

Arthur Naftalin

- Youth and education 1
 - North Dakota, Jewish family 2
 - job on *Minneapolis Tribune* 3
 - undergraduate, University of Minnesota, 1936-39 3
 - Jacobin Fraternity 3
 - School of Journalism, University of Minnesota 5
 - Chamley, Mitch 6
 - Graduate School, Political Science 6
 - Naftalin - instructor, ASTP (Army Specialized Training Program) Kirkpatrick, Evron 9
 - Naftalin meets Humphrey, Hubert, 1942 9-10
 - Naftalin - Ph.D. thesis on history of Democratic Farmer Labor Party 10
- Naftalin works with Humphrey for fusion of DFL 12
 - 4-F 12
 - Naftalin, secretary to Mayor Humphrey, 1945 13
- University of Minnesota 14
 - General Studies 14
 - Social Science Program 14
 - faculty 14
 - interdisciplinary 15
 - research versus outreach mission 16
 - Commitment to Focus 17
 - origins of School of Public Affairs, 1969 17-18
- Naftalin returns to University of Minnesota 18-20
 - Naftalin, mayor of Minneapolis, eight years 18
 - and commissioner of administration, state government, six years 19
- Humphrey as instructor at University of Minnesota, 1969-1970 20
- Naftalin - faculty of Public Affairs 21
 - TV program on current issues 22
 - unclear mission 22
- State legislature and University of Minnesota, 1954-60 23
 - anti-university sentiment 23
 - Popovich, Peter 23
 - Wozniak, Don 23
 - appropriation's battle, 1957 25
 - issue of University of Minnesota's constitutional immunity 26
 - public perceptions of University of Minnesota 27-30
- Nostalgia for Golden Gophers 31
- Naftalin's TV program 33
- Specialization at University of Minnesota 34
- Student body 34
- Loss of community in all of society 36
 - civic life, diminished 36
 - role of Jewish community 37
- Board of Regents 38
- Hasselmo, Nils 40

Interview with Arthur Naftalin

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

**Interviewed on December 13, 1994
University of Minnesota Campus**

Arthur Naftalin - AN
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: I'm interviewing Arthur Naftalin who has had a long lifetime relationship with the university as an undergraduate student, graduate student, member of the faculty, and then seeing the university from the point of view of the governor's office, as commissioner of administration, and as mayor of the city of Minneapolis; so, we have lots of stories to cover. It is the thirteenth of December in the afternoon. The interview is being conducted in my office.

Art, I'm very glad that you would come by and I look forward to an informative afternoon. As I've done with many other persons, it's kind of a nice warm up—as one warms up a car—to have you say something about your youth maybe, how you came to the University of Minnesota. We aren't going to dwell in the 1930s because my interest is the later period . . . but the shaping of your career. How did you get interested in journalism, and politics, and political science? Then why did you go to graduate school? What was your family background and who turned you on? What professors did you have, etcetera. That's a big question and it's meant to be.

AN: That's very good, Clarke. I'm pleased to do this. I'll try to get to your main interests very quickly. I should really begin with my childhood because when I was a youngster living in Fargo, North Dakota, we would have delivered to our house each afternoon, the morning *Minneapolis Tribune*. In those days, the *Tribune* sort of blanketed the Northwest, what we called the Northwest, then. One of the things that I remember from my childhood was that I had a cousin who played on the University of Minnesota Golden Gopher football team.

CAC: Ah!

AN: His name was George Abramson. He played in the line. He was the right guard as we called it.

CAC: Probably right next to big Ed[win] Widseth and other . . .

AN: This was long before that. This was the 1920s.

CAC: I see.

AN: He played against Red Grange.

CAC: Oh, my!

AN: On the team, I later learned, was Lou[is] Gross, who still lives in the city of Minneapolis. They were two Jewish members of the team. When they played Michigan who had the [unclear] Benny Friedman, they could foil Michigan because they could intercept—this is obviously an impossible story—Friedman's Jewish instructions, however it was going.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: The reason I mention this is that this attracted me like a magnet to the University of Minnesota. I wouldn't have needed this. The University of Minnesota was in my mind, and the mind of so many of the young people that I grew up, the logical place for us to go if we had any kind of large interest in a college education. At an early age, I sort of knew at some point I would go to the University of Minnesota. But the Depression came on, as you know, in the 1930s. When I finished high school in 1934, I was already working a bit for the *Fargo Forum* as a copy reader; and I obtained a full time job with them . . . twenty-five cents an hour, twelve dollars a week, for a forty-eight hour week. During that time, I went to the what was then called the North Dakota Agriculture College, now the State University of North Dakota at Fargo, for the first two years while I was working as a newspaper person on the *Fargo Forum*, essentially on the copy desk; although, I did do some reporting and filling sport's desk and so on as young people would do at that point. I left that in 1936 to come to the university. Because of that start in journalism, I thought . . .

CAC: Did you have encouragement from parents? What did your father do in Fargo?

AN: My father was a small merchant . . . it varied, usually in the produce line or the mercantile line. He was also in the hide and fur business. He was kind of a one man operation, always kind of on the margins of . . .

CAC: But there was a Jewish community in Fargo?

AN: Yes, about 100 families and my folks, our family, was quite active in the Jewish community. As a matter of fact, that was a part of my growing up which was quite important. When I came to the University of Minnesota, I was impressed by the fact that there was a sharp segregation between the gentile population and the Jewish population.

CAC: That came as a surprise? You hadn't suffered the same degree in Fargo?

AN: Well, no, there was a sense of separation in Fargo but not as severe as I found it here at the university. There was a big oasis to this in the School of Journalism. The School of Journalism was not discriminatory, as witness to the fact that when I finished in 1939, jobs were very scarce, very hard to come by and the *Minneapolis Tribune* wanted a reporter, and they turned to the School of Journalism for that person, and they had one job and the School of Journalism sent me down. I remember it was Memorial Day that I went for my interview, two weeks before commencement, and I was hired. There's a long story about my involvement with the *Tribune* but that's another story, which we can go to some other time if you like. But that's at this point a demonstration of the fact that they were prepared to send me down without concern as to whether I was Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, white or black, or whatever. I attribute that, really, to a group of people at the School of Journalism at the time . . . Ralph Casey, Mitch Charnley, Ralph Nafziger, Tom Barnhart, Fred Kildow. These were people, I think, who were in a purely egalitarian spirit. This permeated the atmosphere of the *Daily* itself. We, then, met in the basement of Pillsbury Hall. That's where the *Daily* was. That's where the School of Journalism was. That was, as I say, a kind of an oasis in which there was the sense of no discrimination and acceptance.

I might just introduce at this point the fact that at some point along the way here, I become a member of the Jacobin Fraternity. The Jacobin Fraternity had been founded in the early 1930s, like 1933, 1934, by a group of not really radical students but intellectually oriented, progressive minded students. Arne Sevareid is—Arne as he was then known . . . became Eric Sevareid—was a notable one that we remember the most. But there were also people like Lee Loevinger who became a member of our Supreme Court and became assistant attorney general for the federal government, Dick Scammonn who later became the director of the census, Earl Larson became a very distinguished local judge here, and others similarly known. They founded it back in the early 1930s. When I came along in 1936, of course there was a different group and by this time some of the people who were in the Jacobins were active on the *Daily* and we had a kind of sub-caucus among the people on the *Daily* who were Jacobins. I remember one in particular was John Lawler. He was the editor of *Literary Review* and one of our outstanding editorial writers. There were others, too, but I won't try to remember all the names. Paul Meehl was a Jacobin.

CAC: Heavens!

AN: Paul Meehl, as a matter of fact, told me at one point—I've never been able to quite verify this with my own research—that out of the membership of the Jacobins . . . I think I have that kind of records of the Jacobins . . . throughout the whole period, I don't think we ever had, aggregating all of the members from the earliest times until it sort of dissolved in 1940-1941, war time, I don't think we had more than fifty or sixty members all together.

CAC: Total?

AN: Total, maybe a few more than that. Paul Meehl told me at one point that he identified nineteen people among that group who were in *Who's Who*. I find that kind of startling.

CAC: Right. Pretty good percent.

AN: I can identify from my own knowledge maybe a dozen but I don't know how to go from there. The Jacobin Fraternity was a non-sectarian group which was a kind of symbol of protest against the highly discriminatory, highly selective segregationist Greek letter fraternities that admitted no Jews. There were Jewish fraternities.

CAC: And no blacks either?

AN: Oh, no blacks and as a matter of fact, I was told that many of them even had a kind of a quota on the number of Catholics that they would admit because Catholics are then still regarded as a little bit de classe, that they weren't going to let Romanism . . . although it wasn't identified as such. It was more that somehow if you were a white Anglo-Saxon Protestant, you were really at the top cut of the social hierarchy.

I started by telling you that my attraction was that there was this sort of sense that the University of Minnesota represented a great window on the world. I don't think at any point I ever thought of going to a private college, the notion of going to Harvard or Yale or a place like that.

CAC: Or ever Carleton or Macalester?

AN: Those places just never entered my thinking as a possibility. It was going to be a public institution, mostly because the tuition was very low. We were really on the edge of poverty all that time. The twelve dollars a week that I got from the *Fargo Forum* was maybe as much cash as came into our household for that period time. Even though my father was a merchant, he was struggling against mortgages, and bills, and just a constant, constant worry. We never were on relief, as it was known then. We never were but we were mighty close. The only reason we weren't probably was because there was just never any thought that we would ever turn to that, at least I couldn't see my parents doing that. My sister, as a matter of fact, when the New Deal came on—the New Deal came on while I was still at the *Fargo Forum*—was a social worker working for Cass County. I remember her coming home with the tales of terrible decisions that she had to make. A family wanted to spend their meager little allotment from the county to buy dancing slippers for their daughter and this daughter was just all crushed that she couldn't have dancing shoes. My sister, the social worker, had to make the decision as to whether . . . or maybe there was no way to make the decision—or she could have or would have—in favor of the dancing slippers. There were other stories equally sad.

I came to the university in 1936 as an aspiring journalist. I thought I'd become a foreign correspondent to emulate Walter Duranty, and H. R. Knickerbocker, the greats of the day. That was sort of the kind [unclear] that we sort of intellectually pointed ourselves to.

CAC: You were turned on by various instructors at the University of Minnesota who empowered or engaged you in this tradition, right?

AN: Oh, yes. The School of Journalism, I think, had a very special spirit, generated in large measure by faculty members who were excited about their profession, and excited about the young people that were training for the profession, and fighting a battle with the established profession who felt at that time—maybe still do—that a college education really was of no great help to being a successful journalist, that you learned journalism on the job. You didn't learn it through books.

CAC: Sure.

AN: That was kind of a continuing argument at the time and they had no objection maybe to a liberal arts education, to broaden yourself with political science, and economics, and sociology but to learn headline writing, and to learn typography, and to learn advertising, you learn that on the job. This was a source, as you can understand, of some contention among people on our faculty. At that time, there was a certain awareness on the part of our faculty members that journalism was certainly much more than the mechanics, that journalism also involved the whole field of public relations and it also involved the whole field of opinion testing, public opinion. That was kind of the dawn of the period of public opinion testing. My professors—I never took their advice—Ralph Napziger in particular, who had become the kind of measurement person, the quantifier, encouraged me to take courses in statistics and I never did, much to my later regret. I didn't understand how that fitted into my becoming a world famous foreign correspondent.

