

E. W. Ziebarth

- Youth and education 1
 - childhood in Wisconsin 1
 - undergraduate, University of Wisconsin-Madison 2
 - graduate school, University of Minnesota 2
 - Weaver, Andrew T. 2
 - long-distance teaching 405
 - undergraduate athlete, Wisconsin 6
 - M.A., 1936 8
- Instructorship at University of Minnesota and Graduate School 8
 - radio work, KUOM 8
 - Minnesota School of the Air 9
 - Rarig, Frank 10-
 - works for CBS radio, 1940s 11-16
 - documentary on his own heart surgery 16
- Ziebarth is consultant to Macalester College 19
 - other community boards 21
 - Ziebarth is dean of Summer School, 1954-63 23
 - changes in program 24
 - Willey, Malcolm 26
 - Middlebrook, William 27
 - Wenberg, Stan 29
 - legislative lobbying 30
- Wilson, Meredith 31
- Ziebarth becomes dean of CLA, 1963-1973 34
 - loss of Mathematics to IT 34
 - expansion of faculty, 1963-1970 35
 - retrenchment, 1971-73 36
 - criteria for adding faculty 37
 - Turnbull, John - his role 38
- Qualities of University of Minnesota 40-
 - role of presidents 41
 - student participation 41
- New programs, late 1960s 42
 - Women's Studies 42
 - Chicano 42
 - Afro-American 42
 - American-Indian 42
 - community pressures 42-
 - relations to President Moos 46
 - Moos' inauguration 47
 - Shepherd, Gerry 49
- Ziebarth - interim president of the University of Minnesota, 1974 50-55
- Coming of Magrath, C. Peter, 1974 55
- Ranking of the University of Minnesota 56

Interview with E.W. Ziebarth

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

Interviewed on August 28, 1984

E.W. Ziebarth - EZ
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: We're starting, this morning, an interview with E.W. Ziebarth, "Easy," as he has been known for years. He's held so many very important positions at the University of Minnesota. It is Tuesday, August 28, 1984. It is a very warm August morning. We are here at his home in University Grove.

"Easy," it is a real pleasure to start an interview with you. As I have with others, we kind of start with where people came from. I know that you were a baccalaureate [unclear] award winner at the University of Wisconsin and, then, came to Minnesota in the mid 1930s. Why don't you tell us a little bit about how you got to the University of Wisconsin, why speech and theater arts; and we'll pick it up from there?

EZ: All right. Let me start by asking you whether you know where the "Easy" came from. You referred to me a moment ago as "Easy." It's not only my initials, which are E. Z. but if you ever played poker with me, you'd know precisely why I'm called "Easy."

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: I went to the University of Wisconsin, in part, because as a boy, I grew up in Madison and had come to respect the institution, what I knew about it, some of the things which were really peripheral to the central academic program. I had moved to a small Wisconsin town, following my very early years through grade school and into the beginning years of high school in Madison. I went to a prep school peripheral to the city and, then, just quite naturally, almost without conscious deliberation, I gravitated toward Wisconsin, which seemed to me, inevitably, the best institution in the area. It turned out to be as many people have discovered—I certainly didn't discover it—and I discovered for myself what a distinguished, splendid institution it is. Among public universities, I still hold the University of California at Berkeley, Michigan at Ann Arbor, Wisconsin at Madison in the very top public institutions.

In terms of speech, I was in a pre-law curriculum and I found my interest in the law was very deep, very substantial, very great; but, I became interested peripherally in speech pathology, not speech as a rhetorical discipline but speech pathology. I worked in the pathology laboratory for about a year or two while I was continuing undergraduate work. During that period, I thought, perhaps, I would like to become a neurologist because of the neurological implications of speech pathology . . . then, a fierce battle about what we called the two-sided brain issue, that is, cerebral dominance. I found when I took an occasional course at medical school . . . This is an interjection of something which comes much later chronologically . . . as a graduate student at the University of Minnesota, I went to the medical school to listen to lectures given by Dean [Richard] Scammon.

CAC: Oh, heavens.

EZ: Dean Scavin was a fascinating man and I went simply because he related the liberal arts to medicine. He would make references every lecture to art, and music, and what Beethoven had done, and what Brahms had done, which related to medicine. These things were fascinating to me. But I've jumped way ahead of anything you had in mind when you raised the question. I, then, found that I came under the tutelage of a giant in the field of rhetorical and theoretical speech communication. His name was Andrew Thomas Weaver. His son [John], eventually, became a geographer . . .

CAC: Of course.

EZ: . . . and a geographer here at the University of Minnesota, he became president of the University of Missouri, research vice-president at the University of Iowa and, eventually, president of the University of Wisconsin. By the way, he just called me the other day when Peter Magrath, our current president, accepted the job at Missouri and he said, "Here are some things you might share with Peter about both problems and potentials.

CAC: [laughter] Wonderful.

