul campus. That was wonderful.

CAC: Physically, not administratively?

WH: Physically. No, physically but nobody ever came up with the idea of what the land was going to be. [laughter] A lot of people in Minneapolis, including at that time Hale Champion who was the vice-president for Finance, I believe, said, "Oh, well, that's just land." He was going to go out and find us some. They would take the St. Paul campus over and he'll find this other land. He gave that up after about two months.

CAC: Everybody gave it up. Where did that initiative come from at all? The university being crowded?

WH: It just came from the idea that the university was going to make tremendous growth and the St. Paul campus would have 20,000 students.

CAC: This is before the university moved to the West Bank?

WH: No, no, no. This was in the 1970s. Woodie Berg was the dean.

CAC: In the face of it, a lot of folks didn't see any sense in that at all.

WH: There wasn't any sense in it. This is terrible but it's the reason we have the College of Biology. We had outside people come here and study that. They told us, "Put more money into units that have biology." That would have been in Liberal Arts in our program, and so on but a certain vice-president, you know, Gerry, he wanted a monument. I always said that the College of Biology was his monument. Then we had people interview and they couldn't see it work but Dick Caldecott took the job. My opinion . . . I emphasize that . . . Bill Hueg's opinion . . . it has never done what it should have done because it was too artificial. They talked about matrixes, and this, that, and the other thing.

CAC: Why was it artificial?

WH: Well, because they created something, a building if you will, but never were able to pull together all of the biology interests in the university.

CAC: Because the pull in their own college was too strong? I'm thinking of microbiology in the medical science . . .

WH: It stayed there.

CAC: Yes.

WH: There's microbiology there. There's microbiology in the College of Veterinary Medicine.

CAC: And their research agendas are separate enough?

WH: They are very different.

CAC: Yes. But they are all biologists? They are all microbiologists? It doesn't matter?

WH: Plant Physiology and Plant Genetics are about the only two—Bill Hueg's opinion—that have been successful. The College of Biological Science's Ecology Program is an ecology program. In Agriculture, there's one up in Natural Resources, etcetera. We were going to have all kinds of students. We were planning on having 10,000 to 15,000 students on the St. Paul campus. They hired these two young architects from Toronto, very nice guys. I really enjoyed them tremendously. Their only point was, my god! you don't take this beautiful land and fill it up with buildings. You're got all this open space within the campus. Of course, the sacrosanct area was the mall. As a matter of fact, we tried to name it Macy Mall, at one time.

CAC: To preserve it?

WH: To preserve it but everybody just liked it as the Mall and that's what it is. To me, that's one of the beautiful settings of the St. Paul campus. [laughter] So, we had this internal study and definitely then to create strong individual colleges, Agriculture, Forestry, Home Economics.

It's now Agriculture. It's now Human Ecology. It's now the College of Natural Resources. You can drop the Forestry out of it which I don't think was too smart but that's their business. Then, of course, we had the research and Extension relationship with the College of Veterinary Medicine. That has been a long tradition. Actually the College of Veterinary Medicine grew out of the old . . . whatever the old structure was. That was long before I came here. That's fairly traditional across the country. But the research and Extension stayed. As time went along, dean's were created. In the case of Home Ec, it was McFarland. He had been a director of Resident Instruction of the old College of Ag, Forestry, and Home Economics. It was not his background. His wife is a strong home-ecer. That had nothing to do with it. It was the decision that was made. As I recall, there was not a big search done on that and there was some static but Keith ended up really doing a fantastic job.

CAC: I'm going to ask a question here. This is going to be a statement that is a question. I've always perceived Keith as being an administrator, politician, whose talents were transferable by subject matter?

WH: Exactly. That's exactly why he was able to do such a good job over at the General College when that most recently . . .

CAC: He was a trouble shooter lots of places.

WH: Yes, in a lot of places. Then most recently, I guess, he was involved with the Waseca thing.

CAC: Then he has to take on social work, which seems a strange thing for . . .

WH: Yes. Then, of course, Frank Kaufert went from director of the School of Forestry to the dean of the College of Forestry and six months later retired. I mean, we already knew that. And then Dick Skok became the dean and just until three or four years ago, he was the dean. The College of Agriculture has had nothing but bad news—Bill Hueg's opinion—in terms of keeping deans or having deans. Al Linck was appointed out of the experiment station by Woodie Berg, no discussion with me. That caused a little bit of a problem, not with Al but between Woodie and I. I always thought it would be kind of nice if when you have a colleague that there ought to be some discussion but it didn't happen. Al stayed in that position just two years. Then he went over and worked in . . .

CAC: Morrill Hall.

WH: . . . in Morrill Hall with Koffler. He bounced around within the institution. We tried to bring him back.

CAC: Some of us looked to Mr. Link as our best liaison into that vice-president's office which says something about Al in that office.

WH: Exactly. Again, you talk about Keith—although Al has a research background—he was an excellent teacher, wonderful with students, undergraduate as well as graduate. A people person. He was a good listener.

CAC: Yes.

WH: He would draw a conclusion. He'd tell you what it was.

CAC: I had no business having a relationship with him and I found as chair in History that he was one of the best persons to talk with.

WH: Yes. Then, we had Jim Tammen. Then, Jack Goodding who had been with Keith as assistant director of Resident Instruction, then was acting dean. The faculty did not choose to appoint him. Tammen came from Penn State. Tammen never quite got on the job. It was one of those things. I hired him and I had to suggest that he do something else, which I think is important. That's your job as an administrator and there's not enough of that done. We've moved quite a few department heads out simply based on the fact that, Why then do we have the rule—yes, I guess it's a rule—the policy, a better word, that administrators be reviewed on a five-year basis if we're not going to do anything about it? Of course, the difference between our units and the rest of the university is we had heads. We assume that a head had . . .

CAC: Was there a long time.

WH: Well, that was the old tradition.

CAC: Sure.

WH: But gradually, we went on this five-year basis. Now, it was something that Vern Freeh, and Woodie Berg's assistant, Jim App, and I put together one night—I would tell you over quite a little scotch—called this review procedure. [laughter] We carefully schooled Woodie on what it would be; and then when he had his department head's meeting, which we had very seldom, he had this thing prepared, and he slid it down the table to them, "This is something that Bill, and Vern, and Jim App have come up with."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: So, you can imagine what a sell job that was. We couldn't make it. We couldn't grandfather it but as we were making changes, or enough older people . . . as all new department heads came, we went up and explained it to the department. Number one, you have to be absolutely sure that who you are inviting to be your department head is somebody you're willing to accept as a colleague in your department, that you're hiring them for their strength in genetics, or nutrition, or sociology, whatever it may be, that this is not a life job like it has been. I could

show you a few scars on that one. But anyway, we made it stick, and certainly, if you're going to make it stick, you've got to do it. If the dean isn't doing a good job, you can't very well change department heads. Interesting enough, Jim Tammen and I are still good friends. He went on and got a better job someplace else that didn't last very long but at least he left our place happy. [laughter] That's a terrible way to put it. I know how you're using this, Clarke but that's part of that give and take. In the meantime, we brought two very good young guys in. One's name was Dick Sauer, who eventually became interim he became the director of the experiment station; and another guy, Norm Brown, who became director of Extension. Norm then went from us to Kellogg; and now, I understand, there's complete changes at Kellogg, and I don't think Norm is there. I don't know that for a fact.

CAC: That's pretty high turnover you're talking?

WH: Yes but that was all part of the . . .

CAC: Yes, I understand.

WH: We just absolutely had to. I think the hardest thing for department heads was, I was a strong director of experiment station—really the term director is not correct, it's coordinator—I was that interested and I didn't try to run the research but if I was out getting the money, damn it! I was going to have something to say about what we did or didn't do. We talked about that, this reporting business. When Dick and Norm, Dick more . . .

CAC: That's Dick Sauer now?

WH: Dick Sauer . . . came, for whatever reason, essentially, he inherited the staff that I had over in the experiment station just across the hall; so, we saw one another a couple times a day, if I was in town or he was in town. I think he felt that well, you really ought to come in and check this with Bill. Finally, I just said, "Dick, you are the director of the experiment station, and I'm the vice-president, and if I don't think things are going the way they are, you and I are going to talk about it." I don't know what it was but that's all he needed to hear. In Norm's case, he had an agenda and boy! he proceeded and he really changed Extension around quite a bit—to my way of thinking—for the good. The old tradition was that the agricultural agent was the lead agent in every county. Some of them were terrible. They had no administrative skills at all either with their own staff or with the Extension committees so those counties were always in trouble. Norm just came in, opened up all of the jobs—probably a little much—for review and then solicitation of who was going to be the lead agent. In many cases, it was a home-ec agent, a woman; and out in some of these rural counties, you know, that was kind of tough to sell. For the long haul, that's way it should have been and it works.

CAC: Yes. Bill, sometimes I kind of intrude here. As an historian, I've been struck by the lack of attention to Agricultural Extension as a major innovation in the United States of America in

the whole field of education. I don't know why that is. It's an extraordinary system when you think of how many counties are there in Minnesota . . . ?

WH: There are eighty-seven.

CAC: . . . eighty-seven and how many counties in the country? . . . I tell you that's an outreach. You always have a home-ec person.

WH: Whenever I would go and make a presentation—whether I was the Extension specialist in agronomy, or the assistant director, or the director of the experiment station, or then the vice-president—I would always say, "I hope you appreciate that your Extension staff is your arm of the university right here." I think very few people nationally do this. I think very few deans do. They may be beginning to but that's our strength. Our whole network with the legislature was that.

CAC: It was a strength in the whole country.

WH: The county agents, because part of their appointment is federal, cannot lobby but they know how to organize people. So we had these series of meetings around the state—give the credit where it's due . . . Woodie started it—but we didn't do enough of it. When I became vice-president every fall, we went out and told the story, twelve locations in the state. Sometimes Peter would go with us. Sometimes Henry Koffler would go with us.

CAC: But using the Extension as a base?

WH: Extension was the one who provided the structure. They invited the people. We invited people from here. Our Advisory Council became involved. We had a network and I think in the most positive sense, that's the way a network should work. It's what ought to happen in other parts of the university. Hal Miller is a good friend. I used to ask Hal, "Why don't you move this thing out?" People in the state would say to me, "Hey, you know, Bill, we don't live by bread alone. It's great you guys come out here and tell us how to raise our animals, and so on; but we don't all live on a farm. Why can't Art come?" Vern Sutton, just here in 1993 . . .

CAC: Yes!

WH: . . . bringing "This Tender Land." We got involved in it. It was our way of introducing this Seal prize. I was involved in getting that money to come to the university—it had strings attached, like the family used it for ten years before we got it—but it's there. It was beautiful. Here was the total agricultural community and the School of Music, if you will, the whole university being involved in six locations. I think this is what's going to happen. We had so many pitfalls. This started under Gerry. Gerry wanted Extension to become more involved in the total university. Luther Pickrel was all for that. But nobody ever talked about where the

money was going to come from. The assumption was, oh well, there's a lot of money there. It was not the way to deal with it so it didn't happen. I think Peter Magrath saw this but he didn't get it pulled off. I'm pretty convinced that Ken Keller saw this. Ken liked it when he went out on these meetings . . .