CAC: But you must have taken lots of politics?

AN: I was a rather inferior undergraduate student for several reasons. One reason was that I figured I knew all there was to know about journalism and I was just there to get a degree. That was one reason. The classes were just a routine, a ritual, I had to go through. A second thing was that I was immediately caught up in working on the *Daily* and reporting, doing all kinds of things, working on the copy desk . . . in time becoming managing editor one year . . . so busy at all that and one was paid a little money for that. Also I was doing some [unclear] work for the *Pioneer Press*, in particular; so, I was busy, busy, busy and my school work was of no particular consequence. The third reason was that I didn't really think of myself as academically oriented. I didn't think that I was ever going to go on to graduate school. I figured I had to go out and earn a living because of the economic pressures of the time, that I had to get out of school and get a job. So for those reasons and I suppose also—I'm not objective about this; maybe I am objective—I didn't think I had the intellectual grey matter that it took to be a good student. I don't know where I got that feeling but that's the way I felt as an undergraduate. I didn't understand all that stuff that other kids seemed to get around and master. [unclear] write an examination and gosh! I didn't know very much. The reason I didn't know very much was I wasn't reading anything or paying very much attention in class.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: I got a nice series of gifts from Casey and Barnhardt, especially Charnley who was my major adviser. I loved Mitch Charnley, a wonderful man. They all were nice people. They gave me those gifts and then they really gave me the gift of a job. I went to work for the *Tribune* on Memorial Day, the very day I went down there, in 1939. That was the year of my commencement. That gets me to the university. Now, we're still twenty years away from the 1950s.

CAC: Well, that's all right.

AN: [laughter]

CAC: We'll get momentum on it.

AN: Where do you want me to go from there? There's a lot of ways to go.

CAC: You were at the paper but then you did come to graduate school in Political Science?

AN: Yes, what happened was that I worked nights at the newspaper. That was 1939. I wasn't married yet. Two years later I got married. So, I had those day times in which there wasn't a lot for me to do and I was very much oriented to the university. I lived southeast in a rooming house and it was natural thing for me to take up some courses, just a course here and there. I was admitted to the Graduate School as what they called an adult special.

CAC: Sure.

AN: Because I didn't really have a plan. I was just interested in taking a course or two and I did. I started to take courses in Political Science. I remember the war was coming on and there was a lot of concern about the Dutch East Indies, for example. One of the professors was Lennox Mills in Political Science. Lennox was an authority on the British Empire. He was a Canadian, I think, and had a strong interest in that. He gave rather interesting lectures and I registered for his course. I would listen to him talk about the crisis in the Dutch East Indies and then I'd go downtown and I would put up a little story saying the professor at the University at Minnesota, Lennox Mills, says thus and so. The city editor was being impressed by this and they put it on page one, by Arthur Naftalin. God! I came into a crazy instant here with the Political Science Department when they saw me coming they figured . . .

CAC: [laughter]

AN: I didn't do this often but I did it enough so that I was reinforced in my interests and I found in order to do that, I had to know a little bit of something; so, I began to read the material.

CAC: Now, that's a good incentive.

AN: It was an incentive. I began to read the material, and listen carefully in class, and take some notes, and even talk to the professor after class. What happened was that I began to take these courses in Political Science and some in Economics. It was a two-year period and each quarter I would take one-, or two-, or three-credit courses and I got graduate credit because I was registered as an adult special. Before very long, I had acquired maybe twelve, fifteen hours of straight As! Straight As!

CAC: Ah ha!

AN: So, people would say to me, "What are you doing now?" I said, "I'm in graduate work at the university and got a straight A average." I would volunteer that and oh! they were so impressed.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: I figured gee! that's impressive thing if you can claim a straight A average; so, I just went on doing this and, in time, I had enough credits . . . and I began to learn what you needed in the way of requirements for a master's degree. My undergraduate French was rather inadequate but it was adequate for me to pass the reading test that I needed for one language for the master's degree. I might skip ahead here to tell you that in time—as long as I'm on the language requirement—I come up for my Ph.D. This skips ahead about six years. I need a second language. Now, I'm not very good at languages and I had had nothing but that undergraduate French which didn't amount to a lot but enough to get me through. But during the war—I'll tell you why I wasn't in the war in a moment—my wife and I decided that we ought to know a little bit about the Russian language; and so, we registered in an Extension Course, taught by Constantine Reichardt, a wonderful man, very knowledgeable about languages, especially the Slavic languages. We registered, and I labored with a dictionary, and labored through this, in the end knowing that I really wasn't very good at this stuff. Then, this coincided with the time coming due when I needed to have a second language; so, then I registered for [unclear] work with Constantine Reichardt. It was a rather small class, maybe twelve, fifteen people so it was possible to get to know the professor rather well. In due time, I explained to him that I was coming up for a second language. He said that Russian wasn't recognized but he was very eager to have this become an established and recognized language for the Ph.D.; so he said, "Why don't you submit a petition?" which I did.

CAC: Ah.

AN: I submitted the petition and it was granted. I could use Russian as a second language and, of course, the examiner was Constantine Reichardt. He sat me down with a dictionary and a with a [unclear] and I passed this. I claim I may be one of the very few—I was certainly the first—students that [unclear] Russian as a language for a graduate degree. I'm not sure I should

be terribly proud of that because that was working a little bit of fraud on the system but at least for those that came after, it gave them some advantage.

CAC: In the meantime, you become, during the war, an instructor part time in the ASTP program?

AN: Just quickly this about my career with the *Tribune*. The following year, the *Star* which was now under the ownership and the leadership of John Cowles Sr, was a very developing newspaper with a lot of ideas and very aggressive. The *Star* had become—it was the third newspaper—so successful that they bought the *Journal*, our competition and became the *Star Journal*. I survived that first merger and a year later, the *Star Journal* acquired the *Tribune*. I didn't survive that merger. There's an interesting story—it has nothing to do with the university—about what happened to me. There were a lot of people that they laid off and I was among them so I was unemployed. This would have been May of 1941, almost two years of full time work that I'd had at the *Tribune*. Meantime, I had done all this graduate work at the university that I have described, coming up for my master's degree; so, I was well-known to the Political Science Department. After the *Tribune*, I organized with an older fellow who had also been laid off, a very clever feature writer by the name of Mel Davis, already in his seventies by that time. We organized a thing called Press Services. I had a couple little things I worked up as an entrepreneurial enterprise. We had some modest . . . not any real success. We were just on the margins of taking in a few dollars each month doing this thing.

But then war broke out, that is Pearl Harbor comes, in December of 1941. When Pearl Harbor comes, there is great consternation of course; and at that point, immediately the national government organizes what's called the Army Specialized Training Program, ASTP and there's great need now for instructors in various parts of that program. We had assigned to us a group of meteorologists in training. One of the dimensions required was a course in American government, in politics, whatever. The university asked me to teach in that program; so, I became teaching assistant or assistant instructor—I can't remember what we were called—I did that at the start while I finished off my master's degree. That was kind of the beginning of my really serious work to go on into academic work. Politics begins to interfere here pretty soon. But anyway, that was the beginning of my work with the Political Science Department.

CAC: You're a busy young man.

AN: Oh, yes, very busy. I got married in 1941 while unemployed and that was kind of a problem for awhile but nothing serious. It comes to Pearl Harbor, then comes the Army Specialized Training Program, and I'm still living on campus. As a matter of fact, I should say at this point that my wife and I and our family have always been heavily university oriented from those very earliest days. We were both in the Class of 1939. Fran did some work as a teaching assistant with T.R. McConnell, dean of the Arts College. She worked in the testing bureau with Jack Darley; so, she was oriented in the field of psychometrics. She was a psychology major and

Romance Languages, somewhat different fields from mine. Then, as our kids came along, they all went to university pre-school, university nursery, the elementary school. They all went to the University High School. Meantime, I had this on again, off again relationship with the university and we lived all these years right southeast within walking distance of Folwell Hall; although, later on we moved to Prospect Park but still university community. In more recent years, we moved downtown. Even then, we were always university connected. I can't remember where this led off.

CAC: You were talking about being an instructor in the ASTP program.

AN: And then I got my master's degree. Then, in the year of 1942-1943, after I had my master's degree, I had already had in mind to go on for a Ph.D. and had begun to do some research in the activities of the Farmer Labor Party of Minnesota. I published an article and I remember how proud I was. It was the very first thing that I ever published in the *American Political Science Review*. I was interested in the question of why the Farmer Labor Party, despite its ascendancy during the 1930s had never captured full control of the state legislature. I undertook a little study, measured out why it was that the legislative district could vote for Floyd B. Olson and not vote for the legislative candidate in the Farmer Labor Party. The reason for that was the non-partisan feature and also the fact that all of the senate was elected in the bad years of the Farmer Labor Party. That article was published and that was a great boost. I was then identified as not only a young aspiring academic but one who got published.

CAC: It was more than the front page of the newspaper.