EZ: Dr. Weaver was probably the first significant figure in the field to really have a thrust toward pure research, applied research, too, but pure research. He was not so much interested in rhetorical theory because it had applications to our contemporary community. Dr. Weaver impressed me with the necessity for very real scholarship, not the traditional old rhetorician of the schools of oratory; although he was a classicist . . . he was a classical scholar. It was through him that I first learned and learned to love the rhetoric of Quintilian, for example, and others in that classic period. So, I switched my major. Actually, I took a double major, one in history and one in speech. Then, as a graduate student, I did serve as an assistant in the Department of History to a person whom you may remember who had the improbable name, but the marvelous name, of Carl Russell Fish.

CAC: One of the great giants of that early generation, a transition figure.

EZ: I think, we, as undergraduates, recognized that we were with a giant when we were in his classes.

CAC: He was the person that there would be cheers for in the opening and closing of his lectures, right?

EZ: One of the marvelous things, Clarke, is that there were, maybe, 200 of us in one of his lecture sections . . . I remember so well that about once a week, or possibly two or three times a month, he would come in wearing a red, a flaming red necktie . . .

CAC: The Wisconsin red?

EZ: That's right. The lecture section would rise as one and say, "Sss, boom, ah, necktie!"

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: He would smile and, then, go on. It was a marvelous experience to be an assistant to Carl Russell Fish. My first historical interests were in Ancient History and I had some work with Rustof Zeth, who was, then, a visiting temporary professor and there was a man, about whom you probably know much more than I, named Vasilieth. Vasilieth, I found a delightful person, in part, because the typical undergraduate attitude about Vasilieth was that he was an old, ancient kind of professorial type who had no idea what was going on in the world and who really lived for only ancient things. I discovered, by going out for coffee with him in the morning, that he not only knew about what was going in the world, he knew what was going on on campus. He knew what the undergraduates felt.

This does lead me to an impulse to recall some things which I'd forgotten until you mentioned [unclear] Wisconsin background. I had a professor who shall remain nameless—I think that probably would be wise—who was chair at that time of the Department of Physics; and I took an undergraduate course in physics, which I didn't enjoy very much. Professor "Blank" was in his retirement year and, as all of us who suffer from geriatric problems, he would occasionally do exactly what I'm doing, wander about quite a good deal. One day, he said, "Young ladies and gentlemen"—of course, we weren't young ladies and gentlemen, we were savages but he pretended to be unaware of that . . . talking about heat conductivity—"I think I can safely say . . . yes, I'm sure I can safely say that my wife has the coldest feet of any woman I ever slept with."

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: To illustrate our being savages instead of young ladies and gentlemen, the roof literally came off the auditorium and the poor man was unable to go on with his lecture. Those are anecdotal and insignificant.

CAC: It was significant that you worked with two of the great departments in Wisconsin at that time. Wisconsin had always had one of the greatest history departments in the whole country and in the 1930s, it was very strong . . . again, in the 1950s and 1960s.

EZ: It was very strong and I enjoyed history very much.

CAC: I know when you're reviewing, you frequently have picked up, the last ten, fifteen years, a lot of things in history to review.

EZ: That's true and as an assistant in history, I think, maybe I learned as much as I did in my classes in history but I was able to combine the history of classical rhetoric with the history of ancient Greece and of Roman history, as well, of course.

CAC: That's an interesting combination because Harold Deutch's first love was always ancient history and, then, the two of you end up being commentators on the world scene [unclear].

EZ: I didn't realize that that was true.

CAC: Oh, Harold was a closet ancient historian, yes.

EZ: I do know that Harold, more in one circumstance than any other which I recall, did make references to ancient history. We did a series, of which you may never have heard, called Tapes for Teaching. Harold and I were the people who did . . .

CAC: This would have been in the later 1940s and the 1950s?

EZ: Probably in the late 1950s.

CAC: Okay.

EZ: These tapes ran one-half hour, forty-five minutes; we had up to fifty minutes twice a week. We put our comments on tape and, then, an agency shipped them to junior colleges, to some senior colleges, to some universities, but relatively few went to universities because, as you know as well as I, universities have a kind of proprietary pride.

CAC: Oh, you bet.

EZ: We discovered that in many ways. As dean of the College of Liberal Arts, I was very much interested in the development of some kind of inter-institutional programming as our budgets contracted, it seemed to me that we in Psychology, for example, could furnish to people at the University of, let's take, Michigan, as an illustration, some superb people. Back in the days of B.F. Skinner, who was one of my advisers, we could furnish something that probably no other institution could; but Michigan would not accept it, Wisconsin wouldn't accept it, Illinois

wouldn't accept it. We have our own departments of psychology and we're bloody good. We will not have you outlanders coming in. Well, it wasn't an effort to impose any of the Minnesota tradition on anyone else . . . not at all. It was simply an effort to give some distinguished instruction through new methodology which would make it possible for us, then, in the various individual institutions to use funds which were saved to be channeled into other areas.