CAC: I'll bet.

WH: . . . because it was an entirely different focus than what he had ever been involved in. I think Nils, maybe, is doing more of it than, maybe, any of them did. So, the institute now is moving along quite well. In 1984, I made a decision to go and do other things. I talked with Peter about this. The decision was made within the institute that, probably, we didn't have to have a national search. We had had a national search for the two key positions, Extension and research. Norm Brown, in the meantime, got the offer to go to Kellogg. I knew that was going to happen because I was told this by Russ Maubie when I hired him, "Thank you. We had to get Norm out of Michigan so we could bring him back." He was at Michigan State. I figured we'd make this job so damn attractive Norm would forget about it but four years later, they came after him. It seemed logical with the way Dick Sauer was working with the legislature because I had allowed those two guys to take over some of this. They had to talk about the research and Extension so I tended to sit in the back of the room and if I was called on . . . I'd have to tell you it was tough because I would hear them talk. I felt they went into far more detail than was appropriate or necessary but that was their style. I'd sit there and Kegler would kick my foot. Knock it off, you know, rahr, rahr, rahr. The decision was made that we talk to Central Administration so Peter invited Dick Sauer to consider the position. Dick negotiated, then, it to be a vice-presidency.

CAC: I see.

WH: Then it became a vice-presidency. Then Peter left. Dick was appointed interim [president of the univeristy] with the understanding he would not be . . . of course, he had his cap set for North Dakota. Then he made that faux pas of not crediting Frank Rhodes with a comment about teaching, which he claims was in his written speech but it was not.

CAC: Oh, no.

WH: It's really unfortunate because Dick is a really good guy, really good. One of the things I didn't say is that Vern Freeh and I got this idea, one time, that as you look around our department heads and you look around in other institutions, we tend to take guys and women who've been very good researchers and teachers and then immediately shove them into an administrative position. What would happen if we'd set up a short course, three weeks? We did that for three summers.

CAC: For good administrators?

WH: For people who thought they would like to be administrators or who had just recently been appointed but we were really more interested in those who were thinking about it.

CAC: I see.

WH: This was based on some people who we had had. Now Pat[ricia] Swan, you know?

CAC: Yes.

WH: Okay. Pat was the first administrative assistant I had out of the faculty.

CAC: Heavens.

WH: She was tremendous. This woman has a capacity to work like you wouldn't believe and she was still having to do some of her teaching . . .

CAC: Sure.

WH: . . . or no, she gave up the teaching but had her graduate students. The result of that was then, we brought Bob Gast in. He's now the director and is soon to become the vice-president for agriculture at Michigan State. Over the three years that we had this thing, Kansas State took it on for three years, and then for whatever reason, it was dropped. As you look around in these various institutions, either department heads and so on, the majority of them have come through that program.

CAC: That's remarkable because the university at large, just the last year and one-half, is beginning to do this, for the same purposes, university wide.

WH: Yes, but we were doing this in the 1970s.

CAC: Yes.

WH: It was really based on a good guy, Bob Gast, who I've already mentioned. He went to Ohio State to be interviewed for the head of soils. I had talked to him about that. He came to us from TVA [Tennessee Valley Authority], doing research there. I suggested to him, "Bob, there's a lot stronger departments in the country than Ohio but if you want to go, get the experience and . . ." He went there. I guess, in the second day he was in that interview, he just absolutely froze. This is him telling the story now. "My god! what am I getting myself into? In the first place, I've got two departments, one at Wooster and one at Columbus. They don't even talk to one another." They had a vice-president for agriculture, Roy Copman—just died here a couple months ago—the most autocratic s.o.b. in the world. He just didn't get along with anybody, even in the system, for the simple reason that by god! this is the way it's going to be. He saw this and so he just really bombed out in the interview. Fortunately, he didn't get the job

but he got tainted, if you will. He was the second one then that I had in the office. Then when this opportunity came to go to Michigan, he felt more comfortable with it. No, he went to Nebraska first as the head of soils and then, from there, to Michigan. That's one of the things I really feel good about but it was other people involved . . . Vern Freeh, who had a real people orientation.

CAC: Sure. Bill, you've mentioned several times an Advisory Council. Where did that come from? Who were they? How did they get appointed? What did they advise on?

WH: The Advisory Council was something that got set up by Joe Macy and Fenske right in the beginning, 1949, 1950, when the *then* institute was first formed. They came out of the Poultry, Livestock, Co-op, Dairy. They'd start out, maybe, with ten. When I left the institute . . .

CAC: They would be appointed by?

WH: By those associations.

CAC: Oh, I see, by the associations? Not Central . . . ?

WH: Not by us. But they were approved by the regents.

CAC: Oh.

WH: So they became a bona fide . . .

CAC: So they were really semi-official?

WH: They became a bona fide Advisory Council for the broad program . . .

CAC: But unpaid?

WH: Not paid. We bought them a lunch or a dinner. We didn't even pay their expenses.

CAC: Okay.

WH: They became quite a force in the 1960s and the 1970s as we went out and did these education programs. They were always involved.

CAC: How many of them would come from what we think of now as large agri-business?

WH: We had a guy who represented dairy but he came from Land O'Lakes, that's co-op.

CAC: Yes.

WH: We had a fellow from banks but he was an agricultural banker. The Home-Ec people came, primarily, from industry . . . Byerlys' stores, Daytons.

CAC: Heavens.

WH: Mercedes Bates, who was head of, essentially, the Betty Crocker kitchens at General Mills, was at one time on the Advisory Council. They were really good people. Norris Carnes, who was the guy that started Central Livestock, eventually, ended up being the chairman.

CAC: The largest corporations in this field in Minnesota, were they represented?

WH: Like Cargill and so on?

CAC: Yes.

WH: No. They were not interested in those kinds of things. Actually, Phil Pillsbury was, when I first came into administration, the chairman but he was the last Pillsbury to be in Pillsbury. That's an interesting story, too, the Pillsbury relationship to the old School of Agriculture and the beginnings of the experiment station.

CAC: Oh, say something about that because it is history.

WH: Essentially, they were always looking for improved grain and the research program was quite rudimentary so they started importing grain from Europe, Scotland in particular. Now, we don't think of Scotland as a source of wheat, you know. [laughter] But they got the university to increase the seed and they provided the money for these—quote—extensions trains, they were short-course though, that went across the Dakotas, into Montana . . .

CAC: What time period are we talking about here?

WH: We're talking 1880.

CAC: Oh, that early? I see.

WH: Minnesota was not alone. This is what a lot of the chautauqua was, you know.

CAC: Ah ha.

WH: It still is. It tends to be now much broader. Up until the second war, Minnesota was, primarily, an agrarian state.

CAC: Sure.

WH: As a matter of fact, the years that I call the golden . . .

CAC: Except for the iron mine?

WH: Yes, but that was a strange kind of a relationship. That part of the state benefited.

CAC: [unclear] and pretty close to home.

WH: That was an arguing point but the state, generally, didn't benefit from it. Sure, big industry, but nothing that agriculture did. As a matter of fact, [during] what I call the golden years when we were getting quite a lot of money from the legislature, and our faculty was growing, I was involved in something over \$200 million worth of buildings on the St. Paul campus and branch stations at a time when . . .

CAC: And you're counting this from the mid 1950s to the 1980s?

WH: Yes, I'm counting the 1960s to the 1980s. It just seemed as though almost anything we wanted to do, somehow, we got additional money. Now, that used to bother Mr. Moos. We got a building at the same time, the meats building which is the Andrew Boss Meats Laboratory. The first meat's laboratory in the United States was at Minnesota, started by Andrew Boss, 1911. By good fortune, Mr. [Walter] Mondale, who was our senator, put a piece of legislation through about the quality of food handling facilities, meats in particular. I remember calling him up and saying, "God! how do I help you get that thing passed?" He says, "Why?" I told him. As soon as the thing was passed, I went right to the power in the legislature and I said, "We're in violation on the St. Paul campus. We are teaching meats in a facility that is not any better than a privy?"

CAC: [laughter]

WH: Mr. Moos wasn't very happy about that. I think that's your job, huh? So, we got \$2.9 million that hadn't even been in the university's request. It didn't take anything away from anybody else. That's what you have to do. Whenever a legislator would say to us, "Hey, we'd like you to do this kind of research." I'd say, "If you want that, put it on top of what we're already asking. That is the regents' request."

CAC: Yes.

WH: It didn't always work that way but them most of the time it did. Those were the golden years.

CAC: The Advisory Council helped in what specific ways?

WH: The Advisory Council . . . because they all vote and they had the way to do it.

CAC: And access to . . .

WH: That was a correct term. We would tell them at one meeting—we met four times a year—about the curriculum. Some faculty would come in and talk about this new curriculum. At another meeting, it would be something on research done right on the campus. One meeting a year was always held at a branch station . . .

CAC: Bravo!

WH: . . . and we involved Extension then.

CAC: Have other colleges picked up this model? Do they have Advisory Councils?

WH: I guess, I thought it was something that was kind of required now in the university.

CAC: I see. Okay.

WH: But I don't know that, Clarke. I know it was being talked about when I was there.

CAC: The Law School has one.

WH: Within the institute, within the colleges of the institute, the colleges now each have separate one so there's an overriding. This happens to come out from Extension but, essentially, in here is a discussion that the institute will disappear and this new structure. Well, it's probably correct because it's going to be a provost now for what, Professional Studies? It's an interesting marriage, if it comes off . . . Law, Business . . .

CAC: It may.

WH: If you would, could we just go to . . . I think that question you raise about why Extension is, maybe, one of the better kept secrets of the world . . . ?

CAC: Yes.

WH: I think part of it is that there's just a good many people within an institution like the University of Minnesota or Wisconsin who are not in agriculture but I would quickly tell you that there are people in the institute who sometimes wonder, Now, why do we have this tie out here in the counties for? This is where I'm coming back now to the Land-Grant . . .

CAC: Yes.

WH: . . . because, I think, as we shift direction . . . I call myself an agriculturist. I mention in here that I was on the National Science Board and I was the first agriculturist. There was an

ag-economist on it but he called himself an ag-economist. Dr. [Elvin C.] Stakman was on it but he was a plant physiologist or a plant pathologist.

CAC: I see.

WH: When I was asked—when you have to write up this little thing that's going to go in because there are chemistry professors, or there are this or that—what is your position, I was the deputy vice-president, dean of Institute of Ag, Forestry, and Home Economics, professor of agronomy and plant genetics, and an agriculturist. I truly think I am that now. It's kind of looking at this whole system, see?

CAC: The whole thing, right.

WH: That's what I tried to do on the National Science Board.

CAC: What years were you on the National Science Board?

WH: 1976 to 1982. It's a six-year appointment. Some people get appointed an extra term but it's quite unusual.