AN: The Political Science Department was very much impressed with that—as I was. In 1942, one of my professors was Evron Kirkpatrick. Evron Kirkpatrick still lives. He's not very well. He's in a rather advanced stage of disability. He lives in Washington. He is the husband of Jeanne Kirkpatrick, the former ambassador to the United Nations. Fran and I maintain personal relations with Kirk, as we call him, and Jeanne. We came to a kind of divide in our political philosophies. We don't talk much politics anymore when we get together. Kirk was very important in my life. He was my major adviser as I went on to get a Ph.D. He kept telling me that there was a fellow that had just come back from Louisiana and was working in the state of Minnesota that I should get to meet, a fellow by the name of Hubert Humphrey. He said, "You'd like Humphrey. He's a great guy. You've got to get to meet him." I said, "Yes, fine." This went on for awhile. He mentioned this to me several times. Finally, in the summer of 1942, one very nice evening, we were together. We lived near each other and so I saw a lot of Kirk. We had become more than just faculty member and student. We had become personal friends and our wives . . . we have sort of a foursome of sorts. On this very warm evening, he said, "Hey, Humphrey is speaking over at the Continuation Study Center. Come on over. We'll wait for him to get through with the talk and we'll meet him." So, we walked over there and as we came up the hallway, I heard this voice coming down. I turned to Kirk and I said, "I know that windbag." That was my first comment.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: Kirk was a little annoyed that I would call Humphrey a windbag. I had that kind of vague impression. I did not know Humphrey really. I had just seen him on campus and whenever I'd seen him on campus, there was always a little cluster of people around him and he would be holding forth in the style that I came to know so well in time. I just sort of figured he was a soap box type from Hyde Park who was just lecturing. He was probably a little touched in the head, and he was holding forth in this energetic way, and people were kind of amused to hear this kind of little nutty guy talk. Well, that isn't quite my impression but that sort of gives you the spirit of it. When the speech was over, Humphrey and I were introduced. Actually, as it turned out, he was also in the Class of 1939 and there was even a little picture of him, snapshots that were circulated afterwards, and he is there in his cap and gown. We became immediately the closest and warmest of friends. My notion of his being a windbag just dissolved. I don't even know why I would ever remember that. It's just how wrong you can be about a person. We became the closest of friends. This, as I say, was the summer of 1942 and then we became kind of a sixsome: Hubert and Muriel, Kirk and his wife—it wasn't Jeanne at the time—and Fran and I. We would meet two or three times a week in the evening to drink Coke [Coca-Cola] and eat pop corn. We never had any beer or liquor, mostly because none of us could afford it. It didn't occur to us to have a shot of whiskey. We'd have Coke. Very often the evening would consist of our getting together to wait for Hubert to come back from his having talked to the Townsend Club, or a church group, or a PTA [Parent and Teachers Association] because he was already a very active speaker. He was at that point, I believe, still working for the WPA [Works Project Administration] as an administrator. When the war broke out, by the time he ran for mayor, he was working in the regional office of the War and Manpower Commission. By a point in December, we had become very good friends and I was regarded as a knowing [unclear] because I had had two years downtown and I would regale these innocent political scientists with accounts of the underworld; and we'd had the assassination of several newspaper editors and I would know a little bit about that. I didn't know anything to speak of but I knew more than they did; so, they thought I was really very knowledgeable about what was going on in the [unclear] of Minneapolis and what's more, I was probably very knowledgeable about politics—well, of course I wasn't. Anyway, they would sort of defer to me on these questions. I remember Hubert calling me. He had to give a speech or something in Chicago and when he got back from Chicago, he called me kind of late at night. He said, "There's some folks talking about me running for mayor of Minneapolis." "You know, if I run for mayor, do you think I'll get shot?" he said to me quite seriously. I said, "Well, let's talk about it." That began the notion of his running for mayor, as I say, in December of 1942. He hemmed and hawed, and there was a kind of going back and filling, and some talk about it.

Meantime, I had applied for and received a field work fellowship from the Social Science Research Council. I got \$125 a month and that was probably as much money as I was making at the time. The idea was that that was to finance my research for my thesis on the history of the Farmer Labor Party. Beginning in January or February—we're now into 1943 . . . I may have that time wrong about the Social Science Research Council fellowship. It may have come

for the 1943-1944 year. I'd have to check my record on that. What happened was that I became so involved with Humphrey—no, it would have been 1942-1943—that I felt guilty about accepting this \$125 a month when I wasn't really doing my research for the thesis. I was really working for Humphrey and so I resigned from it, which is something really quite unknown. I resigned, and wrote a letter, and said that I really wasn't working on it, even though in a way I was because while I was doing this for Humphrey, these old codgers [unclear].

CAC: Of course, were interested in finding out.

AN: I was interviewing them and making notes but I figured that wasn't really what I was doing. What I was doing was working for Humphrey. I had that research council fellowship. I don't think I was doing any more course work because I was much too busy for that. It was probably at the spring commencement that I got my master's degree, in 1942. It could have been winter. I was heavily involved with Hubert, and he finally filed for the office nineteen days before the primary, and I was handling all the publicity and all the public relations, writing press releases until we couldn't see over them, arguing and fighting with the newspapers about proper coverage. He was nominated, which was quite a success. He was nominated at a time when one of the candidates had had the Central Labor Union endorsement two or three times, [T.A.] Eide . . . I can't remember his first name. Humphrey lost the general election but immediately we went to work after the general election in June of 1943 trying to fuse the two parties. Kirk was very involved in this. That's got nothing to do with the university . . . well, in a way it does. Just to give you an illustration of the involvement of the university . . .

CAC: Ah, that's the important part, yes.

AN: . . . more than almost any other major public university has been, and it continues to be involved in the affairs of the city. We were engaged in very heavy negotiations trying to fuse the two parties. That's a complicated situation but it turned around the election laws, what you could do and what you couldn't do. Our opposition within the fusion negotiations from the left wing, so-called, a kind of communist oriented group, was to constantly pull out expertise about the election laws . . . the election laws said that they couldn't do what we wanted to do. I figured they were wrong. I remember preparing a series of key questions and taking them out to my dear friend Orville Peterson.

CAC: Ah, of course.

AN: Orville Peterson was the executive director of the League of Minnesota Municipalities, and a member of the Political Science faculty, and very knowledgeable about law, especially legal research. I gave him these questions and asked if he could give us a brief on what these were, which he did with no intention of having any pay. I remember, I talked the powers that be into giving me \$100—Orville is now gone from this world; I can tell the story—he didn't want to take it. I said, "You've got to take it. You worked so hard at this." He gave me that brief and that brief, I think, was a very significant factor in our pulling through the fusion. He did this as a

moonlighting activity. All I could say at the time was that this was done by a university professor. I couldn't even say a professor of law because he wasn't really a professor of law; although, he was a lawyer. I was instrumental in that whole fusion thing and, of course, Humphrey was the key person, the swing vote. The fusion, by and by, was accomplished in the spring of 1944. Humphrey became, then, the campaign manager for the Roosevelt/Truman ticket and I became the state campaign director.

CAC: In the meantime, neither of you were in the service? You were going to comment about that.

AN: I'll come back to that in just a moment. We ran the Roosevelt/Truman campaign—there are a lot of stories about that campaign of 1944—and then after the election in November, Hubert and I opened a public relations office called Hubert H. Humphrey and Associates. I was the *associates*. That really became a front for his running for mayor again in 1945—so much for that.

To back up about the service, I had fully expected to be drafted. Curiously enough, one of the last things I did with the *Minneapolis Tribune* was to write a series called "I Expect to be Drafted." Frank Murray, a wonderful man, who was city editor of the *Tribune* came to me one day—sort of the scuttlebutt around was that various ones on the paper would be drafted and I was the logical one . . . at that moment unmarried; it was clear that I was a sitting duck for the draft—and he said, "Why don't we do a little feature? We'll call it 'I Expect to be Drafted' and you can just tell them what you're going through." So, I undertook to do this. One day I was selling my car, and another day I was courting my girlfriend, and another day I was doing this or that. Gosh! it took off . . . it wasn't a matter of people rushing down to the newsstand to buy the paper . . .

CAC: There were a lot of folks going through the same thing.

AN: So, it was a popular little feature and god! I got tired of it. It went on for weeks. They wouldn't let it go. It was only supposed to be five or six days and it went on and on. This came at a time when that second merger I described was about to happen. It was not under a by-line because that would have sort of destroyed it. It had to be kind of anonymous; so, I wasn't identified as the person that wrote it. When I was called up, as everybody was, I was rejected on the grounds that I had—embarrassing as it may sound—flatfeet, *pes planus* as they called it in the medical service. It took them no time at all to reject me. I became 4-F. I probably could have qualified for some other kind of service, the merchant marine, or something but, you know, I was so busy with politics and teaching, got married, and so on, that I wasn't about to out of patriotic fervor . . . Although, at the time that I was rejected, I had the same kind of reaction a lot of people had that somehow, I wasn't going to be with the men of my generation, kind of an ill feeling.

CAC: You bet.

AN: Humphrey had something of the same experience, although he was embroiled because he was a public figure at that point . . . Humphrey was rejected and had deferments. Humphrey was married and had a couple of kids by that time; Skip and Nancy, I think, were both born. He had a hernia and he was given kind of limited service status. Then after the limited service status, which put him down the list, he was given deferment. That became a controversial matter. His opponents dug that up.

CAC: Even as late as 1960 in the Wisconsin primary.

AN: Yes, they kept digging that up and kind of the same kind of problem that [President Bill] Clinton had. I never had that problem because by the time I ran for public office people weren't trying to prove anything anymore and it never came up. It was never asked Why wasn't I in the service at the time? It was to my advantage, in the sense that I was then available to teach in the Army Specialized Training Program.

CAC: You never lose touch with the university through all these shenanigans that you're talking about, politics, and research, and writing in the newspaper, the university is still the central institution?

AN: Oh, yes. Then, I became Humphrey's secretary in 1945 when he was elected and that's like the chief administrative officer. The term secretary, we wouldn't use that today—well, we use it in terms of the president's cabinet, secretary—but we wouldn't use in municipal government. It's more like chief administrator or deputy mayor. I stayed with Hubert for two years and then the university offered me an assistant professorship at a significant salary increase; so, I came to the university and that's when I became a member of the Political Science faculty in the fall of 1947 with the understanding that I would finish my thesis, which I did. I was given the status as a lecturer. They couldn't make me a bona fide . . .

CAC: It's like being a warrant officer, a lecturer.

AN: I was made a lecturer and then I did get my Ph.D. I stood in line, as a matter of fact, with E.W. Ziebarth. We both got our Ph.D.s together.

CAC: Oh, how sweet.

AN: Then I was doing two things. That's rather instructive about the history of the university, still not in quite at the 1950s. In 1947, we had this huge bulge of returning veterans.

CAC: You bet.

AN: We'd had in the Army Specialized Training Program the concept that even a person who was going to be meteorologist ought to understand about the broader things of life, like American government; so, we had that dimension of American government. Now, the notion was that if

a person went to the university, they shouldn't have just a smattering of one course in Sociology, and one course in History, and one course in Political Science. They really ought to have an integrated general education; so, the university had created the department of General Studies. As I recall now, there were three main divisions, one in the Social Sciences, another in the Humanities, and another in the Natural Sciences. I was asked to head the Social Sciences program and at the same time teaching in Political Science; so, I was sort of fifty fifty. My 50 percent in Political Science was to develop a course, which is still being taught by Charles Backstrom, called Field Work in Government and Politics. That I regard as a rather successful venture. In the meantime, to organize what had bloomed into an immediately big, big program, the Social Science program in the Department of General Studies . . . The chairman was Russell Cooper, the associate dean of the Arts College. The head of Humanities was Ralph Ross. Somebody doing a history of this period should have a long interview with Ralph Ross—he's in retirement out in Claremont, with the Claremont colleges out there . . . in Pomona and Whittier and lives nearby there in one of the suburban communities—because he can tell a story of internal conflict and the changing attitudes on the part of key faculties. I don't want to get into that at this moment but that's a very vital part of the university and its turmoil.

CAC: When I came here in 1951, Ralph Ross was a towering figure. He worked on that fast and precisely for the reasons you're talking about, trying to establish interdisciplinary work.