CAC: Were there others than Harold and you in this from Minnesota?

EZ: There were others who were enormously interested and, then—again, I'm making chronological leaps— . . .

CAC: That's all right. Whoever listens to this, that's their problem.

EZ: [laughter] I'm delighted. After I began spending winters in Honolulu and working at the East-West Center in the University of Hawaii, I became very much aware and, indeed, part of a new program which used satellite communication for scientific and educational purposes. I, then, developed a series of tentative programs which involved inter-institutional cooperation. Fortunately, Frederick Jackson, who was the chair of the CIC, the Committee for Institutional Cooperation, with headquarters in Chicago—the Big Ten universities and the University of Chicago are all members—became enormously interested in what we could do. Frederick and I spent some time in New York, perhaps, three, four, five weeks, getting people in commercial, as well as non-commercial, satellite communication areas interested. RCA—as a CBS person, I hate to mention RCA—had a vice-president who was not only very bright and very able but who had a broad perception of the academic spectrum; and he thought this was a superb idea. He offered us—I've forgotten the precise amount and I would have to get Fred Jackson to confirm this—millions of dollars of satellite time if we could persuade the Big Ten universities to start a nucleus of satellite communication. I insisted that it not be done without two-way satellite communication so that a student at Illinois listening to and watching a lecture at Minnesota could simply push a button and ask a question. That seemed sensible to the chap at RCA and he included it in our proposal. That proposal was accepted by the parent corporation and the support we were offered was enormous; but, I hate to say that it was the academic departments which refused to accept it. Now, there was some acceptance. We did put some psychology lectures on tape. We did teach a course at Michigan by tape, video tape recording. We taught some—I've forgotten how many—at Illinois. Then later, this branched out from the great research universities and graduate universities to some small private liberal arts colleges, of which one was Macalester in St. Paul, an excellent small college in my judgment; but, I'm not entirely objective about that since for twenty years I acted as a consultant . . .

CAC: Then, as a trustee?

EZ: . . . and for another almost twenty years as a trustee.

CAC: I want to come back to Macalester later. What you're reflecting in these comments is a very deep sense of guild that exists in the academic world and is here being displayed.

EZ: Indeed!

CAC: It's an ancient anxiety of all crafts persons.

EZ: Of course. Of course. And the academic who might not particularly like to be called a craft person really is, whether he or she admits it or not.

CAC: Oh, I think to have a perception of being a member of guild is a fine thing!

EZ: Ah.

CAC: The radio, I want to come back to, too. But let's swing back to Wisconsin and, then, go on from there. You have a reputation of having been quite an athlete at Wisconsin. You were a pole vaulter?

EZ: How do you know that?

CAC: I know that boxing was a more up front kind . . . right? Were you active in these things? Rifle champion?

EZ: Yes, I was. I was National Intercollegiate Rifle Champion, which I had almost forgotten and pole vaulting, I had almost forgotten. I wasn't much of an athlete in any sense. I didn't ever make the intercollegiate pole vaulting team but I did do a lot of vaulting and I probably jarred my back a bit. Boxing was another matter. Are you interested in how that happened?

CAC: I am because, you see, part of the legend is that you were such a fine dean because you were nimble and quick as a boxer must be.

EZ: [laughter]

CAC: Not a prize fighter but a boxer . . . they're different.

EZ: There was a great golden gloves fighter at the University of Wisconsin who became National Lightweight Champion whose name was Tony Cararri. Tony Cararri, eventually, became dean of the medical school at Wisconsin and died only a couple of years ago. He was a controversial dean but a fine man and a superb boxer. Tony was a fraternity brother and I asked him to teach me to box. One night after dinner, we went down in the dining room and we moved the tables out of the dining room; and he said, "Look, "Easy," I will draw a circle, and I will walk out of that circle, and I wont hit you. You put on these gloves and hit me anywhere you can, high, low, in the head, in the groin, wherever you can hit me. All I will do will be to

protect myself." Of course, I couldn't hit him because he was so enormously sophisticated about boxing. We used very heavy gloves at that time; so, there was no substantial physical danger. I don't approve much of the current kind of professional boxing but I was interested and after we finished, he said, "'Easy,' are you sure you've never boxed?" I said, "No, except as a child, maybe, on the street." He said, "With your quickness, with your speed of reaction, I could make you a champion in no time." So, Tony taught me something about boxing. Then, I became a member of the boxing team. I was very light. I wasn't very strong. I had thin wrists, as you can see.

CAC: Thin and quick.

EZ: But very quick. I couldn't hit anybody very hard but nobody could ever hit me.

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: So, I came out fairly unscathed and with something of a national record . . . nothing that I really would have thought about at all had he not mentioned it. I don't know how you do your research but, in any case, you, obviously, know things which I would have had no idea . . .