CAC: What kind of an agenda did you carry to that board?

WH: How I got on—I've never kidded myself—was not because Bill Hueg was a great scientist. It was I had my mouth open, maybe, when it should have been shut, saying one night to Hubert Humphrey, in Washington, "You know, Hubert, this is absolutely ridiculous that when our people—and I'm not saying just Minnesota but across the country—people from the agricultural experiment stations make proposals to NSF, immediately NSF just sends them over to USDA, doesn't even make comment on them. They don't even look at the science." So, Hubert jokingly said, "Well, yes, but you guys call them cows. You're supposed to call them bovines."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: You would imagine he'd pick up on that. We talked about this, and not only on one occasion, more than once; so one day, in the office, this call came from his office in Washington. It was like on the 28th of September, and could I have a prepared speech, and be present in Washington on the 4th of October to meet with a combined House and Senate research committee that was reviewing all of the research of the federal government?

CAC: I see.

WH: I said, "Why, yes, I could."

CAC: You'd probably been giving parts of that speech?

WH: Oh, hell, yes, I had. I said, "What time does it start? How long is it going to last?" "We'll try to get you on the program around two o'clock so that you can get out on that six o'clock airplane; so, you better come in the night before." It was Dave Gardner who was Humphrey's chief administrator, a good guy. You didn't have to agree with him politically but I mean he knew how to get things organized. That's about what happened. In terms of giving the whole talk, hell no! I might have been able to touch on three or four of the high points but I left with them a manuscript that was, probably, twenty pages talking about the kinds of research that are done in agricultural experiment stations, the fact that they are peer reviewed—essentially, the whole system.

CAC: Yes.

WH: Here was somebody from the cooperative state research service who we had to work with for the Hatch money, and from the agricultural research service, and so on, and you know, both of those guys didn't even make a comment about the basic and fundamental research that was done at the experiment stations because they thought that they were doing . . . At Minnesota, at the time I was there, we had seventy USDA people on the St. Paul campus, salaries paid by USDA, a minor portion of their research funds from USDA, the majority of their research funds from us. [unclear] A year later, I got a telephone call from the White House—Gerry Ford was now the president—asking whether I would I let my name be put forward as one of the candidates for the National Science Board. A very nice young woman . . . I said, "I think you have the wrong person." She said, "Are you William Frederick Hueg, H-U-E-G, Junior?"

CAC: [laughter]

WH: I said, "That's me." She said, "It's you! Would you let us put your name forward?" I said, "Yes." She said, "That's fine. You're going to get a form." Then, I had to go through an FBI investigation, the whole thing.

CAC: Sure.

WH: I almost didn't get it, even to have the FBI thing because question number twenty was, Would you knowingly do anything to damage the reputation of the country, or embarrass the country, and so on? I said, "I wouldn't if the president doesn't." Of course, it was right after the Watergate, you know.

CAC: [laughter]

WH: She called me back. She said, "I think I know what you're talking about but that wasn't a smart thing to do." So, then when the FBI guy came, that was one of the first things he came in on. I told him, "Well, if you people are this sensitive, you need to know I'm divorced, just

recently. It was amicable as much as that can be." How that came about is he wanted to know if he could go talk with neighbors. I said, "Yes, but you need to know this and they don't know anything about this divorce. This is strictly between my wife and I." He said, "What if I went and talked with your wife?" I said, "That's fine with me." When he did . . . when he came back, he told me, "Your wife's on your side. Her point was if you want a damn fool that'll work his head off, that's the guy you want to get."

CAC: [laughter] That's a good recommendation, Bill.

WH: I got appointed. The thing I was most disappointed about when I initially went there, was that . . . [There were] eight appointments every two years, so it's a twenty-four person board. One of them was Herb Doane who was from the Doane family, which is Dow Chemical. He had disassociated himself with Dow maybe ten years before. He was in the investment business. Ted Kennedy was part of that committee. It was Pell's Committee, the committee for these kinds of appointments. It's Labor and something . . .

CAC: Labor and Education.

WH: Yes. It was Pell, and Kennedy, and one other, and they really moved in on Doane, and they worked him over like you would not believe. The question was, What happens if some kind of research come up? He said, Oh, I'll remove myself, just like everybody else does." "Yes, but . . . rahr, rahr." They finally backed off. I came next. The chairman, Mr. Pell said, "Now, before we start asking Hueg any questions, let me read you two letters." The one letter was from Hubert Humphrey. The second letter was from Walter Mondale. Kennedy says, "I'm not asking him any questions with a recommendation like that."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: Afterwards, I went up to Kennedy and I said, "I don't think that's fair. I have a point of view and I'd like to express it to this committee." "You'll have six years if we appoint you. We're probably not . . ." There was a change in the administration.

CAC: Yes.

WH: [President Jimmy] Carter was just coming in.

CAC: Yes.

WH: My appointment is by Ford but Carter, then, was the president when I took office. Actually, we did not get appointed. We went to the meetings—mine downstairs, reads, I think, August—but we didn't get approval until December and it was after the election.

CAC: Yes. You represented this whole . . . for the first time on the board?

WH: No. I kind of sized up the situation, and what I needed to talk about was biology because that's what I know, and at that time, biology was just a very, very small part of the National Science Foundation budget.

CAC: That's interesting because the biological sciences or the genetics are at the cutting edge of all this . . .

WH: They are. NSF always had as its director, somebody out of, as you said, the hard sciences: math, physics, chemistry. The year I was appointed, Marian Coshland, whose husband Dan wrote for years. He was the editor of *Science Magazine*, Berkeley professors, both of them. She was an immunologist. Out of the twenty-four, there were six of us who had a biology background and we just had rump sessions. We'd got in a day early. We'd sit with the assistant director of the biology program which was in a broader science context. Eventually, now, they have a separate biology section. That was a interesting period. It even came to the point where I was suggested to be the chairman, the last two years I was there. It was given to . . . the guy from IBM . . . it will come. The argument that my colleagues told me afterwards was this is a pretty big step to take somebody who in six years hasn't been in this peer system of research. The guy who succeeded me, also an agriculturist, from Davis, Charlie Hess, became the vice-chairman, and then he went off, and now, he's back on. I think, we made an impact.

CAC: Did this caucus work effectively with the full board?

WH: It worked effectively with the full board, but most important, you had to work within that damn bureaucracy. The bureaucracy was so structured.

CAC: I see.

WH: The astronomers were worrying, at that time, about the Hubble [Space Telescope]—what became the Hubbell—but at the same time, they wanted to build two more stationary telescopes. The chemists were worrying about this whole broad area of polymer research. The geologists were worrying about the deep sea ocean drilling. I ended up being chairman of the program committee. I learned so much, Clarke.

CAC: How would the trade-offs be made? You're talking about pretty heavy duty research communities.

WH: We just said, "We all have a vote on this. You need our vote." It's a majority, yes, but you know how these things get played. The amounts that we were asking for were infinitesimal but the most important thing we wanted was a directorship for biology so that that person then could deal with the director of the NSF.

CAC: And you won that?

WH: We won that. Who now is the biggest funder of this whole area of molecular biology? It isn't NIH [National Institute for Health]. It's the National Science Foundation.

CAC: I did interview a person who I asked, "What happened when microbiologists had to attend to molecular biology?" Boy! that was a fast re-tooling those fellows had to go through . . . just exciting.

WH: This company that's now MGI-Pharma was started by people from the university who didn't think we were moving fast enough. They were putting all of their attention, initially, on agricultural things. When I left the university, I went on that board. I felt it was a conflict of interest to go on, initially, because we were building our program.

CAC: Yes. Sure.

WH: We just now have dissolved what was the old ag-research thing because they moved over into pharmaceuticals. We had some really tremendous products but the time it takes to get them through FDA [Food and Drug Administration] . . . We got them patented in Canada and in Europe and never got them done here in the United States. It's the special protein components that you can put into wheat and corn and now DeKalb has the license for all that. It's going to be a long time before they ever put it out because it's not to their advantage to do it.

CAC: Why not?

WH: There seems to be some gene . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

CAC: We're still talking about the National Science Board. You're saying that you had the luck of being the right time, the right place—with a little vigor?

WH: Yes, I think my whole career has been that, you know. Why did I go to Alfred, initially? Only because some stuff got published that I was doing out in the field and they needed an agronomist. How did I happen to come to Minnesota? I built a relationship with Laddie Elling who said, "Hey, we have need of an Extension agronomist but somebody with a plant physiology background." That was me.

CAC: Yes.

WH: I had already kind of accepted that I was going to stay at Michigan State but I was furious that that darned department head hadn't posted because I was the only one that was graduating

in Physiology that year. I came here at \$7500. They had a salary across the board so then I got \$7800. I felt like a millionaire after being in graduate school.

CAC: Before we go on to topics that I always think of as reflections, the larger reflections such as the switch in the legislature, for example, or the loss [unclear] Land-Grant Institution, could you say something more about Waseca, and Crookston, and Morris, and how that played itself out from your point of view?

WH: You mean from the time they were schools?

CAC: Yes.

WH: Until they became colleges?

CAC: Then the dropping of Waseca and then the strengthening of Crookston.

WH: Yes. Let's talk about the Morris one first because, I think, that really turned out to be quite successful, at least everything I hear. Apparently, they do a good job there. I think, Rod Briggs was an organizer. He did a good job getting the college off to a good start and then had good sense enough to leave when he did. John Imholte came in there and moved that. The interesting thing is, I still think, the support that the university has in that community and when you find out what that is, it's these graduates of that west central School of Agriculture. Now, those people, of course, are getting older and there may not be carry over but many of them, their kids went to Morris rather than to come to down here to either the Ag campus or the other parts of the university. This is not all bad because the way rural communities are developing now, I think that's the new leadership. There's a lot of places they can get the technical information about agriculture but if we're going to have rural communities survive, we really have to have well-educated people in leadership positions, I think, and I think that's what's proving to be the case.

In the case of Crookston . . . You said you interviewed Bernie Youngquist and that, as I recall, was his thesis. He has a doctorate in education from the university.

CAC: Yes.

WH: It was What is the Future of These Schools? He kind of drew a blueprint of what Crookston could look like, Waseca, and so on. You keep in mind that he was the first principal at Waseca when it was created as a high school. He went there. Then he moved to Crookston as the superintendent. History can only tell this . . . it was, maybe, the most serious difference of opinion that Keith McFarland and I had. I was quite sure that Bernie Youngquist should not be the head of the school and continue as the head of the experiment station. He wanted that in the worst way. I think, initially, Keith thought that would be okay. We interviewed several people but the one that got the job was [Stanley] Sahlstrom. Sahlstrom ends up being the head

of the new school—director, I guess, we called him—and Bernie headed up Ag division within that new technical college. Those two guys never were on the same wave length. They weren't even after we moved Bernie out of being the head of the Ag division because he didn't do really well in it—I'm not the only one that felt that way. We continued him as a superintendent. That's where his real strength was. Stan—I'm getting really personal now—was the more aggressive one and, fortunately, Stan brought this guy in as his assistant, who's now the chancellor . . . Do you have this problem, that you forget names?