AN: The university, though, in its lack of good judgment let him slip away—as they did a lot of others for that matter. That's a matter that needs to be told by others. For me, that was a great learning experience because I had to develop a faculty for this integrated course. Part of the faculty, I begged and borrowed from other departments. One of the people I begged and borrowed was a fellow by the name of Andreas Papandreou who was later professor of Economics, the prime minister of Greece, now off and on the primer minister. I begged and borrowed Mulford Sibley. He was another of our political scientists. I did hire a fellow by the name of Don Calhoun who came here as a sociologist and then a fellow by the . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

AN: There was Ben Nelson, Don Calhoun, Mulford Sibley, Andreas Papandreou and myself. The five of us constituted a team that set to work to do a text, which we did. We organized the course, a three-quarter course: the first quarter dealing with personality as an integrating theme for the Social Sciences centering largely on psychology and sociology but also involving the other disciplines; the second quarter was work centering largely on economics but also involving obviously political science and sociology, psychology—that whole point of the course was that these integrating themes involved all of the Social Sciences; then our third quarter's work was under the subject of community. We had personality, work, community, an Introduction to Social Science. We did what I think is a very important text of readings with a lot of interlocutory material. It was, I think unfortunately, so advanced in the concepts and the theories

that it advanced that it really never caught on as a freshman/sophomore text; although, we had a lively market. Our publishers sold a number of books and came out all right.

CAC: You're saying that you were ahead of the curve, Art? You were ahead of the need for it elsewhere [unclear].

AN: Although there were other things that were attempting this integration. Where we were ahead of the curve was that we didn't want to compromise by making these snippets . . .

CAC: Right.

AN: . . . that it would be too brief or by trying to offer a kind of pap. That's a long complicated story. That gave me a great insight into the university. For one thing, for the first time my education, to the extent that I've had it in the Social Sciences, began to occur at that point. The endless discussions we had about Freud, and about Plato, Aristotle, you name it. We went through the whole canon of its day, a very rich Western canon. As a matter of fact, I think that volume is more clearly the canon than anything I've seen before or since but I don't want to get involved in that argument at this point. What I found was that I had great trouble with . . . here we were, a genuine effort to integrate the Social Sciences and the established departments, Sociology, History—not Political Science—the other departments, Economics, took a very dim view of this. They thought that integrating the Social Sciences in this kind of way was a very dilettantish, and if not stupid, way to treat the materials of Social Sciences. They couldn't see this and they weren't about to permit their faculty to become polluted by this association. They were willing enough, if Andy Papandreou was willing to spend time with us on his own, that was okay with them. We didn't have any trouble with Political Science. If Mulford Sibley wanted to, that was fine with them. I had one leg in Political Science and so that was regarded as kind of more their baby than other disciplines thought of it as theirs. But I could never get a joint appointment for Ben Nelson in the History Department even though he was a remarkable medievalist.

CAC: He was. [unclear] on usury in the Middle Ages, didn't he?

AN: Yes. I don't know how you felt about this, Clarke, but at the time I thought it was pretty clear, even the remarks that Herbert Heaton and August Krey made to me, that there was really a little anti-Semitism there. I had not known that Ben Nelson . . . the name of Nelson didn't strike me as being a likely Jewish name.

CAC: Benjamin might be a tip off. [laughter]

AN: Ben Nelson could have been anything. But it was a derivation from Katznelson. Katznelson, I later discovered is a very distinguished Jewish name. It has a long rabbinical, or whatever, connection going back many generations.

CAC: I suppose I shouldn't intercede at this point, Art, but one of those senior persons in my own department—I came hear as a very young, tender fellow—when I was teaching the U.S. History in the Twentieth Century course, took me aside and confided in me as an academic uncle that I should know about the New Deal because that would have to be central to the story, that the New Deal was a Jewish conspiracy. So, what you're saying, I can confirm.

AN: I had a course in Economics in which the professor, who later went to work as a top functionary in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, delivered what I would regard as out and out anti-Semitic talks in class. I was horrified by this. I went to see, what was his name, Margot, who was a Jewish faculty member in the department and he just shrugged his shoulders. He said he knew about it but there wasn't a thing in the world he could do about it. As far as History was concerned, this was a well established notion in campus among the faculty that the History Department was clearly not about . . . They had a faculty member, Lawrence Steefel, who had become a Unitarian and was not really in any way identified as Jewish, but apparently had antecedents that were but that was not regarded . . .

CAC: Ironically, he taught the Reformation, among other things.

AN: Is that right? [laughter] I was going to point out the dichotomy that the established people in the departments drove or identified between the kind of thing that they thought they were doing and the sort of thing that they thought this populist thing . . . which is a very large theme that at some point in our interview I should talk to you about in larger terms . . . about the kind of split personality this university has had.

CAC: Well, say it now. We'll come back to the main narrative. Go ahead.

AN: I went to a speech Hy Berman was giving in connection with the 125th Anniversary and I took off after Hy had talked about some of the observations he made to explain that the University of Minnesota has always had a split in its soul. This soul has been deeper here, I think, than in almost any other university or college of higher education. From the start, we have pointed in two directions. We have pointed to becoming a major research institution, a major window on the world, with aspirations to be recognized as an institution of high quality engaging in research on the frontier of human activity. And at the same time, because of our Land-Grant status and because of our location, we have been very responsive to the pressures of the public. We have, from the very start, been a great service organization. You name it, we're prepared to do it, as we know; so, we wind up today with Mortuary Science and a General College which attempts to take those that haven't got such great qualifications . . . still to welcome them. We've got a huge Continuing Education program through Extension . . . on and on.

CAC: Yes.

AN: This was the thrust of the speech that I gave at this symposium way back at our fiftieth anniversary. [Note: Clarke, he says 125th and then 50th] We've had on the one hand, this thrust

toward what we would frankly call an elitist point of view—I don't use that in a pejorative sense—and at the same time, this thrust in the direction of populism. Now, these are not antagonistic. They are in a lot of ways complementary and they have to be complementary; that is, one kind of feeds the other.

CAC: But they are sometimes competing and that's what you note also?

AN: We reach the crisis and this is a real crescendo. You're going to get a lot of discussion about the pros and cons of this but we reach this crisis point when [Ken] Keller is president of the University. The faculty members are saying that we're not treating our function properly. The public is beginning to have an awareness that the university's terribly costly and there are criticisms here and there are criticisms there. The question is, How do we finance this institution? And Keller undertook to make a kind of deal, first with the governor—kind of a misguided place to go for the deal because the governor really isn't quite that central in making this deal—and makes the deal that says in effect, "Let us hold our budget steady for the future and we will then concentrate, we will focus our resources where it properly belongs. We will stop doing those marginal things, those tangential things, that don't relate to a great university." Now, this is a very serious pact that's made and the university is taken at its word. As a matter of fact, that word lingers on even now . . . the notion being that the university—the killing phrase is "all things to all people"—is doing a lot things it shouldn't do. It ought to get rid of those things and use that money to do the things that it should be doing. So, there's a form of cannibalism in which the notion of elitism is going to chew up the populist thing in order for it to succeed in its own way. This is, from my point of view, a misguided notion but I don't want to harp on that. I just want to say that this tension goes on, goes on through all of higher education but it's white heat on this campus. As a matter of fact, it's been a tension ever since this university was established, ever since it became a Land-Grant institution. From day one, you see it's wanted to react to everything.

CAC: And your general study story is a case in point.

AN: A case in point, exactly.

CAC: You had very distinguished persons—Ben Nelson, Mulford Sibley, yourself and others—on the one hand but you were doing general education.

AN: We were doing general education . . .

CAC: And that was too populist?

AN: I'll tell you, another illustration of this is that when I came back to the university—this would have been now in 1969—the School of Public Affairs had not yet been established. You may have been on that committee. There was a big committee that [Malcolm] Mac Moos had

appointed. Mac Moos appointed a committee because there was what was called a Public Administration Training Center which had been originated in the Political Science Department as a means of providing a sort of professional course for people who would have government jobs. The Political Science Department by and by came to feel that that wasn't the kind of work that it ought to be engaged in, that the professional training ought to be done outside the department. So, it was spun off and it became a kind of independent free floating body with some kind of [unclear] connections but not really. It had fallen into quite a low status and Mac Moos figured that the time had come now for this kind of enterprise to enter the real realm and we ought to be a real school of public affairs. There was a committee that was appointed. I remember that it included Walter Heller, Carl Auerbach, Frank Sorauf . . . about fifteen or twenty members on that committee.

CAC: That's pretty heavy artillery.

AN: Yes, it was heavy artillery. They were to explore the creation of a School of Public Affairs and that intersected with the moment at which Mac Moos had decided to put me into a stable of people. I remember Fred Lukermann and Gerry Shepherd coming to visit with me in my house. I had decided not to run for mayor again. My decision to come to the university is sort of interesting—I can say this now after all these years. I had had a very unfortunate experience while I was mayor. An operation on my upper esophagus had paralyzed a vocal chord and I couldn't speak at that time; I just could kind of aspirate in a whisper, and the prognosis wasn't very good at the time, and it seemed like I was going to be sort of disabled. I had several offers to do this and that and I just didn't feel I had the energy. When the university offer came by, I really saw it as a sheltered workshop—this is a terrible thing to say. I don't know how many other people have come here with that notion but I had bona fide credentials. I had been a faculty member. It wasn't really fraudulent for me to come to the university but it was fraudulent in the sense that I wasn't oriented to becoming a full researcher, a full academic. I was coming here because I thought my disability would not be an impediment—and I was right about that. At this point, I'm interviewed by this committee. I suppose Mac Moos or somebody said, "Why don't you interview this fellow?" So, I go before this committee and I'm very frank in telling them where I am, and who I am, and I go over whatever it is they want to know. Then, they want to know what I want to do. I said, "There are two things. Look, I've had six years as commissioner of administration . . ."

CAC: That's in state government?

AN: Yes. " . . . followed by eight years as mayor. These were heavy administrative responsibilities and I don't want to run anything. I don't want to organized anything or run anything." I suppose my disability made me feel I didn't want to do that. "Secondly," I said, "I've got to be honest with you. The whole field of Political Science has turned to a form of behavioral research and quantification. I'm not in that spirit. I don't think of myself as in that spirit. I don't think that a proper place for me is in Political Science. I don't know what the president has in mind for me but . . ." I'd just put two strikes on me in a very big way. People

figured what the hell is this monster doing here? He doesn't want to do research. He doesn't want to manage anything. He doesn't think of himself as a scholar.

CAC: [laughter] You didn't want to do the [unclear] research.

AN: I suppose I figured at that time that I was a resource. I thought, I've had all this experience and that Mac Moos, my fellow political scientist, has all these problems in administration, and in politics, and public relations, and I can just be a great help to him. I can show him where the dead bodies are and I can help him with the legislature. [laughter] Good old Mac, once I was appointed and accepted, he just went on to other things. He didn't know who I was or where . . . he knew who I was.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: Fran and I and Tracy and Mac had spent many evenings together because very often organizations like to have the president of the university and the mayor of the town come.

CAC: Of course.

AN: You know, it graces their occasion. So, we would go to these things and then we'd wind up the evening. I didn't realize at the time that Mac and Tracy were so heavy into the booze. Somehow the evening just seemed to be a social evening and we were great friends. And I thought it was on that basis that we would have a kind of continuing relationship. It may have been as much my responsibility because I didn't come with any agenda. As I say, I didn't want to be an administrator and I didn't want to be a political scientist in the new sense. I thought I could still write the history of the Farmer Labor Party . . . somehow make that a career.