CAC: Historians know that legends often have objective evidence behind them

EZ: [laughter] If there is objective evidence, it is that I wasn't much of an athlete.

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: I didn't play football—I'm sorry about that because I am a football fan. I did play baseball but I'm not a baseball fan. I'm delighted that the Twins, in this year when this recording is being done, are doing very well except with Toronto. I did begin to play golf, actually, when I was in prep school.

CAC: Of course, that's a hobby for a long time.

EZ: Yes, indeed. I stopped playing golf only about a year ago after my second open heart surgery; so, that has been a lifelong hobby. While never playing brilliantly, I did play down to a 5 to 7 handicap, which is pretty respectable. Many people now in the group who recently retired who play frequently at the University Golf Course, have handicaps of 25. One has a handicap of 32 . . . someone you know very well and for whom I assume you have a certain amount of respect for things other than his golf. The rumor that I may have been an athlete is about 99.99 percent nonsense.

CAC: But as a boxer, we've established that. This was the Depression. Were you working while you were student at Wisconsin? You say you had an appointment as a TA [teaching assistant] in history and so forth.

EZ: Yes. I did do some work under the acronym—it almost escapes me—NYA.

CAC: I'm glad you said that because I've talked to three or four people who got their start with the National Youth Administration in the 1930s. They never would have gone to school if it hadn't been for that. Keith McFarland is one of them, for example

EZ: Oh, really?

CAC: Yes.

EZ: That was not the case with me but it was very, very helpful. The NYA, I think, was begun in my senior year; so, until that time . . .

CAC: It starts in 1935.

EZ: Yes . . . I did have one other work experience which was very informative and helpful. I waited on table at my fraternity house and that means that I not only waited on table but I washed dishes. I did that for one year. I, then, became what was called the steward of the fraternity house, which meant that I kept all the books and records and, probably, was responsible for making much of the bathtub gin and did irreverent things along with the reverent ones. There was a little work history, not the kind of work history which some people have. I talked with Ross Smith the other day and he said he couldn't have—he went to the University of Iowa, I think, as an undergraduate and came here as a graduate student before he became director of Concerts and Lectures—possibly gone to the University of Iowa without a dishwashing job in the Union.

CAC: There are lots of these stories, of course. Tom Jones would be another. You get your MA in 1936 from Wisconsin and, then, came to Minnesota?

EZ: That's correct. There was a year between my coming to Minnesota and my completing work at Wisconsin when I taught history in a senior high school in Wisconsin. I didn't much like it. I liked teaching history but I didn't much enjoy pouring golden pearls into empty minds and having leaden clichés [unclear]. I decided when a temporary appointment here to grab it. It was only a one-year appointment. A senior professor was on sabbatical leave and I was given an instructorship. Toward the end of that year, in addition to my teaching and, presumably, research functions—I was beginning work on a Ph.D. at that time—I became the head of the news department at what then was called WLD [unclear] radio and what now is known as KUOM. So, I began doing news casts.

CAC: This was in 1937?

EZ: About that, 1937 or 1938. Because of my preoccupation with using current methodology not previously tried for educational and scientific purposes, I founded and directed something

called the Minnesota School of the Air. We went into high schools and a few elementary schools all over the state each day of the week . . .

CAC: This was through the university radio?

EZ: Through university radio. We did this as a non-commercial, purely educational venture. I can't remember all of the programs. *Art for You* was one of the titles. *Current Events* was another. We had a miscellaneous hodgepodge of garage sale stuff.

CAC: With regional circulation here in the Upper Midwest?

EZ: That's right. Then, it was picked up by what was preceding the development of National Public Radio, a kind of regional network. They picked up the School of the Air Programs. I had done some of this at the University of Wisconsin, too.

CAC: Mr. [Frank M.] Rarig was head or chairman of the Department of Speech and Theatre Arts when you came here and they were one department then?

EZ: That's correct.

CAC: And for a long time. We'll maybe look at their separation later. Rarig is another legendary figure at the University of Minnesota.

EZ: Indeed, he was. Dean [T. R.] McConnell who is no longer with us but was dean when I came to the university . . . more accurately Dean [John Black] Johnston, who preceded McConnell was dean when I came but McConnell very quickly became dean. When McConnell talked with me about the possibility of my coming, he said, "Young man, you will be working with one of the genuine towering figures in the field, if you work with Mr. Rarig." Mr. Rarig was a rare and marvelous person who, when I came into his office to talk with him about the possibility of my coming, looked me up and down and said, "Well, all I can say is that you look a lot better than your picture."