CAC: Oh, yes. But I can't help you on this one.

WH: No. That was the guy that made that program go. Stan came up for review. It was not the greatest review. I suggested to him that, maybe, we ought to find him something else to do. He wrote a letter saying that he would resign but Peter Magrath never signed the letter because he didn't want to get in trouble with Mr. Moe.

CAC: Ah.

WH: Here we are . . . we have Stan Sahlstrom . . .

CAC: Mr. Moe makes Senator Moe?

WH: Yes, Senator Moe. I'd already had that conversation with Roger. He didn't care. That was our business. Now, over time, Stan left the university but he continues as a regent. I'll not make further comment there.

The Waseca situation . . . very similar. When it became—and it was some years later—Ed[ward] Frederick . . . I brought Ed Frederick from Crookston to Waseca to be the superintendent and principal of the high school, superintendent of the southern experiment station and principal of the southern school. With this then the idea came—not pushed by me . . . I think Rod Searle was quite taken by it. Rod was the chairman of the Education Committee at that time.

CAC: Came from Waseca?

WH: Came from Janesville but Waseca district. Now, we were going to have a college there. There's a lot of history there. If Mr. Wenberg were alive, he could give it to you rhyme and verse because a lot of this happened in the back room and he was the only one privy to it. So, we have a college. So, we're right back on the same thing. Ed Frederick says, "I'm going to be the superintendent and the head of this new school." I said, "Ed, you're not." I prevailed this time. Ed kind of went to everybody and I had lots of conversations. We brought Dick Anderson in there but Ed, in many ways more aggressive than Dick, and those two guys . . . so what was a really great idea, in my opinion . . . It's something I wanted to see happen but we never seemed to be able to separate this idea that the southern experiment station or the northwest

experiment station were separate entities and that the two colleges were separate entities. If, yes, they could use those facilities amenably, and usefully, that was fine but it just never seemed to work. Ed was very autocratic as the head of that school. I used to go there every quarter. I would meet with the administrators. I would meet with the faculty because I had the responsibility of both Crookston and Waseca.

CAC: Yes.

WH: The same process . . . meet with the Civil Service staff, meet with some of the citizens at lunch time, dah, tadah, tadah, you know. I would go separately to the experiment station, not on that visit. In my mind, they were two separate entities. It came time for Ed's review. He got a rather poor review because he was so autocratic. I would say he had about a 40 percent approval rate. I, again, suggested to him sitting out in that Holiday Inn north of the campus, two days, and finally, got him to write a letter. Again, Peter didn't accept that letter. Six months later, we had a union. That damned near killed me, Clarke, because I couldn't talk with these people. The university's attorney just told me, "Bill, you cannot go to Waseca." I said, "Don't tell me what I can do." "You cannot go to Waseca. You cannot even go to the experiment station because you'll meet with these people." So, they would come here, a lot of these guys. They were torn up. They didn't want to be in the damned union . . . just get Ed Frederick out of here. Now, what I'm saying is the strongest program was at Waseca.

CAC: Waseca, yes.

WH: Now, we're talking about making Crookston a four-year institution? I mean, we've got rocks in our head. We've got rocks in our head.

CAC: They're not only talking about it, they're doing it.

WH: I still see it as a trial but so was Morris a trial, initially, and then it became four-years. Don Sargeant . . . Don is a good man, he is a good man, but he's gotten caught up in the politics of this thing; and obviously, it's a feather in this cap if he can make it a four-year college. Much of his background is in technical education. That's why he was initially hired to head up the Ag division there. Then, he became Stan's assistant. Stan Sahlstrom would not put a budget together. He figured he could bull shit his way through the regents—excuse me—and the legislature, and everything else. So, Don Sargeant would get the job, and always late; and I just would say, "Peter, I'm not submitting a budget for Crookston this year."

CAC: [unclear].

WH: Yes. You just have to understand that's Stan. I said, "Do you want to run the place or am I?"

CAC: You've had a long career. You haven't had many high administrators who wouldn't accept a letter of recommendation, I'm guessing? That's an unusual thing.

WH: It is. But see, I think, this was part of this difficulty that Peter seemed to have in making decisions. This was a good decision for that institution. The system within the university . . . I mean those guys would go on a sabbatical. Ed Frederick could be hired as an animal scientist. He'd never got [unclear]. Now, he's got some no job as a coordinator for something called Dairy Round-table. He operates out of his house in Waseca and is attached to the Humphrey Institute, for god sakes. There's no relationship but the people in Animal Science don't want him around. Unfortunately, now after eleven years, these are the things that I get drawn in on and I absolutely refuse to. If people want to talk to me about it, fine. Things I'm telling to you, I haven't talked about in years. I talked about this to Nils, at that time. Nils, in southern Minnesota is considered not very well because he took their college away.

CAC: Yes.

WH: It's unfortunate that these things happen but they do.

CAC: Let's turn to the changing nature of the legislature that has a bearing on the university's health.

WH: Yes. In the 1960s, and long before that, it was a citizen legislature. As I recall, they worked six to eight weeks a year, every other year. The only people who had staff were the two speakers of the House and Senate, the chairman of appropriations, and the chairman of the tax committee; so, six offices had administrative staff. You would go in and see somebody like Rod Searle, he had a secretary but he didn't have two or three staff people. Today, a new guy that's elected immediately has four or five assistants. We have this at the federal level, too. They are the ones that are making the laws now . . . staff.

CAC: Yes.

WH: These people were quite dependent on their source of information. I think of Harold Popp. He was a pharmacist at Hutchinson, a fantastic guy. He was on this building commission that I have talked about. One night he said to me, "Isn't there a way that we could just consolidate all of your requests so we just look at them at one place?" I said, "Sure, you could look at them in St. Paul. I could show you slides of the buildings we have and what we need, and so on; but, I said, "it's you guys that made the decision that you want to go see everything." "Well," he says—this is now sitting out in his drug store in Hutchinson—"I'd like to take it one step further. Why can't the legislature give the university, say, \$20 million and then let the university make the decision on what buildings they want." I said, "I think that's an excellent idea. I don't think you'll sell it in the university. I'm positive you won't sell it to your legislative colleagues." "Well," he says, "it's just ridiculous, the amount of time that we're spending."

CAC: The university wouldn't want it, why?

WH: Because that would be the legislature telling them . . .

CAC: Well, but if they give them a lump sum, then they get to spend it as they wish.

WH: But they'd have to go back and . . . No. In the first place, they wouldn't settle for \$20 million.

CAC: Sure.

WH: Yes. So, of course, it never happened but every once in awhile, I would throw that out in the pot when we'd be sitting there, and what's the strategy going to be, and I'd say to Wenberg, "Well, Wenberg, why don't we quit this garbage. Tell me that I can have \$20 million. I can sort it out for the St. Paul campus and the branch stations." When Ted Fenske was there, we didn't get much but he had each one of these guys fighting one another. I found that he'd brought all of the superintendents together. I said, "This is how much money I'm going to try to go to the legislature for . . ."

CAC: And how you set priorities?

WH: ". . . and you guys tell me what your needs are but then you also tell me what the priorities are. Then on the St. Paul campus, I would have to start out . . . this is how much we're asking for at the branch stations. Okay, this year Agronomy is on the list or Plant Pathology. Borlaug Hall was a combined effort. My god! seven years, we were at that damned thing. It started out at \$8 million . . . then it ended up costing close to \$20 million because they didn't appropriate it right in the beginning. I'm not suggesting to you it's a better building because it was \$20 million. It just was inflation. It was much easier to get these seven—now we were down to seven branch stations—to agree and only once did we have an end run and that guy left the position rather quickly. That ended it right there. Were you on the Faculty Consultative Committee? The time that the faculty would have to spend on getting the presentation . . . my god! Then, of course, you get Plant Services get involved. Uh!

CAC: Let's come back to the main theme of the switch in the legislature.

WH: From my standpoint, the main importance of that is that the legislators were more dependent, if you will. You can say that was then to our advantage. I'm not sure it was. They were different kinds of people. They were perfectly willing to give six to eight weeks of concentrated time and then whatever it took in the interim, but informed themselves, but asked you for advice, and so on. This happened very seldom after the 1970s because these guys had staff. The staff might ask you but you never really knew how the staff . . .

CAC: It was more difficult to get to the legislators on university matters?

WH: Yes, unless in our case, we were out there all the time so I just would go and see them. They just spend more time here. They're here six months out of the year and then special sessions.

CAC: And every year?

WH: And every year.

CAC: The staff are year around appointments?

WH: The staff are year round. Where I said we used to have these branch station visits because of the buildings, well, then it got to be on almost everything. That Environment Committee, my god! those first few years . . . Of course, Agriculture was right in the center of all of it. [laughter] I was part of the Minnesota Agri-growth Council—helped get it organized—and we had what we called *diaper legislation*. Every chicken, pig, cow would have to be *diapered* for what first came out of the old Department of Environment. Probably, by working together, we got it modified to be workable, and of course, it's been progressively made more and more difficult and I have no problem with that.

CAC: The problems are more difficult?

WH: The problems are far more difficult, sure. I think, it was more comfortable. You could sit down with these guys in their environment and they felt comfortable with that.

CAC: Now, is reapportionment part of this change of focus [unclear]?

WH: I told you, I think, some of our best support came after the 1970s and with urban. But, of course, when the Democrats took over, immediately, we didn't get these big staffs. That's build up over time. Ray Faricy had Vic Manos. Actually, Rod Searle had him. Now, Vic Manus, I think, is part of the university staff in Business and works, probably, on budget on the legislative request. He was good because he was, let's say, appropriately suspicious of anything that we asked for; but he was fair, I always think, in making presentations to the committee. I think, it's like so many things, churches, for example, used to have the pastor. Now, you have the senior pastor, and the one for youth, and the one for counseling. Basically, when you come down to it, as I say to our minister, "Just work on getting me to heaven . . ."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: ". . . because sometimes I have a pretty hard . . ." You remember Doug Pitts, of course?

CAC: Oh, yes.

WH: Doug, every once in awhile, felt because he had had that church down in Janesville . . .

CAC: We lived across the street from him is the reason I know him.

WH: . . . he had to make some comment about how tough it was for farmers, about the hungry people of the world, and so on. I can remember one Sunday, just standing right up in church like a Quaker, saying, "Doug, you worry about getting us to heaven and I'll worry about you getting food."

[short break in interview as Mr. Chambers and Mr. Hueg have a short conversation with Mrs. Hueg.]