I should tell you also this interesting little insight into how things sometimes work. I was exacting a price from the university and I said, "Look, I'm a tired person. I've had six years as commissioner and eight years as mayor, I need to recharge my batteries." Mac said, "You're absolutely right! You come to the university and we'll get you a leave for the first year." Ah! what an attraction to have a whole year in which to do my own thing. What I didn't realize was—I learned this later—Mac picks up the telephone and calls the Ford Foundation from which he had recently come. They have a program to help rehabilitate, reestablish, worn-out practitioners and he gets my first year's salary from the Ford Foundation. What I later learn is that in the election of 1968 and the assassination of Robert Kennedy there were a lot of these young fellows like Peter Edelman and a number of others that were left out there to dry and the Ford Foundation had given them stipends, fellowships, the same thing that I got, and this led to such a furor in Congress that they amended the foundation act, whatever the act was, because of that. Well, I got in under the wire; I got my year's time. During that year's time, they had to have a make shift place for me to . . .

CAC: I'm going to intercede for a moment. This was the same year, 1968, that Mr. Humphrey goes down to defeat?

AN: Yes, exactly.

CAC: [unclear] his career again and you're still very closely [unclear].

AN: You see, it was after his defeat in 1968 that he's hired by the university, and I come shortly after that, and then I'm hired by the university.

CAC: Mr. Humphrey is hired by Public Affairs?

AN: No, no, no, no, no. Humphrey is hired by Macalester College and then there's some kind of split off arrangement made.

CAC: Oh, okay.

AN: I don't know the nature of that exactly but I think that the university—and through what agency I don't know—buys a part of him for him to come over and teach a class.

CAC: I see. He had an office here, yes.

AN: I don't know where he taught that class. I'm not sure whether he even taught that class. I don't know what that was about. See, that year of 1969-1970, I had traveled . . . I had that year off. That's the year that's Hubert's here. In 1970, he runs for the Senate again; so, he's only here a brief time, and we never overlap, and we never ever do anything together. At that time the university had ownership of—maybe they still own it—the old Remington Rand building over on University Avenue, near the city limits, near the KSTP tower. I don't know if you know the Remington Rand building? I was just delighted to be given a little office that had no windows—it was just choked off from all of society—in order for me to move my files, whatever I had and to do whatever I was going to do during that year. I had a lot of ambitious notions about reorganizing my life, and reorganizing my files, and I did do quite a little bit of writing actually during that year. That was a very productive year, even though I was traveling a lot. I had a little money for hiring some help and I hired a woman who had worked for me in the mayor's office. She came and was for several months, maybe even a full time secretary. It must have been a very arid experience in that office I wasn't around much and what she was given to do was probably not as exciting as being in the mayor's office; so, she decided after a few months to go back. I didn't blame her a bit for that. I loved my office. It was just down the hill from where I lived, and I would go over there, and as I say, it was very productive—when I was in town. There came a time when they had to do something about the office space and they had to find a place for me to go. In the meantime, I told you that I didn't want to run any School of Public Affairs.

CAC: Yes.

AN: By this time, Lukermann and the others, they don't know what the hell to do with me because there I am free floating, drawing a salary. I don't know on what budget I was; I was on some kind of budget. I was getting a paycheck every . . . I don't know how this worked. I never inquired about it. So, there's kind of a crisis because I'm being forced out and I have to have a place, have to have a place to sit down and have a telephone. They say, "What you should do is go over into the School of Public Affairs." I don't know that I'm protesting. I figure, I don't have any particular objection to going over there. That was kind of a strange decision because I was on the School of Public Affairs faculty almost before there was a School of Public Affairs. About this time, they hired John Brandl and one of the first things he wanted to do was to have me in an office with another person. I said, "Oh, look, I think I'll go back to the Remington." I don't know as I could have gone back to the Remington Rand building. I didn't throw a tantrum but I explained that I just didn't want to be doubled up. They made a little concession and gave me my own office. When they gave me my own office . . .

CAC: God! I would hope so.

AN: . . . it was in this building, in the Social Science building and I had a little office just like this. Having this little office made me content to stay. Then they put my salary item on the School of Public Affairs budget. I'm not deciding this; others are deciding this. Once this happens of course, I'm invited to faculty meetings and I'm regarded as a faculty member. I kind of back into this. There's no really great grounds for my objecting. People aren't telling me what to do and I can decide what I want to do but now I'm expected to teach. I figure, okay, that's no great problem either because I can teach a seminar and this and that. I decide to teach a course in contemporary public problems for undergraduates and I taught that course. We had quite a big class. I kind of floated around but progressively I was more and more involved with the School of Public Affairs. I'm only telling you this because in a way, there's nothing uncongenial about this. I'm not fighting anything. I'm just kind of going with what is being laid out.

CAC: As we said in the 1960s, going with the flow.

AN: Going with the flow. So, I'm on the faculty of the School of Public Affairs and Brandl is a nice fellow. He conceded me this single office, is not pressuring me about what I'm doing, what I decide I want to teach is fine. The down side of this is that I am soon perceived as not in the spirit of the place because the place is really devoted to the notion that in order to be in public work, you have to be trained in methods of quantification. You have to be a policy analyst. The school is no longer training budget people, personnel officers. They are really not engaged anymore in the training for public administration. It's now a School of Public Affairs and I've never, from that very moment on to this day, been fully reconciled to that kind of approach. By and by, some concessions are made to the more practical applied side but, again, this is the elitist notion as against the populist notion.

CAC: It's gone back to your theme, yes.

AN: What is interesting about this is that [unclear] as they may, the School of Public Affairs is never perceived as elitist by the Social Science Departments; so, my career at the university is a very stunted one in that within the family, that I'm presumably a part of, my work is not regarded with any kind of real enthusiasm . . . because I'm doing what? I run a television program that deals with the here and now. This doesn't involve . . . when Harlan Cleveland comes, Harlan figures that's good . . . there's no objections to your doing that but it isn't Public Affairs in the sense that we're engaged in at the university. In the meantime, the Social Science Departments are looking down on the school itself. It's really not looking down upon Harlan Cleveland. He doesn't have a Ph.D. He's engaged in the work of the world not in the work of the mind, see? I tell these things because I think this is part of the large story. I hope that whoever listens to this tape or however the type script is read, people won't see a kind of judgmental note in my saying these things. I mean them to be descriptive. I don't know where real truth lies. My own conviction is that a university like Minnesota has got to face in both directions. It's got to have ample budget for both. One can't really exist at the expense of the other. I think, for example, that our School of Public Affairs, now the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, doesn't really know its own soul. In order to finance itself, it has to reach out now in a time when Republicans are in the saddle and it's now trying to undo the name of Humphrey, which presents another dimension to the problem.

CAC: Ah!

AN: I don't know where it lives . . . what kind of research it's engaged in. I don't know where its soul is. This may reflect the large confusion that besets the whole body politic of America. We don't know who we are, or where we're going, or what we're going to do. This is reflected in the last election. We want to globalize and what does this mean to people that are dislocated by the globalizing move? There's no program for that, no real program. We've got homeless and no real program for that and on and on.

CAC: You bet.

AN: In the meantime, we think we're going to achieve solutions through some form of measurement—and that's very helpful. We can't deal with our social problems except as we have accurate and fundamental data but beyond that there's a lot of other need. We have to have people who are trained in the skills of leadership and boy! we're in short supply of that, I'll tell you. We don't really know how to train leaders anyway but that's another matter.

CAC: It won't surprise you that when I had John Brandl and he plays on some of the same themes, and with great poignancy, because he also has been in the public arena as a senator and has been a professor.

AN: Right.

CAC: He sees these divisions rather clearly. I'm going to ask you to back up just a minute. You were here seven years—now, we're going back to 1947 to 1954—in Political Science and in General Studies and you had responsibility for putting that Social Science program together. Then, when Orville Freeman is elected governor, you become his commissioner of administration and for six years, right?

AN: Six years, right.

CAC: In that position, the university isn't the only item on the governor's agenda but he has to be concerned with higher education. Can you say something about the perception of the university in higher education from the governor's office and from the commissioner of administration?

AN: Well, that's very interesting because that's worth a whole chapter in itself, obviously the relationship with the legislature. The point at which Orville Freeman was elected in 1954 and I become commissioner of administration, there is a very unfortunate reaction, an adverse reaction, to the university spearheaded by Peter Popovich and Don Wozniak, two legislators. They come in to some very prominent leadership roles by virtue of the Democratic Farmer Labor victories in 1954. They are very prominent people in the legislative House of 1955. The Senate is still conservatively controlled. Their vendetta against the university is very pronounced.

CAC: Where is that derived? What is the source of that vendetta?

AN: Well, they're alive and you can ask them. They may . . .

CAC: But you observed it. I'll ask them if I can.

AN: They may have recanted over the years but we don't know. We think that there were some kinds of disappointments that one or both of them experienced. I don't know but it was very pronounced. They were out to get the university. There was just no question about it, to gut the appropriations.

CAC: And Governor Freeman was an alumnus of the university?

AN: Yes, Freeman. Freeman was resisting. We had other arguments with them. There were other problems that we had with the Popovich and Wozniak connection. Freeman was much more politic about this than I was. He was not going to kill himself over this but he was very sympathetic and very supportive of the university appropriation. Now, the relationship with the commissioner of administration is very important here. The commissioner of administration develops the budget—that's why I went to work early for Freeman—he works for the governor but in those early years the commissioner of administration tends to know a little bit more about the budget than the governor himself does. Of course, I was very sympathetic to the university's request and was not about to touch it on the grounds that the university's request ought to go to

the legislature without our putting a heavy hand to it. I think, by and large, that's what Freeman did in all three sessions was just to let the university request what they wanted. Then, when it gets to the legislature, it's not our responsibility. We have supported the university's request but now it's up to those legislative committees.

CAC: And it's up to the university to make its own case?

AN: Make its own case, right and there's no particular point in our going before those committees to argue for them. What was kind of interesting to me personally was that Lew Morrill, who was president during that entire time . . . I think even . . .

CAC: Yes, right down to 1960.

AN: . . . and Ray Amberg of the hospitals, and Bill Middlebrook, the vice-president for Business Management—the three of them were the great triumvirate—and they kind of made my office a sort of headquarters.

CAC: And Stan Wenberg?

AN: No, he comes later. Bill Nunn may have been at that point . . . These are the heavies and they're there everyday, especially when it comes to the hearings. They kind of make my office sort of their headquarters, to get a drink of water, park their coats and they know that I'm a friendly person to them. They don't own me and I don't own them obviously but we were friendly.

CAC: Sure.