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: I'm not quite sure now how to interpret that. Mr. Rarig was a joy to work with. He was frightening to what he referred to as the "hollow men and women." He wanted to work only with students whom he felt had some substance. I must say that when he retired and I became chair of that department, people would say, "I understand you're succeeding Mr. Rarig." Nobody could succeed Mr. Rarig. He did not publish . . . I'm sad that he didn't publish . . .
[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

EZ: . . . because he had so many wise things about which to publish nor did he really do research in the way we view research contemporaneously; but he did publish wisely, and deeply, and dramatically, and coruscatingly on the minds of students. For that, Rarig Center is named in his honor, as you know so well and as most people who will listen to this tape would probably know. I chaired the dedication ceremony and it was an enormously difficult task because I tried so hard to choose those contributions he made which were unique to him and I discovered that there were so many that it was just impossible to incorporate them all into a single ceremony.

CAC: He was a magnet figure in building a department, which is another ingredient of greatness.

EZ: Indeed. The Department of Speech, Speech Pathology, and Theatre Arts had been part of the Department of English when Mr. Rarig came.

CAC: I see.

EZ: It was Mr. Rarig who broke away from English not in the spirit of revolt but in the spirit of recognition of the need for focus in these areas. When I took over as chair, what I inherited was a triple department, Pathology, Theatre Arts, as well as Speech in the rhetorical, and research, and psychological sense. By the way, there was no Ph.D. program in Speech at that time.

CAC: Heavens.

EZ: I began mine in History and Psychology and two of our senior professors had taken their Ph.D.s in Psychology. Their names were Franklin Knorr and Howard Gilkinson. Howard Gilkinson said to me one day at the Campus Club when someone sat down and was damning people for insisting upon research, "Otto, people who teach and who are good teachers but who do not do research or scholarly work are quite likely sometimes to be very good teachers of things that aren't true." I kept that in mind as I pushed for, if not actively participating in research and publication, at least at a minimum being aware of what research was being done, being aware and conscious of all the developments that related to research, whether pure or applied and in that field, there were both. My own interests were a little more in what we laughingly call *pure* research than applied; but, I had interests in both. I had interest in applied phonetics but with a motivation which I think was somewhat similar to Mr. Rarig's when he led the department in its breaking away from English. I suggested to then Dean McConnell that a committee be establish to consider the possibility of making the department into really three cooperating divisions of a department or possibly even three separate departments. Later on, after I had become dean, that was done so that there is now a Department of Speech, a Department of Speech Pathology . . .

CAC: Communications Disorders.

EZ: . . . Speech and Hearing, and a University Theatre Department, which, by the way, is a very distinguished one and a very solid one. The theater people took over, somewhat to my eventual disappointment from a safe distance, the interpretation of literature, which I felt to be something of a loss . . . just as later as a dean, I felt that Mathematics going to IT [Institute of Technology] was a loss and a whale of a loss—but that's a different matter. I think as chair of the Department of Speech, perhaps, the single thing of which I could have the greatest feeling of satisfaction is that I brought Don Smith to the University of Minnesota.

CAC: And from Wisconsin?

EZ: From Wisconsin. Don said later when he was here for a Christmas party or something of that kind, "My god! I was naive. You didn't even offer me tenure!" [laughter] It was a wise thing and Don's contributions to this institution are simply incomparable.

CAC: I think we'll pick up on that later, too. Certainly to build a department, to build a staff is a contribution of crucial significance with Rarig or with anyone else in the university community.

EZ: I think Mr. Rarig had a sense of the propriety of moving in modern directions but moving with great caution and with what tends now to be called prudence; although, it's not a term used very often in academic life. But Mr. Rarig, or Gilkinson or Franklin Knorr . . . Franklin Knorr was a pioneer in pure research. I would come into my office on Saturdays—no classes were taught on Saturdays—to do some work and no matter what time I got there . . . if I came at seven o'clock in the morning, Franklin Knorr had been there pounding his typewriter, doing his statistical tables, and working on his latest research program and he would still be there Saturday night. His wife hated it as mine later hated my own habits which were somewhat similar, although not as dedicated as Franklin's. We had a good staff: Melba Hurd, Wendell Johnson, Spencer Baum in Speech Pathology, and, of course, Bryng Bryngelson in Speech Pathology. Bryng Bryngelson was without doubt a clinical genius although a little too devoted, perhaps, to his interpretation of the theory of cerebral dominance. He actually, one time—this is anecdotal and not terribly significant except as it illustrates a person's behavior—built a left-handed monkey wrench because he was so persuaded that young people, children, who should be left-handed were forced into right-sided activities and into right-handedness and that this created a cerebral conflict which resulted in stuttering. But, he was a superb clinician and a fine human being. [unclear] on the theater side was a person of real distinction followed by Frank Whiting who has still been coming back to be kept into the Showboat who though, perhaps, was more enthusiastic about theater scholarship and classical theater than Frank. Each of them wrote fairly widely, published fairly basic things. Chuck Nolte, for example, currently is a significant figure whom I saw just before he came back to the university. I was walking down 42nd Street in New York, and saw a familiar figure coming toward me, and it was Chuck Nolte. We greeted each other and I said, "Chuck, I saw your *Billy Budd* last night." He said, "Oh, I'm so glad. When you see my father, please, tell him how good I was." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: His father was Dean [Julius] Nolte of the General Extension Division.