WH: I was quite impressed, of course, by the willingness of these people to kind of accept me. What I told you earlier, about Ray Amberg . . . he did a good job of training Stan Wenberg and so I would say that really pretty much through the 1970s—although it was definitely a shift—there was still a lot of trust between the university and the legislature. I think, we had a few people . . . one of them Hale Champion—I don't know if other people have commented—but he was so brash and he would make comments. I'll never forget the morning, in the legislature, when somebody asked about how many airplanes the university had. Hale Champion said, "Three." Well, I used the university Air Force quite a bit to get around the state and I knew that there were eleven out there. Now, they were in the process, Clarke, of selling those. The guy that asked the question—I forget his name now and he's long out of the legislature—a young guy, an accountant, sharp, as they were walking out the door, he said, "Well, I nailed him. They've got eleven airplanes."

CAC: Heavens!

WH: That and a few other things that happened . . . The most recent, to me anyway, was when the regents, but primarily David Lebedoff, made the comment, "I've been on the regents for years and I didn't know we had a regents reserve." The regents reserve was traditional. It's the way good deans and department heads got extra money for their departments. It was the money left over after each quarter, perfectly legitimate. I always felt that poor old Ken got strung out on the line to dry.

CAC: You're suggesting that the regents knew perfectly well there was this . . . ?

WH: I would think so and if they didn't, they shouldn't have been regents. That's all part of the budget.

CAC: I have several conversations and, of course, they knew.

WH: That's all part of the budget. It was just like our income. I can remember Chuck McCarthy . . . no it wasn't McCarthy . . . he was a dentist and became the chairman of the board. When he found out that we had income, why it was always the greatest revelation in the world. I said, "If you've ever read the budget book, it's there. It's what is appropriated money and

income. If we didn't have that income money, we could not operate these branch experiment stations." He says, "That money should be controlled by the regents." I said, "Be my guest. That says you take over all the responsibility for running the place and everything else." I said, "Maybe, Chuck, you and I ought to trade places. You be the vice-president for Agriculture and I'll come out and run your dental office."

CAC: [laughter]

WH: That wasn't a smart thing to say but that ended that conversation.

CAC: To what degree did the various presidents play a part in the state legislature, making presentations or conversing with [unclear] persons?

WH: I knew Dr. Morrill but only from a distance.

CAC: Sure.

WH: It was Met Wilson the president when I came into administration, very impressive. He had a famous line, I always say. You'd ask him a question, he'd say, "I'll get that to you." Some years later, I was talking to the woman who was the head administrator for Dick Fitzsimmons in the Appropriations Office. We were just sitting there having a cup of coffee—now Moos is the president—and I said, "God! Met Wilson was really fantastic in the way he made a presentation. It was scholarly but friendly. He did the appropriate handshaking and little visiting that had to be done." She said, "And he never sent the information that he promised." [laughter] "Oh," she said, "I used to type that so many times, 'We'll get that for you. We'll get that for you.'"

CAC: [laughter]

WH: I then remember saying something to Wenberg about it. He said, "Don't tell anybody you're going to get them something if you don't intend to get it." To his credit and to Kegler . . . Kegler and George Robb kept notes and the day after you made a presentation, you got a list, "You promised this. You promised this. You promised this. Send me a copy." That's the way ought to be.

CAC: Yes.

WH: I don't know what it's like now.

CAC: And Mr. Moos in the legislature?

WH: Mr. Moos was . . . as I've said to people, "He liked the ceremonial parts of being the president" but it was pathetic. Elmer Learn was his assistant. Elmer had been an ag-economist—still is, in that sense.

CAC: Right.

WH: He was department head for one year and then he went over there with Malcolm. The only good thing about that was that we got Vern Ruttan to come to the university and that was an interesting little sideline. Vern, at that time, was economist at the International Rice Research Center in the Philippines, had been there, maybe, three years. He was interested—at least I'd heard he was interested but the department members knew he was interested—in making a change. I was chairman of the search committee and went in and told Woodie that the committee would like to have him come out. He says, "No way can we fund that." I said, "At least, can I make a telephone call to him?" "Yes, go ahead." Vern had other ways of getting here. He was on this Agricultural Development Council in New York and he said, "I could make an arrangement and you don't have to pay my expenses from New York to Minneapolis and back." We brought Vern here and, of course, he was the one they selected. Vern had told us—this is really an aside but I think important because you were talking . . .

CAC: Because [unclear] professor, right?

WH: Yes . . . but you were talking about Ag-Econ and it's strength. A lot of people felt that Vern was almost too laissez faire in terms of the way with the department people. All the while he was department head, he was writing books, and everything else, and I suspect, maybe, still does. He had his hands in so many things of importance. Then he went to be president of this Agricultural Development Council. They moved the office to Singapore and he went there, I think, for four or five years. Then, that was dissolved. It became part of the Rockefeller brothers and all of that mish-mash that, eventually, ended up to Winrock and Vern was available. Cornell offered him the Babcock chair. Whoever has that chair can be in any discipline.

CAC: Sure.

WH: We had found out that Vern . . . and what's his wife's name, Marilyn? . . . yes, Marilyn . . . had bought a place up at Ely [Minnesota] so we put a little hardcore press on him. I can remember, it was out at the Spring Hill Conference Center, some international food conference, and Jim Tammen was the dean then and the two of us took him for a little walk out on the patio on a beautiful spring day. I said, "Vern, I would very much like you to come back. Jim would like you to come back and somehow we will get you a regents professorship." It took a hell of a long time. It was after I left the university but it happened . . . wonderful guy.

CAC: Yes, he is.

WH: A real asset to this institution.

CAC: Yes. We're coming back to the legislature briefly. Mr. Magrath?

WH: Well, you asked me about Met . . .

CAC: Earlier . . .

WH: Why we got on the Ag-Econ? Because his talks—I think, Elmer Learn had a lot to do with them and his staff—so, he would read these.

CAC: This is Met Wilson now?

WH: No, this was Mac Moos.

CAC: I'm sorry. Okay.

WH: Then when they started asking questions, he didn't know one damn thing about it—excuse me. It was a disaster. Then, he would climb in his limousine, and go back to the campus, and we would pick up the pieces.

CAC: Or downtown?

WH: Or downtown, whatever the case may be. As a person, I really liked Dr. Moos but I always felt that was not the right job and after somebody like Wilson, it showed. Then "Easy" [E. W. Ziebarth] was the interim president for a year. In truth, Peter was the third choice. I think, in fairness to him—and of course, hindsight is wonderful—the man never stayed in any job long enough for us to know what he did do. I can remember—I wasn't on the search committee—he came and visited with our administrative group, with some members of the Advisory Council who all put that question to him, If you're the president, will you support this idea of a vice-president for Agriculture? and he corrected, and deputy? He was dean of the graduate school of Brown by the time he was twenty-seven years old. Then, he goes to Nebraska as the dean of liberal arts and was in that job a relatively short time . . . then, assistant vice-president for academic affairs at Nebraska. Then, he goes to one of the strong units of the State University of New York, Binghamton—I mean, that's what the people in New York say. He came to us at thirty-nine years of age. The great unfortunate thing is he stayed ten years. Maybe, in five years, it would have proven he was pretty good but in ten years, it kind of came unraveled. My feeling was that he had to touch everything so, I think, he probably approached the legislature in a very energetic and serious way.

CAC: And fairly well-informed in detail?

WH: And well-informed. He knew what he was saying. I used to like to go out in the state with Peter. It was interesting if you sat behind him, you saw little characteristics that made you

know he was nervous as heck. He had this terrible habit of taking his papers and . . . oh god! used to drive me nuts. Then, he would stand on one foot with the other one cocked. Crazy things that, probably, the audience didn't notice it but when you had been with him day after . . .

CAC: The audience even knew it.

WH: They may. I don't know what then happened. I think the main thing was he really had to touch everything and that kills a lot of administrators. This young man [Marty] who wanted to be the governor of our state, that's what killed his campaign. He didn't have any confidence in anybody that was working around him. [laughter] Now, if that was the way he was going to try to run the state, we'd have been in real trouble.

CAC: Yes. It was the problem that [President] Jimmy Carter ran into in his own administration.

WH: And maybe, to some extent, this guy [President Bill Clinton], I don't know. It's been interesting. When Ken made the statement that he would not be a candidate for president, I can remember letting out one hell of a big groan, knowing that he wanted to be the president. He never should have said that. There's a lot of faculty—as you well know . . . you know faculty better than I do—that never quite forgave him for that. He and I were on the Senate Research Committee, both ex officio. He was the associate dean of the Graduate School. I was director of the experiment station. We used to have to drive, occasionally, together down to Hormel because we had the Hormel Institute. It was connected to the Graduate School but it had a lot of things related to agriculture and so that's how we got involved.

CAC: Sure.

WH: We used to have wonderful visits. One of the first times, come to find out, we're both out of New York City; he from the Bronx, Bronx School of Science and me from Long Island . . . a lot of things. We kind of agreed one time, that if we were successful—kind of two egotistical guys—it was because of our background. I went to a high school of 6000 kids. I think I had a wonderful education but by godies! if you were going to get noticed by the teachers, you either were a complete bust or you had to be pretty aggressive.

CAC: [laughter] Yes.

WH: You had to get up, and talk, and so on. I was in the choir and I was in this . . .

CAC: And Ken, too?

WH: And Ken, too. We both made that comment that people that have grown up in the Midwest, they're more comfortable with themselves . . .

CAC: That's known as Minnesota nice.

WH: Yes, well, not only here. I saw it to some degree in Michigan.

CAC: Sure.

WH: And to some degree in western New York but I grew up in a high-powered family. My father was constantly fighting for contracts. His language was very colorful. Unfortunately, I learned part of that. My kids . . . I just do it. I've done it here a few times and that's probably not appropriate. It just kind of comes.

CAC: It's always appropriate to be whom you are.

WH: Yes, I guess. I really had great hopes for Ken when he was the president. I also think—and that's all part of this history . . . whether this new structure is the answer—maybe, we're at that point where we have to put more of the responsibility back where it should have been in the first place.

CAC: The provinces?

WH: In the provinces. I like to think that our branch experiment stations were successful. They made our part of the university look good because they were the arm. Let's face it! Most of the research done at those branch stations was organized by people on the St. Paul campus, the Don Rasmussons, Ernie Rinkes, and so on. The barley research that goes on at Morris and Crookston is really Don Rasmusson's research. It's the verification, if you will, of the new ideas. I think, somehow we learn to, Okay, that poor agronomist out there, he's the guy that has to overlook all of this; so, let's give him some credit. So, the papers were written jointly and dah, tadah, tadah. I think the same with Extension.

CAC: You bet.

WH: To me, this is the next dimension. I heard some comments made here over the weekend by [C. Eugene] Gene Allen, the current vice-president for the institute who has hopes of being this new provost. His point was that the university, in a sense, has to reinvent itself, that in fact, we probably will not be having most of our students sit in the classroom. They'll be out in the hinterland there someplace taking it by interactive whatever, will be able to talk with . . . That's kind of like space age but in truth—and we're back to your question—this is what Extension is all about. Extension . . . you'd call a meeting, the people would come in, and I would hear something, and immediately, I would contact somebody up at Cornell and say, "Hey, these are some of the questions that our guys are asking."

CAC: Right, right.