AN: Morrill is an impressive fellow. He's got his own sort of stiff manner but it's impressive and these fellows know how to lobby, at least they've been doing it for a long time. I can't remember what happened in 1955 but in 1957, A. I. Johnson is the speaker of the House and it's in the House where we're having our trouble. In the Senate, I think Jerry Mullin still may be active. It's the House that's cutting the university up something awful. The university appropriation, as I recall, comes out of the House in a very bad way and it's the Senate bill that needs to be supported. This goes to conference and I intervene at this point. It really is a terrible thing that I did and I think Freeman was quite unhappy with my having intervened at that point; although, he was with me and he may even have been party . . . he maybe even approved of what I did. I undertake to coral A.I. Johnson at a breakfast meeting with Lew Morrill and maybe Freeman came, too . . . I'm not sure but I know I organized that breakfast meeting . . . which he had to keep Pete Popovich, the chairman of appropriations off the conference committee. I don't know how to give you a parallel to this but to his lasting . . . Pete Popovich was going to destroy the university appropriation in that conference committee if he was on it. I'll be damned . . . to his credit, A.I. Johnson refused to appoint the chairman of appropriations to that committee.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: Pete was just absolutely livid, just enraged!

CAC: Well, appropriately so. I mean, he was chairman of that committee.

AN: Yes. He later became so important in the whole world of the Supreme Court and the whole works.

CAC: You bet.

AN: It would be interesting to talk to Pete to see to just what extent he recalls those days. Pete and I were enemies. We really fought, not only about that but we fought over architectural contracts. He and Wozniak represented architects that they wanted to have blessed with awards which I wasn't prepared to give. We had terrible fights. They also were not very friendly to some of Freeman's proposals for governmental reorganization. Later on, we had to some extent a [unclear] so that today when I see Don Wozniak and Pete Popovich, we don't fight anymore.

CAC: But the appropriation in 1957 then survived the conference committee?

AN: Yes.

CAC: [unclear] closer to the Senate [unclear]?

AN: Oh, yes. There's always some give and take in this. But the Senate was just much more friendly to the university. That was my major invasion of the relationship. Oh, I should tell you about something, too. This is an interesting kind of byplay. Milton Eisenhower was then at Johns Hopkins University and he headed—I think a foundation set this up—called a Commission on Government in Higher Education. It was a very distinguished committee. As a matter of fact, Lew Morrill happened to be on it. It included James B. Conant, the president of Harvard and any other number of notables. It also included Sargent Shriver. He was then the head of the school system in Chicago. He lived in Chicago and managed the Merchandise Mart that had been bought by his father-in-law, Joseph Kennedy. I have a lot of stories to tell about my relationship with Sargent Shriver. Mac Moos was the executive director of this commission, in other words, he was at Johns Hopkins at the time.

CAC: Ah, okay.

AN: This was while I was commissioner. I had achieved a little national reputation of sorts as a very creative state budget officer, which I was, you, a state budget officer here. Mac said that he understood that I believed in the constitutional immunity, was a supporter of the immunity of the university from state control . . .

CAC: Ah, it's autonomy.

AN: . . . and would I come and address this commission on this subject. I said, "Sure." So, I went down to Baltimore and I addressed them on this subject, and my testimony was very well received, and I published this in the *Educational Record* and, as a matter of fact, it exists side by side with an unrelated article by a fellow by the name of O. Meredith Wilson. That was my first awareness that there was a guy by the name of O. Meredith Wilson. I ought to send you for your archive a copy of my statement about constitutional immunity.

CAC: Please, do.

AN: I had at that point the theory that one appropriation that state legislatures ought to keep their hands off was the university . . . to make that appropriation and then forget it. This ran counter, of course, to what the Popovichs and the Wozniaks wanted to do. They wanted to make an appropriation [unclear] riders on it.

CAC: There's that tension all the time.

AN: It's like Congress and its relationship with the Humanities Commission.

CAC: Yes, right.

AN: I just figured that when you're in the realm of education, the realm of arts and humanities, you've got to keep your hands off. Give them the money and then let the people who are engaged in that work do their work. It's not a very popular view today and it wasn't terribly popular even in those days.

CAC: [unclear] believe the university clings to this?

AN: The university still has constitutional immunity but I think it's been attenuated. It isn't only the matter of the letter of the law, it's also the spirit.

CAC: Sure.

AN: The constitutional immunity thing is so central as a life spirit of the institution that that has to have some attention and what happened to it. I think that you'll find that James Gray deals with this fairly extensively . . .

CAC: Well, but it's had a lot of implementation since then . . . forty years.

AN: Yes. Now, we've probably talked about not very much . . . we've gone on and on here, gosh! more than you want.

CAC: Oh, no! This is wonderful stuff.

AN: [laughter] I don't know where we left off. We've had a lot of tangents.

CAC: Other people who have commented on politics in the 1950s and then in the 1960s talk about the friends of the university consisting primarily of conservative—in the old sense conservative—Republican, often rural senators who thought of the university as a gem of the state that needed to be protected, and financed, and [unclear] you were suggesting. Now, did you have that impression during the 1950s when you were the commissioner of administration?

AN: The sources of university support are varied, as you know. There are a lot of people who, when they think of the university, think of glorious triumphs in the field of medicine. This was certainly true of Jerry Mullin who was a stalwart in the state Senate for many years.

CAC: And a Republican?

AN: No, he was a Democrat. He was clearly a conservative Democrat.

CAC: All right.

AN: Jerry Mullin was one of the early people that I went to when I was first involved with Humphrey and he was very responsive. He was very supportive of the university. The story was that he had had a very serious stomach operation, and had come through successfully, and was forever grateful to the university for that. Well, that's one great source. There are a lot of people, at least historically, who feel that the university, and its connection with the Mayo Foundation, and its reaching out with the teaching hospitals has just been a source of great, great service to the state and to the world. You rub some people and what they think of right away are the glories of our medical establishment, and this extends to dentistry, and it extends even to veterinary medicine, the whole point being that here's where good minds are doing enormously important work. That's one of the great sources.

CAC: But has a consequence for the daily welfare of the citizenry?

AN: Right and for years we had on the board of regents one of the Doctors Mayo, and that was recognized, and that would be clearly conservative. The people that are on that bent would probably subscribe very strongly to the notion that this is an elite institution.

CAC: Dr. Amberg represented that position very successfully for the hospital.

AN: Oh, yes. And that would be a very conservative source because doctors historically, and still, are a very conservative group. You can go across the spectrum and, here and there, there are pockets of support. I don't know to what extent lawyers think of the university as being something special to them, like the doctors. I wouldn't say that the doctors necessarily feel all

that loyal to the university. I'm thinking of that part of the medical/hospital community that associates the great work going on here . . . it isn't necessarily doctors that do. It's a more mysterious segment of the population. As you go across the board here, there are other areas too but it is particularized so that people begin to feel that while they like the university for what it does for them . . . like the morticians like what it does for them. The labor people may like the university for the Industrial Relations Center to the extent that the center is really serving their interest . . . so you can go kind of group by group across the board.

CAC: Let's mention the farmers.

AN: And the farmers, yes.

CAC: The farmers are an enormous [unclear].

AN: Right, you're absolutely right. That's been historically a very important segment.

CAC: The Experiment Station.

AN: That's right. That would be, by and large, a kind of conservative element. It's a farmer bureau element. We think of the farm as a kind of entrepreneurial activity and not beholden to any kind of regulation but rather going to prosper because you improve the techniques of production.

CAC: And management.

AN: And management. Yes, a very important segment. Now, there's also this support that comes today from people like you and me, people who are let's say just university oriented for intellectual reasons, artistic reasons, humanistic reasons. We're supporters of the university but we're the greatest disorganized mass you ever saw. We don't have any coherent lobby organization but we do in fused groups and kind of lend a spirit. There is a diffusion of feeling which is a source of support for the university—which the university doesn't quite know how to capture as a lobbying group. They reach out toward, and they don't know where to find it, and how to use it. If they ever could discover the key to that, they'd have a rather powerful lobby.

CAC: They are trying to use the Alumni Association in that regard.

AN: Yes, I know. They try to use the alumni but the alumni doesn't have an identifiable core that they can reach. I know that because I'm to some extent active in the alumni. It is the good feeling, the good feeling about the university but this tends to get frittered as the cannibalism develops. People don't know what to make of the university. At this point, the great supporters of the university see it's big, it's overgrown, it's got arguments out there, the faculty is unhappy . . .

CAC: And Art, wouldn't it be the case—I'll put it in the form of a question, in the way a rhetorical question—that then when this crucial Health Sciences program gets into trouble and the press begins to investigate and have stories revealing troubles, then the whole university is in more trouble? Would that be correct?

AN: Well, the people are just puzzled. How does that affect the teaching of undergraduates? What really is going on there? Who are these people that are presumable doing bad things with research and so on? It's a great puzzle. It's a great puzzle to me!

CAC: Of course.

AN: I don't know what the hell is going on here. Nobody is telling me much that I can understand. Joe Rigert's articles sort of tell me something but they, in a way, sensationalize things and there is never enough rounded information coming out. Maybe that's because I don't read it carefully enough. Maybe the fault is mine and not in the coverage. Take the proposal of Hasselmo's for reorganizing undergraduate work, I don't really understand it—and I must be in the upper 5 or 10 percent of the people in the state. I don't understand it and I don't know how you make this understandable to people.

CAC: How much of it, Art, do you think is identified? You started by saying "football." You saw that connection as a kid in high school. Let me say a bit more about myself . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: . . . from my father and from the community that in southern Minnesota, the university was it! in a kind of abstract way, a real pride in the university, and it was an amorphous pride. That's what you're suggesting, is it not?

AN: It's awfully hard to know how to mobilize that and put it to work.

CAC: Yes.

AN: When I spoke at the end of that series of symposiums that our Class of 1939 put on, we had a panel that followed it. Elmer L. Andersen, our dearly beloved former governor, was on it with me and one or two others. I had shown through an overhead projection . . . there are something like 200 things called *centers* here at the university. I don't know if you have looked at that chart and that speech that I sent you?

CAC: Yes.

AN: This captured the attention of the group and they all wanted me to hold it on the screen awhile in order to identify . . . make sure that their center was up there.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: It went for three pages or more, single-spaced. You'll find it in that speech I sent you.

CAC: Right.

AN: I made the remark afterwards and said, "What we should do, instead of relying on a chief lobbyist, we ought to send to the legislature all these people that represent these centers." I said it in a kind of facetious way. Obviously, you aren't going to have 250 lobbyists lined up to testify but, in a way, I was kind of serious about it. I remember Elmer's reaction was, "Gee, that's the most off the wall damned thing." He just wanted to strike the whole record and, of course, he was right. In a way, this is sort of the problem with the university, that if you said to a legislator, "Your lack of appropriation really means the death of this, and this, and this, or the diminution of this, and this, and this, they'd say, "Well, yes." They don't really have an appreciation of that. What they get are the gross statistics. It's kind of like dealing with the federal budget, you know. It's easy for a person to say, "They're going to cut 20 percent out of the budget," like they know where the 20 percent is. Well, nobody knows where the 20 percent is. They don't know where 2 percent is.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: If you're going to get an appreciation of the federal government, you'd almost have to have every bureau and every unit, every department come in and present its case.

CAC: Yes.