CAC: You got into radio very early . . . here. It was not only WLB but, then, you became director of the northwest area for CBS in the 1940s?

EZ: That's correct. While I was still at the university with a double kind of a responsibility, I became an international news analyst for CBS regionally and, then, became public service director for the Central Division which officed in Chicago.

CAC: This is still CBS?

EZ: It's still CBS. I almost commuted, not quite, but I would go to my office in Chicago every weekend . . .

CAC: This would have been what years that you were doing that?

EZ: Probably the mid 1940s.

CAC: This is in the war years . . . right after the war?

EZ: This was starting in the war years and, then, for three or four years after the war. At that time, at the end of the war, I did leave the university, except that I gave a lecture everyday the first thing in the morning before going to my office downtown. I became production manager and what was euphemistically called, without much real responsibility, educational director of WCCO radio.

CAC: You sustained a regular commentary program in those years?

EZ: That's correct . . . and starting three nights a week, following Cedric Adams and preceding Halsey Hall, so that my wife in a wifely way when the ratings would come out and my ratings would be enormously high would say, "What do you expect coming after Cedric Adams and before Halsey Hall?" She was right. I'm sure that the ratings would have been less dramatic . . .

CAC: Now, was Harold Deutch on the same spot or a series on other nights? What was that relationship?

EZ: I had Monday, Wednesday, and Friday night following Cedric Adams and he had Tuesday, Thursday, and, I guess maybe, Saturday.

CAC: It was the same spot on alternate [unclear]?

EZ: The same spot. Lennox Mills, for a time . . . I think he had preceded Harold Deutch.

CAC: As an undergraduate at Carleton—this can be a conversation for a minute—we used to catch that at 10:15 when I was there as an undergraduate and it would be Harold and you. Those are the voices that I remember commenting on world affairs when they were pretty close to an undergraduate student because that war was coming . . .

EZ: Oh!

CAC: . . . and came.

EZ: Yes, and came, of course. I'm delighted that you did as an undergraduate listen.

CAC: It was not just myself . . . it would be the whole wing so that the outreach of that program was very significant. We looked forward to it as, you see, more substantive than Cedric Adams who was a towering, great figure in his own but we wanted the real news and analysis.

EZ: I think all of us, Lennox Mills, John Raleigh, Harold Deutch, "Easy," worked enormously hard. I would come home from the university at about 5:30, gulp a quick dinner—without having a martini before dinner—finish quickly, scoot to the newsroom, and write until 10:15.

CAC: You had to write your own script, obviously, in those days.

EZ: Oh, yes. Then, later on, when channel 4 began telecasting, I had a rather interesting and dramatic kind of schedule. I would be at the university all day. I would be writing my script for 10:15 radio from about 7:00 to 10:00; and then, I would have a taxi cab waiting for me downstairs with the door open and the make-up spread out on the seat . . .

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: . . . and a page boy holding the door, and dash down, be whisked across town to the television studios and, then, go on ad lib. I, retrospectively, think the radio broadcasts—I recognize that this is a parochial view—were very solid and very sound and did make some contributions. I think the television programs did, too, but management at that time had an idea that the programs should be closed with—that meant taking almost a quarter of the program time—a prediction of what the headlines tomorrow internationally would be. I rebelled against that. I did it for a time but I thought it was phony and bad. Then, on the television side, I moved over to KTCA and to the National Educational Network and, then later, to PBS. There, the thrust for a sizable audience was considerably less strong. I could video tape one night and, then, video tape the next night if I felt that there was enough news to justify it. That, I think, was a more significant contribution.

CAC: You had won the Peabody Award in radio twice. Once, in 1951—we'll get to the second one later—which was for this combination or for some single sequence of programming?

EZ: The Peabody, I must say, is a very significant kind of award. It's national and it's often compared with the Pulitzer Prize.

CAC: Of course.

EZ: The first one I got for—it's a euphemistic kind of title and, maybe, meaningless but I'll explain it in a moment—significant contributions in intercultural relations and with an international news analysis attached to that. We did a series called *Neither Free nor Equal*. The publication called *The Nation* had characterized Minneapolis as the capital of anti-Semitism in the western world.

CAC: I remember that was a series by Carey McWilliams.

EZ: That's right. We did a series called *Neither Free nor Equal* which was a very powerful series on which, by the way, Hubert Humphrey appeared as a guest. I felt that that really was important to the community.

CAC: This was an exploration of *The Nation's* charges or the refutation of them?

EZ: No, it wasn't a refutation. It really was an illustration of some of the ways in which we still held provincial racial attitudes.

CAC: Regarding the Jewish community and other communities as well?