WH: "Do we have some research on this or could we set up a demonstration?" That was the basis of a lot of the things that I did.

CAC: That's that contact with the grass roots, isn't it?

WH: It is.

CAC: What you're suggesting is that the research is done, a lot of it, in St. Paul and credited out but a lot of the questions are asked in the field?

WH: Sure.

CAC: The whole development of the sunflower industry or the sugar . . .

WH: Exactly.

CAC: . . . they all have special problems?

WH: Did you interview Bob Robinson?

CAC: No. I should.

WH: Bob Robinson—I say I'm an agriculturist—he is truly the traditional agronomist. Bob always asks the question, "Why don't we grow this here? Well, let's find out." Now, the sunflower thing, I can remember when Bob Robinson . . .

CAC: Yes, yes.

WH: . . . he did it under a umbrella project called "New Crops for Minnesota." He would come and he would report this at the meetings where we made decisions on new crop varieties that we would release. That's a formal process. People think somebody develops this but it's a very formal process. All of the wheat and barley goes through industry checks and so on. But Robbie was working on these crops that oh, hell, nobody thought they were very important. Now, look what the sunflower industry is in this state.

CAC: Yes. It's a [unclear].

WH: He did some of the cultural work with soybeans that Jean Lambert . . . please, I'm taking nothing away from Jean, but Jean concentrated on the genetics. That was complicated enough, especially in the 1960s when the industry decided that we wanted to really get into this export of soybeans to Japan. The Japanese had a very special requirement and that was the hilum, that little seed attachment, had to be perfectly white. They didn't want a black hilum because when they make the tofu . . .

CAC: I see!

WH: . . . then you get specks in it.

CAC: All right.

WH: Jean found the gene . . .

CAC: Oh, good heavens.

WH: [laughter] . . . that controlled that.

CAC: [unclear] [laughter]

WH: Yes. Again, if you go back to the history, in 1927 I think, H[erbert] K. Hayes had gone to China, brought back some soybean seeds with him from Manchuria. He kind of fiddled around with them a little bit but he was a geneticist, quite a fundamental geneticist for that time. He got his degree from Yale. You don't think of Yale as . . . but Yale gets the credit, or Connecticut gets the credit for hybrid corn because the guy who developed the whole idea of hybrid corn got fired at the University of Illinois because the inbreds were, maybe, three feet and ten kernels on a cob.

CAC: I always thought it was Henry C. Wallace . . .

WH: He helped to make it commercial.

CAC: Yes.

WH: But it was Dr. [Edward M.] East at the Connecticut Experiment Station, which was Yale, and a student named H. K. Hayes who came here, I think, in 1913-1914, took the old oak pollinated lines of corn here, went through this whole process of inbreeding, and then came up with the hybrids. Because he had done that, now, he goes to China and he brings back this soybean; and in a talk he gave to one of the branch station field days in 1928-1929, somebody asked him how important the soybean would be in Minnesota. He said, "I expect that, maybe, someday, we will use it as a forage crop and a green manure crop"—you know something that you plow down.

CAC: Sure, sure.

WH: Well, it's the second most important crop in the state.

CAC: That happened fast. I went away from southern Minnesota to the war, and other things, in 1939 and by 1950, we used to think it was a corn/hog. It was corn/soybeans/hogs . . . fast.

WH: Sure. I came here in 1957. When you'd go through southern Minnesota, Highway 60 from Mankato to Worthington, there were still lots of dairies, lots of livestock. Today it's mostly corn, soybeans, Florida or Arizona, you know. That's the rotation.

CAC: [laughter]

WH: [laughter] So, a lot of changes. Again—I think you said you want to talk about the agricultural system—to me, the real strength is that, although the public experiment station is still quite vital and important, private has taken over a big part of that, especially, in corn, in soybeans, certainly in the chemicals.

CAC: You bet.

WH: There was a time when most of the new herbicides, pesticides came out of universities. Very few do now. We evaluate them, see where they fit into a management system. And that's not all bad. The same with nutrition. Companies like Purina and Cargill, and others do pretty good nutrition research. I could go on for hours.

CAC: We're going to on some more but, maybe we should take a time out to have a glass of milk.

[break for lunch]

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[Tape 3, Side 1]

CAC: Whoever is listening to this, I hope they are as engaged and interested as I have been. We have several things still . . . twenty-five things we could talk about. We broke for lunch and you mentioned several things that we could pick up on. Then just looking at your CV here that you kindly sent in advance, there are all kinds of things in the foreign field, not only recently with your Russian program, but earlier as well. Why don't we talk about your own perspective in the world outreach of your own personal career at work but also the university's, as you've seen it because we're an international institution.

WH: I think there were, maybe, two things that influenced me when I came here, initially, for an interview . . . that Minnesota has been known in agricultural circles, but then after I got here found out in much of its endeavors to be an international institution. The first real formalizing of that though, I guess, came with Met Wilson when he had somebody come from the Ford Foundation, and as you'll recall, the first program we had then as a university, that was really university, was in Chile. It was with Catholica University. It was Ford Foundation funded.

CAC: Didn't he choose an ag-economist to set that up? Wasn't it Will Cochrane that came aboard on that?

WH: Yes. Right. Then, of course, at that time or shortly after that, they created a position of dean or director of international programs. That's gone through . . .

CAC: Different names?

WH: Yes, different names, and different people, and different interests, and you name it. Minnesota has always had a good reputation and if you'd look in some of the plant explorations that were done in the late 1800s, early 1900s, it was seldom that there was not a Minnesota scientist in botany, and/or plant pathology, or whatever. Then Stakman, who was long time head of Plant Pathology, developed a very strong relationship with China. Interestingly enough, when the university as a university came into the picture of having more formal relationships with China, the College of Agriculture already the year before had signed a working agreement with Beijing Agriculture University.

CAC: This would have been approximately what date?

WH: I would think this was 1976 or 1978.

CAC: Oh, that late. Okay.

WH: It turned out that the man who was the academic head of the Beijing Agriculture University was one of Stakman's students in Plant Pathology and sometime in the late 1920s. He was an old man, obviously. Dr. Hayes, when he was head of Agronomy, when he retired, he spent three or four years in China, on and off. Will Meyers, who was the department head in Agronomy when I first came here . . . On one side I was very pleased of that fact but it was very frustrating because he was never around. He was always in India or South America and, eventually then, left the university and went with the Rockefeller Foundation. It's just kind of natural. The demand is there but the attitude if a faculty member in our units had an interest in doing something international, we usually were willing to shift their schedules to make that possible.

CAC: Because the tradition is there?

WH: Well, the tradition is there and it's this whole concept—it started in this country—you cannot have a country stable, politics will not be stable if people are hungry. And of course, if you read, which you know better than I, the history of the United States, it was the [unclear] up and down . . .

CAC: Yes.

WH: . . . and basically, it was because people were hungry, and they didn't have land; and even though we had the tremendous movement through the Homestead Act, that was no guarantee that people would be successful. I always said in my talks that the beginning of commercial agriculture was after, roughly, 1867, five years after the Homestead Act, because people who got land through the Homestead Act had five years . . .

CAC: All failed. [laughter]

WH: . . . to prove their land and they didn't all succeed. Then, the guy next door bought that land or part of it and that's really how commercial agriculture got started . . . the enlargement, you know. That's the fun of tracing our own farm back. The original charter of that farm was 1854 from the state of Wisconsin. This is before the Homestead Act.

CAC: Yes.

WH: So, in a period of four days, in 1862, four transactions took place. The son sold the farm to his father, the father back to the state of Wisconsin, Wisconsin to the United States, the United States to the son, so they could get the benefit of whatever came out of the Homestead Act.

CAC: The deeds to your property in Wisconsin indicate that they . . .

WH: Indicate all of those.

CAC: God! that's . . .

WH: And I think truly, Clarke, if just some ordinary soul had bought that farm . . . In the first place they wouldn't have paid cash for it so they wouldn't have gotten all of the deed.

CAC: Right.

WH: Of course, you realize that I paid cash—or we, Hella and I—because it was all the money I made as a university professor.

CAC: Good! Good investment.

WH: I have never suggested otherwise. Hella was very helpful in our acquiring that land. They would overlook that. If you know the history, the important history . . . You said something earlier, the success of American agriculture, compared to other parts of the world . . . I'm not suggesting northern Europe wasn't successful but it was all built on a peasant agriculture. In the United States, other than the sixteen southern states, it was built on the bower, the owner.

CAC: Yes.

WH: Sure, they rented land. Iowa still has, and Minnesota, a high tendency rate of land absentee landlord, but the ownership pattern is such that most of those leases are for a longer term than year to year, which is important in terms of soil stewardship, and everything else.

CAC: Sure, you bet.

WH: I have seen international development in agriculture as one of the real critical issues. How do you get land moved from generation to the next? Phil Raup is the guy you ought to talk to about this.

CAC: Yes, I've interviewed him.

WH: In some cultures where they divide the land up among all the children, as again, say, the northern Europeans system and the English system where it's always the oldest son . . . I heard somebody talk about this just recently. In Korea, it is always the oldest son but in other parts of Asia, it keeps getting divided. In the Philippines that's what they've done and it's kind of pathetic because it's down to less than three-quarters . . .

CAC: Less than you can make a living on, that's for sure.

WH: Yes. So, that has some problems. My own involvement in international agriculture development was always, How do we assure that economy an adequate supply of food? I think the program in Chile was at a very difficult time. That was when Mr. [Eduardo] Frei [Montalva] was the president. They had gone through land reform. They left out a very vital ingredient and that was educating the people who were going to get the land, the peasants. So, partly that was our responsibility working with Catholic University in Santiago to take young people . . . They already had an Extension system of sorts at the province level but they had nobody to go between what were formerly the Rockefeller Foundation Research Centers, where there was a tremendous amount of information . . . and how do you get that information out there? The initial job of the Chile project was to train—that's the wrong word; you train a horse, you educate people—to educate people to make that transfer, Of course, the people who were most receptive were the people who still had the land, not the poor *sentimiento*, they were called . . . the peasant. The history now, if you look at it, many of those farms that were broken up ended up going back into, at least, the management by the original owners . . .

CAC: In larger units?

WH: Yes, because these people were not skilled in that. The other part of that program was with the Department of Economics. You mentioned Will Cochrane. Initially, it was Will and then I forget who did it from Economics. It was to establish at *Catholica* a very strong Department of Economics.

CAC: I see.

WH: Our responsibility in the College of Agriculture or the Institute really was an Extension Program. It was administered through the Extension Service. It was to develop what we called specialists. I went down several times and I would take my hat off as a, then, assistant director and/or director of the experiment station and be an agronomist again. That was kind of fun—beautiful country. Personally I got involved . . . as a matter of fact, in 1964, took the second People to People farmer group to Russia and that was a real inoculation for me. I was forty years old, quite impressed with what the opportunity was there.

CAC: Opportunity means the work to be done?