AN: And it's doing all these enormously important and wonderful things, with research, with climate control, protecting the food we eat, just an incredible . . . and these are the things that are going to be cut, unmercifully cut. That's what the university problem is, not maybe as serious as the federal government's but it's serious enough. We expect, then, that the president though is somehow is going to get on top of all that and find a real skillful way to send a PR [Public Relations] person to the legislature. You know this morning, the retirees were meeting—I saw it announced—to try to help with the legislative budget. Well, you know, if I knew how to help, I might volunteer myself but I don't know how to help. It's a tough, tough life and I do think that the university is facing, at this point, a very serious crisis. That's as much as I probably should say here at this present time. I don't know where we were, Clarke.

CAC: I started talking about your perception of the university on the commissioner's office in state government and we spun that out. I think that's a very useful part because what I'm looking

for, as I said earlier, is the informal history. How do things really function? Your observations are very helpful in that direction.

AN: You mentioned the magic word of *football* and I should treat that rather seriously in that when I came to the university in 1936, there was I think a general spirit that you call a school spirit. I think people felt identified with the university.

CAC: The students did?

AN: The students did, yes, and the faculty, too, and the community did. The university was an object of great pride. However you might have individual troubles and differences, the university as an institution was a matter of great pride. This is a great intangible thing but on a Saturday afternoon, those golden fall days, especially if it was a national champion as it was when I came . . .

CAC: With Bernie Biermann around, it helped.

AN: Yes, with Bernie Bierman around. When I came down in 1936, we suffered our first great defeat at the hands of Northwestern and I remember the campus went into mourning. We lost 6-3. This was the period of Ed Widseth and company. On those golden afternoons, we'd march up University Avenue to Memorial Stadium and there was a sense that we were home . . .

CAC: Belonged.

AN: . . . that this was our community. If we lost, we went into mourning. If we won, it was a moment of great triumph, and we'd read the papers with great satisfaction, and especially, as I say, if we were winning. But it wasn't only the university football team. It attached just generally to the life here. People had the sense that they were really part of it. It attached to the *Minnesota Daily*, in my life in a very significant way.

CAC: I've had people talk about their attachment to the theater in the same way.

AN: To the university theater, certainly, in the same way.

CAC: Yes.

AN: I think some of these things still operate . . . obviously, they do. I'm sure that the present crop of people working on the *Daily* feel a kinship. Whether their spirit is of the same intensity, I just have no way of knowing. I see this, of course, through glasses of old cheers . . .

CAC: That's fine.

AN: . . . so I may embellish it. Maybe, we didn't feel all that way at the time but there was the sense that the university belonged to us. It belonged to the public. It was our place even despite

the kinds of things that we knew were wrong here, it was still our glory. We knew that mysterious things were going on in technology, and in medicine, and dentistry, all these places. Even those of us in the Social Sciences knew truth was being discovered and we had wonderful minds at work here. As a matter of fact, what's interesting is that—and I don't know where we are today—during those years that I have described at such length, when I was a younger faculty member, we had a community of peers and other faculty . . . I mentioned Ralph Ross and there were all kinds of others, Ben Nelson, Leon Festinger . . .

CAC: Oh, yes.

AN: . . . Isaac Rosenfeld, Saul Bellow, Allan Tate. We . . . I'm not sure I should associate myself with this but there was an awareness, that there was a kind of . . . even within the group that I would have known . . . intellectually alive, concern, interested in what was going on in the world.

CAC: And creative?

AN: Politics, religion, everything was on the table for discussion and challenge, partisan review, commentary. The publication of the *Atlantic Monthly*, the publications of the time were up front and center in the people's arguments and the new books that spun new theories. Wilhelm Reich, his [unclear] would be discussed. There was a ferment that was enlivened and enriched by the presence of the university here.

CAC: Ah.

AN: I don't know whether that exists today or not. I never find it. If it's there it may be just attenuated. It may be that the specializations in society have become so severe that minds just don't talk to each other across these walls. I just don't know.

CAC: Would you like to come back and try to start a general studies program again? that's a rhetorical question—I mean, just pointing out the difficulty of doing it.

AN: The difficulty would be impossible, I think.. It would be absolutely impossible and, probably, if for no other reason, because what there is now, to encompass this is so enormous that I don't know how one sets about doing that. In our time, we may have been kind of innocent to think that if we could just get the right levers, we'd understand about human behavior and we'd understand the particular ideology that would serve this nation. Now, I don't think anybody thinks there's any ideology, there's any philosophy, there's any approach that's going to help much.

CAC: Or any approach that can synthesize at least?

AN: Yes.

CAC: Art, let me interpose here again that many people I've talked to have talked about it in terms of specialization and sub-specialization within their own discipline and even within a discipline, the conversations are difficult. Many people report this.

AN: I told you about how I never ever resolved my own relationship to the School of Public Affairs and the Humphrey Institute. I did for eleven years that program *Minnesota Issues* and I would have come as my guests . . .

CAC: On television, Channel 2.

AN: . . . on television. It was carried on other channels, too, over the state. It actually originated here on campus. It was not a Channel 2 program, which is another problem which we won't go into.

CAC: All right.

AN: I had the governor come. I'd have a congressman come . . . people that were kind of in the news. Some days there were arguments, there was a clash of points of view, sometimes even a panel. We taped the program on Friday morning at ten-thirty for the first showing on noon on Sunday. I figured gee! it's too bad, I get these men and women on campus and I ought to share them with my colleagues and with the students. So, I would make an announcement that at eleven o'clock when we complete the taping that I'm going to have as my guest Congressman so and so, and maybe his adversary so and so, and we'll meet in room such and such, and there will be a continuation. I even worked up a broadcast of the program. They could watch the taping through closed TV. What I discovered early on was that just a handful, almost nobody, came, just a handful of people came . . . four five students maybe if we were lucky . . . two or three faculty. It was just an embarrassment. When a governor came, then we'd get maybe twenty or twenty-five people to come. One time they came to see Perpich. He may have been in the heart of some kind of real crazy struggle, I can't remember. I discontinued it after awhile. It was an imposition on them.

CAC: An imposition and you're suggesting an embarrassment?

AN: An embarrassment and I discovered that the reasons were—as I inquired about this—that number one, our students really work so much. They really work.

CAC: But you were talking about your own undergraduate career where you worked, and worked, and worked.

AN: They were either at work, or they were in class, or they were preparing for class. That was one problem, the time factor. The second factor is that this didn't bear much relationship to what they were studying. If I had an environmentalist come and the professor who handles environment questions would be there—probably was on the program as a matter of fact—but

nobody else would come from the faculty. They figured that's environment. We've got a man that takes care of environment. You're mentioning specialization, even in Public Affairs . . . If we have a person who is dealing, say, in juvenile delinquency, a welfare question of some sort, well, that's welfare. I might get a few people to come up from the Social Welfare Department to hear him on that day and maybe even a person in Police Administration might come by if it's juvenile delinquency, if I get the word to that person. One could build an audience within a speciality because there are so many people who are working on a speciality from different points of view. But that requires a computer to find those people, and inform them, and keep them involved. This is not just true of my program but this is true generally. I think this is true of all departments.

CAC: You're contributing it in some part to specialization within disciplines itself?

AN: Yes, I think so.

CAC: But you're also, I think, making a comment that I wish you would speak more about, that is, the needs and the life pressures of the students themselves.

AN: Phil Raup talks about this . . .

CAC: It's in Ag-Econ.

AN: You're got to talk with Phil. He's a very important person.

CAC: Yes, I have.

AN: Phil explains that large numbers of students who work off campus and on campus . . . In a way this is made more difficult and a worse problem by virtue of our location because there is a market right outside our doorstep for the services of our students. Northfield doesn't have that problem quite like we have it here. They don't have that problem, say, at Ann Arbor quite like we have it here, or for that matter in East Lansing. We've got it here in spades.

CAC: Or in Champaign-Urbana?

AN: That's right. I think it would be worth a study to find out about this. I don't know how it is at the moment but historically, a lot of our students in Public Affairs don't finish, don't see themselves through to the degree. This gets to be an embarrassment. You have x number of entrants and then when you look at ten years later, only a certain percentage have finished off to get the actual degree. I think it has improved because a lot of people bear down pretty hard on this, and insist that people come back, and finish their incompletes, and really get on with it, and finish because we want the record to reflect something better. Typically, what happens is that students (a) are working and (b) they go out on internships. Because the degree doesn't really mean the matter of acceptance or admission to the speciality—not our degree. It would be

a little different if we had a board so they had to qualify before they get a paycheck. It doesn't mean that much to them. They have their entrée, their entrance already established.

CAC: Through the workplace and apprenticeship?

AN: Through the workplace. That's why some of them don't continue to go on. They go off on an internship and they are a bright young person—that's why they got admitted to begin with. They've had some training so they have some little vernacular that sounds pretty good to the department that's employing them as an intern. There's an opportunity, with the natural turnover, and so they stay on in the agency. It's hard to reclaim that body. If you say, "Come back," what are you going to do the following year if they give you something more of the same. You say, "Well, I've had that." [laughter] That's not fair what I've just said. The university here is in a tough way on that account.

CAC: You're saying it's less relevant in the lives of the students and the careers they are planning?

AN: Well, it's perceived that way. It may not very well be.

CAC: Yes, yes. We're talking about perceptual reality.

AN: Exactly, yes. The university faces a lot of problems.

CAC: I'm going to push just a little bit more on this because what you describe has been more or less true of this undergraduate student body for many years, which is to say they have lived at home. We've been a commuter campus for seventy or eighty years at least. A very small percent live in dormitories or fraternities and sororities. Our students have for a long time worked twenty hours or more a week.

AN: Right.

CAC: It may be that the pressures are more now with the high tuition, and lack of jobs that will pay a great deal, and higher aspirations, perhaps, and wanting to have a better standard of living while you're going to school. I see that as pretty steady, Art; so, there must be some other factors operating to make this what you describe as a loss of a sense of community and identification with the university that difficult.

AN: I think a lot of things operate but that's one of them certainly.

CAC: Yes. What else do you think operates then, to press on this point. I'm hearing this from lots of people and I'm trying to press and find out what other things are going on here.

AN: The loss of community is not by any means limited to the university.

CAC: Ah!

AN: I think there's been a huge cultural shift. There's a loss of community with respect to church. There's a loss of community with respect to family, as destructive as that is.

CAC: Or identification with a political party?

AN: Political parties, labor unions. I think that what's behind that is a whole series of shifts. I attach enormous importance to television. I think television has fundamentally reoriented individual lives. People are really homebound . . . favorite programs, entertainment centers. They find that that gives them as much as they want to absorb in the way of information; so, they read the newspapers less and less, probably read magazines and books less and less. Those who do are kind of a special breed. The communitarian, collegial, collectivist life become diminished.

CAC: The public life?

AN: Yes, the public life.

CAC: Civic life?

AN: And civic life becomes diminished. The university suffers from that. The students rush onto the campus to pick up their classes, get their credits, and get off campus. They are not joining a community. They are coming to take from the institution what they need and they figure others can do the chores or whatever needs doing. But they've got their lives to live which are now much more self-contained. They've got to get on to do the things that they find rewarding and fulfilling though those rewards and fulfillments are now much more personal, much more private than they are community related.

CAC: You are mayor for eight years?