EZ: The Jewish community, the Blacks, and even the Asiatics, who were beginning to appear in greater number. We would point out some things. We had a dramatic tape . . . I guess I still have it somewhere, at least I think I have. A very distinguished obstetrician was asked to assist at the birth of a Black child, and refused to do it, and refused publicly; and we had that on tape. We used the most, to me, astonishing—even then, and more astonishing retrospectively—examples that we simply as residents of this area knew about and could document; and we documented them very carefully. We had the cooperation of Sam Shiner who was director of the Organization for Christians and Jews, and the head of the Urban League who helped us with documentation on prejudice against Blacks, and with the Asian American societies on the Asian side. It was really a very hard hitting documentary series; so, it was for that as well as the international news analysis that the first Peabody Award was . . .

CAC: You say you have one of these tapes. Are they saved anywhere, in any archive?

EZ: I had given a number of them to the university archivist. What they are, I don't really know. This is also anecdotal. One of our very distinguished economist is named Francis Boddy.

Frank Boddy and I were on a mission to the Soviet Union some years ago. We were way out in Siberia and the hotel had inadequate space and we were assigned a common room. I went to bed a little before Frank did but in about ten minutes—I say this not without Frank’s permission for reasons which I’ll mention to you . . . I really shouldn’t interrupt this tape with this kind of nonsense—he snored so loudly that he, literally, shook the walls of the building. I got no sleep at all. The next night I took a sleeping pill and got into bed an hour before he came back from an assignment but, nothing doing, he shook the walls again and I’m something . . .

CAC: You’re a light sleeper?

EZ: . . . of an insomniac as well. So, the next night I thought, I will get mine. I held a tape recorder over his face and he made all these snoring noises and, then, the next day, I edited that and asked questions. “Now, ladies and gentlemen, here is Francis Boddy deep in the heart of the Soviet Union, a distinguished American economist. Dr. Boddy, what do you think of the Russian economy and the five-year plan? [sounds of snoring] The very last question, I remember so well, was, “Dr. Boddy, what do you think of the Soviet women?” [sounds of snoring]

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: I played that record for President [James Lewis] Morrill who had such a great sense of dignity. He was here for dinner one night and in this very room, I played that record and Dr. Morrill simply collapsed in laughter with the tears running down his cheeks; so, presidents can be human, too. That, I recognize as tangential and I shouldn’t interrupt by giving those little anecdotal things.

CAC: You wouldn’t be surprised how many people know that story and tell it.

EZ: Oh, really?

CAC: Oh, yes. Everyone who was on those Hill trips knows the story, of course . . . that would have been the 1958 trip. I’m going to come back to the 1958 trip, too. All through your career, you kept in with radio and TV?

EZ: That’s true.

CAC: When you were a dean, when you were dean of the Summer School . . . I mean, the whole thing; so, you never lost that connection with the real world, so to speak?

EZ: It is a little different and people on campus do occasionally say—someone who comes to join the faculty or who came when I was dean and whom I might have been instrumental in helping bring—“You seem a little different. You don’t seem quite like all your colleagues. You dress a little differently.” If any of my colleagues were ever to hear this tape or if I were to do

this as a broadcast, I would say, "I hope you remember that I live in two separate worlds." I thought when I left CBS and came back to the university that a great research university and graduate school was the only environment in which one could live a rich, and rewarding, and aesthetically satisfying, and intellectually stimulating life. I was wrong. I was wrong. I think my association with Edward R. Murrow, who was my boss, my chief for four years, and with people such as Eric Sevareid who was very well-known in this area, and with others . . . Bob Trout was one. These were enormously stimulating experiences and continuously intellectually stimulating.

CAC: You name the cream of the crop, certainly. You didn't know Eric, by any chance, when he was an undergraduate and you would have been an instructor here?

EZ: No, no, no. I did not know him until I had been working with CBS for three or four years, at least. Then, at least one of our overseas assignments coincided, and I would see him often in Washington, and grew to admire him very much. I think he was not a great radio performer but he was a great person in terms of substance. Recently, when George Burns did the movie *Oh, God!*, someone said, "George Burns doesn't look like God. God looks like Eric Sevareid!" [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] You kept on with it. I'm sure you've told this story many places, but one more time won't hurt, of your open heart surgery in 1970 or 1971?

EZ: I think it must have been 1970.

CAC: The broadcast was done and the award was made in 1971. What inspired you to think of doing that piece on open heart surgery for radio?

EZ: I can tell you precisely and I don't believe I've ever been asked that question. They have talked about it a lot because it had such international circulation.

CAC: Yes, indeed.

EZ: I think my motivation—I think it was . . . no, it might not have been . . . it might have been tempered by many other bits and pieces of input . . . That open heart surgery was one of the very early ones.

CAC: That's thirteen years ago and it was pioneering. What surgeon did it . . . what team?