WH: Yes, but what could be done . . . I mean, that land resource. Here we are 1994-1995 and this is really our project in the northwest section near Moscow working with some 25,000 acres. The land resource is wonderful. It's the people resource that, How do you get them to accept responsibility? Basically, there's no land transfer system. There's no good banking system that people could make loans. Our efforts are joint ventures. We're perfectly willing to get the money raised here in the United States, put it to work there; but they have to work out the business, a profitability plan. You know, that's just like talking to the lamp here. They don't know what you're talking about. So, this summer, we brought twelve of these guys here, spent two and one-half weeks . . .

CAC: You're saying *we*, this is not the university but this other organization?

WH: No, no. This is another organization. But the point is that all of them were either former university people or my counterparts. One of my colleagues is my counterpart at Iowa State, Lee Kolmer.

CAC: I see, yes.

WH: Ralph Hofstead, who was a former CEO [Chief Executive Officer] of Land O'Lakes, is the chairman of our group. We brought these twelve . . . I can't call them farmers because they're not that. They want to be the business people that will work in this rural community. Just this summer, we changed from the Russian Farms Project to the Russian Farms and Community Project. That's what extension's been all about in this country for the last thirty-five, forty years. You can't just look at the farm. You've got to look at the total environment, the total system in which that farm finds itself.

CAC: But introduce it to a culture that's entirely different, you've got lots . . .

WH: Lots to do. Yes, And I think, maybe, the most significant that came out of that visit was that they said, "Now, we know what trust is. In Russia there's not much trust. We thought you were in this because you were going to make a lot of money." Well, we were not going to make a lot of money. My reason for being in it is I have fourteen grandchildren. I showed them those pictures of my grandkids almost everyday. The last night we were together, I said, "I hope I've

made my point. I want your part of the world to be stable because if it is not, then my grandchildren will go through what we did." I didn't believe in it, but my wife did, that we ought to have a bomb shelter—can you imagine in St. Anthony Park—so I bought the bricks. I bought the beams. It turned out to be a very nice patio.

CAC: [laughter]

WH: But I never built the shelter because I just thought it was so negative. We've got to bring peace to the world. That's the reason Hella and I work in the Philippines, to help with education but, again, as an agriculturist, there's thing that I can do. In her case, she's a linguist, so she can help with the English. As far as the university, maybe, the most successful program, not only for the university internationally, but USAID [United States Agency for International Development] was the Morocco project.

CAC: Hmmm.

WH: That ran for twenty-five years, just closed out I think a little over a year ago. [It] was, probably, greater than anybody ever could have anticipated. The crazy thing is at the time it started, I was not really all that gung-ho because I thought, My god! what are we going to Morocco for? I'm thinking of Dorothy Lamour and Bing Crosby going across the sand dunes and, of course, Morocco has some beautiful agricultural land. As it turned out, we built a relationship with eight other U.S. universities and this, Clarke, will go on forever for simple that the graduate students had to go back to Morocco to work on their research. That was the success. Most other programs where they came here, they worked on a U.S. problem, went home . . . Uh. What do we do? India's is a perfect example of that. We've educated a lot of Ph.D.s who go back to India and they still don't have a job . . . or Egypt.

CAC: Or they choose to stay here?

WH: Or they choose to stay here and work at some very low level, technical job. I think there's two things . . . the university has had a very open attitude about consulting, against what it was at Michigan State when I was there as a graduate student that I saw. You were encouraged to go out and help in the community. Maybe, we've gone overboard in some areas but the point is that it was there. You could spend one day a week, if you could justify it, in a consulting capacity. The other was this attitude about having international—I don't like the word foreign—students come here, not segregate them, but make them a part. That's what I knew as an undergraduate student at Cornell.

CAC: Hmmm.

WH: We had a lot of international students. As a matter of fact, in that house that I lived in that first year, we had a young man from South America, I think, Argentina. [laughter] He used to tell some really interesting stories. One was that when he wanted his horse, somebody would

bring it for him. When he wanted his bicycle, somebody would bring it for him. He couldn't understand when he came here that, well, you're in the dairy program, and you go out and work in a barn two weeks and yes, you do shovel manure and yes, you do feed and milk the cow, and this, that, and the other. It was not a case of, oh, José, come over here and do this for me. He had a tough time making that adjustment. I saw that in graduate school with some Indian students.

CAC: Yes.

WH: I made up my mind that if I ever got to where I, eventually did, but I wasn't . . . Rather than being critical of them, we were unfair to them not telling them that when you come to the United States, you have to do what we do. It was so against their culture. Why should I work with my hands? I'd hire that. I'll go back home as a Ph.D. geneticist. I won't . . .

CAC: I worked with some graduate students from Kuwait. Boy! it was strong there and they didn't want to do anything.

WH: One of the first things I did when I became director of the experiment station was to say that nobody will be funded, no graduate student, more than three years.

CAC: Keep moving?

WH: We really got a lot of completions in a hurry. It's crazy, you know. It's not good for the faculty. It certainly is not good for the student whether they be domestic or international. I just really feel that the university, at least in our arena . . . Forestry always had a . . . Frank Kaufert spent considerable time in Korea after the Korean War helping evaluate their forests.

CAC: There is even a number of people from our medical faculty who go.

WH: Medical faculty and, probably, in other disciplines that I'm less aware of. To me, those are all positive things. I know when we went to Morocco, we took tremendous criticism out in the state. I explained this to people . . .

CAC: You mean it was seen as a boondoggle, a wasting of resources?

WH: Why would we go there? Number one, they are Muslims.

CAC: I see.

WH: So, what difference does it make, they are people. In that context, through the Iranian hostage thing, I just went out of my tree. Then, we did the same thing in Iraq. We have people in the State Department—again, my opinion—that have never learned that these people are different than we are in many respects. You give them always alternatives. It took me quite

awhile in the Moroccan project with Mr. McCauley . . . We were a guest in his country so he never said, "No." But it was his program. He truly believed it. So, don't you come and tell me what to do. We would make a suggestion and he would say, "Yes." He'd say, "Yes," and "Yes." I found out that there were three kinds of yes. Yes, maybe, we'll do it. Yes. And yes, don't ever bring it up again. So, then you go back the second year and "Well, Mr. McCauley, you had agreed that we were going to do this?" "Oh, I didn't agree. I said, 'Yes.'"

CAC: [laughter]

WH: It took about three years for this dumb head to figure that out. These people want choices. Now, I'm not so sure that isn't true with our farmers.

CAC: Sure.

WH: When I was a student at Cornell in Extension, the instructors always said, "You give the farmer choices." My first experience, I told you this Green Acres when I went into Herkimer County, I went out and this farmer said—there was something he needed an in-between crop because we had had a drought—"Now, tell me what I should grow." I said, "I'll give you some choices." He said, "I didn't ask you out here for choices. Tell me what I should grow." I said, "If it was mine, this is what I would do." I had another experience when I first came to Minnesota. I had only seen flax at the Farmers' Museum at Cooperstown.

CAC: Yes.

WH: I knew, of course, what it was. I'd read about it. But you go up in the Red River Valley and it was just like they were lakes when they were in blossom.

CAC: Beautiful.

WH: Sitting in my office there in the Agronomy Building on the campus one morning, this call comes from a fellow, Al Kinney was his name. I later found out he operated something like 20,000 acres of land up in the Warren area. His problem was that he had yellow rocket. It's like mustard. It's a biennial, fall weed. How do I control it? So, quick, quick, quick, I go into the little book here on weed control. In those days, there were, maybe ten chemicals. Now, there's thousands. I said, "Oh, well, from our research at the Crookston station it looks like if you would use a third of a pound of MCP but you've got . . ." I'm giving him all the details . . . the wind can't be blowing, dah, tadah. I said, "Now, if it were mine, I would try this a little heavier on one part and then, maybe, that recommendation, and leave part of it untreated. Then, you're going to know." Mentally, I'm thinking, well, maybe, the guy's got—he hadn't told me how many acres—fifty acres total. Comes fall, I go up there to see what the result was. He had 850 acres of flax and he did exactly that. A third, he treated heavier; a third the way it was; and the third that he hadn't treated, of course, had just a much lower yield because of the weed competition. The about right was fine and he had problems where he used the double amount because it just

knocked the flowers right off. So, he laughed about it. "Well, hell," he said, "we both learned something, didn't we?" I said, "Yes. The thing I learned is to ask first, How many acres are we talking about?" [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

WH: Really, that's what Extension is all about. It's this exchange of ideas. Sure, I felt very strong about it. I should kind of pick the brains of my colleagues in the Agronomy Department, get the best information, and of course, they were quite concerned about it. Most scientists in biology, if they've got ten tests, they'd like to have ten more. That's not the real life. When we came out with these new short-strawed varieties, we got into quite a difficult situation with what's called the Crop Quality Council. They test for all the universities, put them through bread baking, the mixing, and all of this . . . all of these things that are important. Initially, the protein level of the short-strawed varieties, stuff that [Norman E.] Borlaug and others developed in these international centers . . . I went to the meeting and I said, "This is what we have." Actually, the wheat scientists had presented the information but as the assistant director or the director—I guess I was by then—of the station, I had to defend whether we were going to release or not release. In addition to the bread baking qualities, or the mixing, or this and that, I think we had to look at the economics. Well, the industry wasn't interested in that.

CAC: I see.

WH: These two varieties that we said we would release were yielding 27 percent more than the standard. Now, I go to the legislature. I ask them for money to do this research. Now, we come up with something superior in one characteristic, yield and the protein wasn't that bad. I went through this talk last year and then knowing we were going to do this, I went through it again. Essentially, I said, "We're going to release that variety." My colleague in North Dakota was very unhappy about it. He called the man who was the chairman and asked for a meeting. This was Mark Heffelfinger . . . Peavey Company. I see Mark now, occasionally, and I'd like to say, "Hey, do you remember when . . . ?" But again, a role of a regent . . . Les Malkerson was the chairman of the board at the time. He called me up and he said, "I think we've got a Donnybrook coming." He says, "Your counterpart at North Dakota's not happy that you're going to release this variety because of the quality." Wheat to North Dakota was a heck of a lot more important than in Minnesota. In that Red River Valley, it's important. We had this meeting. Essentially, some people would have liked my job to be had; and Les, to his credit, just said, "That's a decision we'll make here, not in this room." I still see Les regularly in Florida and we don't talk about this. We released it. Two years after that variety was released, it was being grown on 4.8 million acres in Minnesota, South Dakota, North Dakota and Montana. That meant about \$33, \$34 million more income and that was each year, each year.

CAC: Sure.

WH: Arlen Hazen, who was the dean and director at North Dakota, it kind of strained our relation for a little while. We both got over it because as he well knew . . .

CAC: It worked.

WH: It would work . . . they would come up with better varieties, which they have. *Era* was the name of this. It was a new era.

CAC: Yes.

WH: We went from the big stiff old straw down to the short straw and in the process of making that change, we lost a little bit of the quality. Those are things that if you'd done it strictly on, well, this is what industry wanted . . . but industry was not willing to say the same thing to, now, the private plant breeders who've gotten into this. They were releasing stuff that was absolutely junk—Bill Hueg's opinion but a lot of other people's. It's all published data.