AN: Right.

CAC: And that's some time ago now. Would you think, to pursue this just a moment, the same thing would be true of city politics or city government, that there's a sense of loss?

AN: Oh, yes.

CAC: Could you say something about that? You were mayor in the 1960s . . . 1961-1969?

AN: Right.

CAC: Can you say something about what you perceive in civic life? After all the university is an urban university. Minneapolis and St. Paul surround us. Could you reflect on that?

AN: I think it would be an elaboration of what I've just said; that is, I attach a great deal of significance to television and that affects . . . But there are other things that crosscut with this. I mentioned very early on the whole notion of diversity in this country. I think as long as we thought of ourselves as reasonably homogeneous, Western European, there was generally a sense of community. We were all sort of *white* . . . but with blacks, Asians, new immigrants? That homogeneity, that which underscores the sense of community has become fractionated.

CAC: You saw that operating in your own life as a person from the Jewish community?

AN: The Jewish phenomenon has its own dynamics which I think has to be examined pretty carefully with respect to this. I would have to think long and hard about this. There is a sense in which the vulnerability of the Jewish people increases as the general turbulence increases but at the same time, there is a broad assimilation which has occurred for the Jewish people. They are much more integrated.

CAC: Well, certainly in the university that's true [unclear] the 1960s.

AN: Integrated most every place. They're relationship is very complicated. The Jewish people, for example, did feel—many still do feel—this kind of common cause with blacks but undercutting that now is this concern about safety, and security, and crime, and Affirmative Action in the Louis Farrakhans, and so on; so that the Jewish people now are on both ends of this equation—some. One has to be careful . . . we are generalizing here. The vulnerability of the Jewish people, I think, increases as the search for scapegoats increases. I think that that's what we're beginning to see now very dramatically in this election . . . that in a way the public is sort of the scapegoat of the Democratic Party. I don't know who they are going to scapegoat next. When it turns out the Republicans can't deliver any more than the Democrats could, now who do they scapegoat next? The welfare mothers are scapegoated . . . if they'd get with it and didn't have illegitimate kids, we wouldn't have a problem, wouldn't have any crime. Liberals like me . . . I don't know that we scapegoat the National Rifle Association but we don't figure they're doing us much good.

CAC: [laughter]

AN: I don't think getting rid of them would solve the problem. I figure there are a lot of things that are wrong here and a lot of groups that are advocating things that I don't like. I shouldn't put myself among those as a scapegoat but what I mean to suggest is that there is a fragmenting of the community who are suspicious of each other whether . . .

CAC: And this is to say, to put it bluntly and directly to you, Art, that it's more difficult to be mayor of the city of Minneapolis in the 1990s than it was in the 1960s?

AN: Oh, no doubt about it. I've often remarked that. There's no question about it.

CAC: So, the same thing would be true of the university? All of our institutions are more difficult [unclear]?

AN: There's no doubt about it. It's much more difficult to be a Catholic cardinal today and a Catholic pope than it was twenty years ago. Then we say, "What's gone wrong?" "Well, it's those women that have illegitimate kids, that's what's causing all the crime." Well, you know, that isn't true. They may be part of the problem like we're all part of the problem.

CAC: But it does come back to the university as a central institution of this community. If the community is fragmented—I don't want to put words in your mouth—then it's more difficult for the university to govern itself and to create a constituency in the state that would be supportive?

AN: You're absolutely right. I come back to my little basic thesis about populism and elitism.

CAC: Yes, yes.

AN: If you move in one direction, you do it at the expense of another direction and the bridging of the two requires a kind of leadership that is . . .

CAC: I'm looking at your memoranda. We've covered a lot of ground and a lot of very useful ground.

AN: One of the sources of interest and concern is the matter of the regents. I've been a regents watcher for many years. I think one of the problems of the university has been that we don't have genuine generalists on the regents. We may think we have. We have that advisory committee that was appointed on the selection of regents. My wife, Fran, was on that when the it was first organized.

CAC: I always thought of it as a screening committee?

AN: They get applications in and then they recommend. I don't know how you solve this problem but I think that the regents must have on it people who can see the tension of the elite role and the populist role in clear perspective and be prepared to argue vociferously with the legislature, and with foundations, and with the public for the kind of support the university needs to fulfill its function. I don't know what the regents do. I don't get a sense of awareness in which the regents are . . . This may be, and one can argue, and I think it's true that the regents are no better and no worse than the university president because they are really the handmaiden to what the university president makes of them, how he shapes them, what he lays before them . . .

CAC: Ah, but he has to use persons who are brought to him.

AN: Right . . . and how he shares his own reflective view. In a way, instead of saying the regents, one has to say the regents and the president. I like Nils Hasselmo. I think he's a first rate human being. I always enjoy being with him. I think he's very bright. I think he's very responsive to what goes on around him. If I had to be choosing a president, I may very well be voting for him for the reason that I like him so much and he has a lot of good interpersonal strengths which are very good.

What is interesting that this is precisely the way I feel about Bill Clinton. I figure that Clinton is just a wonderful person. I don't know anybody that can communicate like he can. There's just nobody that knows as much about the particular problems that are presented to him and if I had to vote again, I'd vote for him, most likely. And yet, I fault both Hasselmo and Clinton in a very profound way. That is, I fault Clinton for not going out to say, What is it that this nation really needs to deal with the problem of the homeless? Forget about money for the moment, just forget about it. How would we treat this problem if we had the money? How do we deal with the environment in a way that is beneficial and constructive? How would we really deal with that? How would we deal with public education so that we really build into it? How would we deal with the problem of crime now? It's asking an awful lot, in the face of all of the turbulence that we know, for a president to come up and say, "These are the initiatives. These are the programs." Because as he does it, it's going to sound like the New Deal, Fair Deal, Great Society, all over again—and it will. I don't know how to present these things except in those terms. I fault Clinton that he's no longer a New Dealer, Fair Dealer, Great Society person. He's become a Democratic Leadership Council person which is a pale imitation of the Republicans, which is the notion that somehow you can solve the problems of society by cutting the budget, and increasing the military—and he's for both of these things . . . that's his program at the moment—not touching entitlements, and shoving everything to the states. Well, you know, all of these things, as nearly as I can see, are kind of wrong. They're all wrong. He's buying into this because he refuses and is incapable of restating what your intelligence would tell you has to be done. If we're going to do something about the people displaced by the move toward globalization, we've got to have programs that are costly. If we're going to do something about public education, we've got to have huge federal grants. The states aren't going to do very much. The states are at war with each other. It's an uneven playing field. If we tax them in Minnesota, they'll go to Texas and Florida.

CAC: Right.

AN: If you're going to send things to the states, you've got to have an initiative that's going to level out the playing field. I'm very prepared to give him a lot of advice on that. I served seven years on the Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations and I've got a lot of ideas about that. But nobody's asking me because nobody is interested in doing that and, what's more, the senators for Texas would be the first to say, "You're off the wall and we aren't going to give up not having an income tax." My president of the United States, I think, has got to be for initiatives like this and I think as a matter of fact if he was, he might survive the 1996 election. But he ain't going to survive it by being an imitator of the Democratic Leadership Council. I'll say it

again, I'll vote for him in 1996 because he's going to be better than anybody the Republicans put up but he ain't going to save anything. I say the same thing about Nils.

CAC: Okay.

AN: I've been on this kick many times about Clinton—not about Hasselmo. Nobody ever asks me about that anymore. But about Clinton, I wind up saying, "I would vote for him in 1996." I suppose I would have to concede that if I were president, and I look out, and I see that ugly Senate and that ugly House now with Gingrich, I might even be doing what he's doing. I wouldn't want to but I don't know maybe I would. That's how difficult the situation is.

Now, that's the way I feel about Nils. If I were president of the university and I had to deal with what's going on, a business partnership that figures that the worst thing that can happen to us is to increase our income tax, cap spending. I've got to deal with them and they've got crazy notions about how this university is doing things that it ought not to be doing, educating too many undergraduates . . . I suppose I'd make some on the paper concession to that kind of thinking because they've got some control over in the state legislature. But even as I did it, I'd know that it would be wrong. This goes back to Keller's time. I think that the big mistake was made when we said, "Yes, we can become an elitist institution and we can throw over or we can triage this other stuff." Big mistake! It lost a part of our source of our support and what's more, it's just impossible to do. The result is we're left with a shrinking budget and we still have to do it all.

CAC: Yes.

AN: Hasselmo inherits this. Now, in order for him to do the job that I think a university president has got to do, he's got to play catch up. He's got to go back and say, "That was a mistake. We're asking for \$72 million. We need probably \$200 million. We need as much as those banks are going to get back from that Supreme Court decision." It isn't really very much money. Part of the problem is that the Heritage Foundation and the conservative forces have persuaded everybody that they are overtaxed. You're not overtaxed. I'm not overtaxed. It's crazy. We're maybe in the middle of the middle, right?

CAC: That's a distribution [unclear].

AN: Whoever *we* are, if he could tax us the way we should be taxed, we wouldn't have a big problem.

CAC: England, Germany, France, Scandinavia [unclear].

AN: They're all been terrified by the [Walter F.] Mondale experience.

CAC: Yes.

AN: Being terrified, what has it got us? It's gotten us worse, and worse, and worse. I just figure at some point, our leadership has to stand up and say, "Look it, this damned person's got no clothes on! It's awful! We can't go on like this." [pounding of fist on table]

CAC: You're suggesting the university also, in a smaller way?

AN: Yes, the university. You see, that's where the regents come in. It's interesting that a student or somebody added \$10 million; so, something is going on there in that direction. They added \$10 million to what Hasselmo asked. Maybe the university ought to be up front and center enough for the university president to say, "Well! you want a cap"—the business partnership wants to cap—"let's get after Texas and Florida. Let's go to Congress and get them to change that and make that the condition of any federal aid . . . no federal aid if they don't have an income tax." They'll get one quick. But we don't do that.

CAC: Nobody will say that.

AN: Nobody will say that. Nobody will do that. It's so easy to be critical.

CAC: But you've been in positions of responsibility and you can say it with more authority than most of us, Art. After all, you were mayor, and you were commissioner of administration, and you were many things.

AN: There is a great ambivalence in the souls of people.

CAC: Sure.

AN: They will be cooperative on one end, sharing, generous, and at the same time they'll be greedy, defensive, protective and that's the spirit we're in now. The only thing that brings us out of that is leadership that leads us onto a greaterer vision. "The vision thing," as our friend [President George] Bush would say. The poison that the conservative forces have spread over this country is just enormous, just enormous. [unclear] among colleagues, real politic, you know. We threw money at problems and they didn't go away. Of course, they didn't go away. We didn't throw enough money. That was the problem. I saw this when I was mayor. As soon as we began to make a little progress, the federal funds would dry up and then they said, "We threw money at that but it didn't go away."

CAC: [laughter]

AN: So, what are you going to do?

CAC: Mr. Naftalin, I tell you . . .

AN: [laughter]

CAC: . . . that's an enriching conversation and I'm very grateful that you came.

AN: Well, very good.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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