CAC: The university did and continues to play a very crucial role?

WH: Right. I don't ever see the time when there will not be a place for public research. It may not be done the way we are now. [laughter] We raised that question when Al Linck was assistant director. We started a program—he reminded me of it just this weekend when we were having breakfast together—and it ties in with what the university's going through now. Do we have to offer everything that everybody thinks we ought to? Why don't we get together with some states? We tried this in the middle 1960s in Agriculture. It worked until the commodity groups—in other words the dairymen or the sheep people, or this, and that—because we were going to combine the Wisconsin, Michigan and the Minnesota system for sheep. It makes no difference where you have them. Instead of having seven or eight locations in the three states, have two. We would have had one of them at Grand Rapids and they would have had one in northern Michigan. The sheep population then was already going down. Today, it's important but it's not that important to have every state doing it. The same with dairy nutrition. It was important to us. Well, just by now, the budget problems that all states are having, if by chance a dairy nutritionist retires, chances are, they're not going to get hired back; but the dairy industry isn't going to suffer for the simple reason that ruminant nutrition, whether it's done in Minnesota or in California doesn't make one heck of a lot of difference. There's a lot of things that are so obvious but we seem to have to wait until we get clubbed . . .

CAC: There are artificial divisions, aren't they?

WH: Oh, right.

CAC: To put up regional cooperation is extraordinarily difficult.

WH: The country was divided into four regions, both for Extension and research, with the idea that there was cooperation. It was mostly on paper because each state wanted to have their own expertise.

CAC: Each must have its own School of Veterinary Medicine?

WH: Well, there's only nineteen in the country but, maybe, we could get along with eight. That's heresy. [laughter]

CAC: It was indicated when there was a strong suggestion to eliminate the School of Dentistry and the School of Veterinary Medicine.

WH: Yes.

CAC: A lot of constituents who are there locally. Maybe, the time has come, Bill, to kind of reflect on what you and I would consider the larger issues, not that each one of the things we've talked about don't spin out into things of very crucial importance; but you've spoken often with me and this afternoon about Land-Grant Mission, which makes this university and its counterparts quite different. So, why don't you reflect a bit on that?

WH: It was, probably, only after I came to Minnesota that I realized the good fortune that Minnesota had to put the state university, which was established first, with the Land-Grant. As you know being an historian, it was a pitched battle went on here. Land was offered out in Glencoe, and Hutchinson, here, there, and everywhere.

CAC: Yes, yes.

WH: Then, the legislature and the regents of that time, fortunately, had the wisdom to say, "It's going to be one."

CAC: Is there any state that the same thing would be true? Or are they always separate as in Iowa?

WH: They tend to be separate but Nebraska is together.

CAC: I see.

WH: That came at a later time.

CAC: But there aren't many?

WH: There aren't many.

CAC: Okay.

WH: You see at Cornell, that would be the closest thing I knew. Cornell was not the Land-Grant college. It was a private university but then the way things were done and the arrangement with Mr. [Ezra] Cornell for the Land-Grant which was a 100,000 acres in central Wisconsin—that made him a millionaire when the timber got cut off which he proceeded to lose on the Atlantic cable and a few other little things . . . It was kind of the philosophy that went with this. Now, I don't know of any country in the world that ever gave its land away. In fact, that's what the United States did.

CAC: It gave away the whole out-of-doors.

WH: They did. The concern was that after the Civil War—this is before 1862—these three significant acts, I think: the Land-Grant Act, the Homestead Act, and the creation of the Department of Agriculture . . . At that time, it was agriculture. It wasn't all the things that it is today. The reason was that Justin Morrill who was a Vermont farmer, but also a senator, had tried to get this idea through because if you read the early American histories, on the east coast, they were short of land and they were short of food. That's hard for us to believe but they had food riots in New England, etcetera. So, he pushed for this idea. Here, the United States has these vast territories out beyond the Ohio River, or the Allegheny River. What are we going to do with it. Of course, some settlement had already been taking place. In 1862, he finally got that through, the Homestead. That's why many campuses have Morrill Hall. I've often wondered, was Morrill Hall built as Morrill Hall or was it something else? I think it was built as Morrill Hall. It wasn't named after James Morrill, as some people think. Well, it may have been.

CAC: I think it was.

WH: Okay.

CAC: That would be one great exception?

WH: Yes. But at many places, they have a Morrill Hall and it's for Justin Morrill who was the principal author of the Land-Grant Act. I don't know of any country that gave land away like we did here. The average price of the homestead was \$1.19. The land was not just given . . . but 160 acres. The idea then, if we're going to give this land away, or develop it, then we have to have an education system to go with it. Now, the United States had pretty good colleges in the East but they were not concerned about the needs of the sons and daughters of the mechanics and farmers. It was a more elite education system for the doctors, lawyers and ministers.

CAC: You bet.

WH: Had it just stayed at that, then I suspect, maybe, we wouldn't have seen the progress that we do. As you know, Iowa State is a very, now, respectable university. It started though, primarily, as an agricultural . . . When I went to Michigan State, it still was Michigan Agricultural College. Today, it's . . .

CAC: They are known as A & Ms [Agricultural and Mechanic]?

WH: Yes, yes. That still exists in the South. The traditional black schools are A & Ms. Then the others are the universities. It was not really until 1914 that officially . . . Let's back up. In 1885, they created the experiment stations through the Hatch Act. In fact, Connecticut was the first one and then that became the model for the United States system. Minnesota came in 1887. Nineteen fourteen was the Smith-Lever [Act] which gave us Extension. Now, it didn't take an act to have these happen. Minnesota was doing research before that. Certainly, the eastern universities had been. They'd also been doing Extension but it was formalized and they got funds from the government for these purposes.

CAC: They got regular funding?

WH: Regular funding.

CAC: You could count on it year after year?

WH: Yes. It was done on a ten-year cycle based on the agricultural census and some other factors. It's been modified but, essentially, it was a base. I would say the last forty years, it's just barely been cost of living. It hasn't even been that in the bad inflation years. It doesn't make any difference. It established a system. From the Extension standpoint, maybe, the most important thing is it created that three-way partnership. That's why most states have now gone from Agricultural Extension to Cooperative Extension.

CAC: Yes.

WH: Because it's the state, the county, and the federal. In Minnesota—this is not true in every state—the faculty are faculty of the university. Now, they go through different kinds of promotion ideas but they are faculty of the university.

CAC: For many years they had, therefore, a separate retirement system?

WH: They still do. They are on the federal retirement system, the majority of them, both at state and federal level.

CAC: Yes.

WH: Roland Abraham and I joke about this because he stayed many years longer than was necessary to get the 80 percent retirement but he just liked to work. Then he left. Then, of course, they get these [unclear], so I suspect today—I don't know it and I've never asked him—that Roland is an example of somebody that gets more income now in retirement than he did when he was working.

CAC: Right, right.

WH: When he left, he got 80 percent of whatever his salary was. The point, I think, that is important for posterity to understand is that Extension has gone through little modest revolutions through the years. I've seen them in this state since 1957 till now where there were many, many people both on the St. Paul campus, as well as out in the counties, who felt that Extension Service was strictly agricultural; and yes, they had a youth program and they had this Home Ec but it was agriculture that they were supposed to serve. Then, the community became more sophisticated and started to ask us for help through Extension. Then, you see the rural sociologist moving in on things. You see Home Ec, the textile and clothing, as becoming a more significant part of the program, and so on. One I was not happy with—I wasn't at the university at the time—when we were going through all these farm foreclosures, the university got the job of mediation. I don't happen to see that as an education job but somebody had to do it and the legislature provided some money, I understand initially, to have this happen. It's something that they still do. If you can mediate something like that, then you can begin to mediate other things. They've become more involved in a regional setting of economic development. Where do we go from there? I truly think if the university is looking to 2000, and 2010, and beyond, there are segments of the university that have not—I'm going to put it this way—shared in this because it was not thought of as their role or their responsibility. I guess, I feel as long as the University of Minnesota's been given the mantle of being this state's university—if I was president at St. Cloud, I'd probably think boy! this is an elitist guy but truly we are the state's university, the state university and the Land-Grant—I would like to see into the future this expanding role because the literature and the arts should be moving out. We talked about what Vern Sutton did. That's just a little drop in the bucket. I'm not suggesting to you that some people are not doing this. What's the future role of Continuing Education and how does that get incorporated here? Continuing Education really is an income generating activity.

CAC: Self supporting.

WH: I guess, I think that that in many ways has to be a change both in philosophy but attitude. [laughter] I want to say something here that, maybe, isn't very politic but I kind of am amused when I read in the paper how the Business School—because it's going to get a \$45 million building—is now going to get up into the top twenty. It's not in the top twenty now. Now, does that mean they're going to clean out all the faculty that haven't gotten to be in the top twenty?

CAC: [laughter]

WH: I mean, that's heresy. We still bite on some pretty raw apples. I can remember when we got the money for the Horticulture building on the St. Paul campus, I think it was 1969, and the building was dedicated, I kind of put the wet blanket on there because the old Hort building, which is now a part of Human Ecology—I think that's where the Textiles program is . . . I remember saying, "The progress that this department has made when you were in that old rat trap, the oldest building on the St. Paul campus . . . just think of the challenge you've got. You've got a \$4.9 million building and greenhouses and what you did in a building that cost \$280,000 when it was built, what the anticipation is." I, then, made it positive saying, "Hey! the research opportunities, the teaching, and the outreach . . ." And that is a department that has done outreach.

CAC: Yes.

WH: DIAL-U is a perfect example for what they do. Unfortunately, now you've got to pay two bucks to get the information that used to be free but maybe you use it. The thing I say is that we've kidded ourselves for so many years that it's the building, or it's this, or that. It's the people that we, initially, hire, that somehow we provide them the environment in which to extend their imagination. I still think the last outpost for people that have differing opinions is in a university. We need to foster that. We need to encourage the dialog of difference, not just to be different, but because there are different ways of approaching something. I guess, as I look around, I think we tend to coalesce too much . . . you know, this is the way we all ought to think . . . and that's not true. Farm organizations have tried to get farmers that way. That's why they're going down the tube. Most farmers belong to about three or four farm organizations. When you ask them why . . . well, it makes political good sense; I have to live in this community. Do you think they're going to do any good for you? Oh, hell no, they haven't done any good for anybody for twenty years. And that's the truth. NFO, the National Farmers Organization, was going to get everybody a higher price. NFO has never said, "Hey, guys, learn to lower your cost of production and you don't have to worry about price." I think as we approach the twenty-first century, I'd be pretty disappointed if the University of Minnesota was not a major player for—not only the state—the region, the nation, and the world. We're an international institution.

CAC: Yes. You have to stay nimble to do it.

WH: Yes.

CAC: Which may be a good point to kind of conclude our conversation.

WH: Yes. It's been great.

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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