EZ: Dick Vargo was chief surgeon of the team, and the Yang Wang scrubbed, and Dimitri Nicoloff, who did my second open heart surgery, scrubbed, as did a wide variety of other surgeons. After it was over and I was recovering, I would be asked by people, "How does it feel to have your heart stopped for sixty minutes and be on that machine? Were you legally dead? What happens? What goes on? What does catheterization mean?" I thought, Let's do a

broadcast and tell them. So, Ray Christensen and I simply sat in a studio, much as you and I are sitting here this morning, except that Ray didn't ask very many questions. Having been more garrulous than I am now—I guess I'm still reasonable garrulous if not articulate—I talked for about an hour. Jim Borman who was director of news for the local CBS area edited the tapes, got the surgeons to make comments about my comments, put it together as a single documentary; and it was the first one done on open heart surgery, especially . . . bypass surgery was just barely known at that time.

Mine was not bypass; mine was actually the removal of the mitral valve from the heart and the replacement with a steel alloy valve, which had two disadvantages—also tangential, sorry. One of them is that it was emplaced in a nylon sack and after seven or eight years that nylon bag began to shuck off emboli and one embolus lodged in my right eye and I became blind in my right eye. The other disadvantage was a more humorous one. It was noisy. Dr. [Howard] Burchell, then and still, a very noted cardiologist, formerly head of cardiology at Mayo in Rochester, then, became head of cardiology at the University of Minnesota Medical School, said, "Easy, I've forgotten. It seems to me you mentioned one night long before this surgery that you occasionally played poker." I said, "Yes, Dr. Burchell, " with a big smile, "I do." He said, "Your tense is wrong. You did because if you played serious poker now, and the room were quiet, and you got a good hand, they would hear that steel ball rattling in that cage, and they would know that you had good hand."

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: So, I played very little poker since—not for that reason but for other reasons.

CAC: You've raised this game of poker. Mr. Deutch, as you wouldn't be surprised, commented very quickly in his own interview . . . There was a rather distinguished group of university people and community people in that floating poker game.

EZ: Yes, indeed, Sander Genis, who was international vice-president of the Lady Garment Workers Union, Dr. Herman Garmers . . .

CAC: It was gown and town?

EZ: It was gown and town and a decent group but very tough around the card table.

CAC: Was Hal Chase part of that group?

EZ: Hal Chase was part of it.

CAC: What other people from the university?

EZ: Anwar Chejne.

CAC: Oh, I didn't know that.

EZ: He was not a very good poker player but an enthusiastic one, erratic in his play. Harold Deutch was one of the two best poker players I've ever known. I just really felt in a game with Harold that I was, at best third or. . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: . . . his earnings during the war [unclear].

EZ: It's something more than legend.

CAC: I see. I like to get independent witnesses to the same fact; then, we can nail it down.

EZ: He certainly did get the bulk of what he needed to make, at least, his down payment on that place, which has turned out to be a magnificent resource. Other university people, I guess, were, primarily, in the Medical School.

CAC: So, you didn't talk business, didn't talk shop on these occasions?

EZ: We tended to talk [unclear] rather than shop.

CAC: [laughter] You see, there were some young people in History who thought maybe Mr. Deutch was doing well in the Arts College because he played such good poker with you and you were dean.

EZ: [laughter]

CAC: No suggestion of corruption . . . just a little friendship there.

EZ: Harold Deutch did well in the College of Liberal Arts because he was Harold Deutch and one of the most magnificent people we had on campus.

CAC: For this open heart surgery tape, you got the second Peabody for that?

EZ: Yes.

CAC: I gather also from the American Heart Association as a public relations . . . ?

EZ: The [Howard W.] Blakeslee Award which is very national, a top award, which carries a small cash award. I think it's \$1,000 . . . maybe, it was \$2,000, I've forgotten. We simply

signed that over to the Minnesota Heart Association immediately. It was very kind of them to recognize . . .

CAC: I think it was really a breakthrough in making palatable to a large public that this was done and it was a reasonable kind of surgical procedure.

EZ: I hope it never encouraged anyone who shouldn't have had the surgery to try it but I hope it did encourage some people to understand that it could be done.

CAC: And subsequently, of course, it has come to be more routine.

EZ: Yes, of course, especially the bypass. Ad[amson] Hoebel's recent surgery was valvular and Tommy Thompson's was valvular as well as bypass.

CAC: While we're on the community—these tapes are never perfectly chronological and that's not the best logic in the world anyhow—you had this community outreach through radio, later through television, through your work with WCCO, and your work also with Macalester College. Why don't we comment about that briefly at this time?

EZ: Sure. I became consultant to the Board of Trustees of Macalester back in the fairly early days. A man named David Winton was appointed toward the end of the war first ambassador to New Zealand. He invited me and the president of the United States invited me to become the first consul in Wellington, New Zealand. We had some problems with the Japanese aircraft which didn't particularly want civilian aircraft to come into that area. David Winton was on the board of Macalester and he and then President [Charles] Turck, asked whether I would become consultant to the board and I said, "I would be delighted to," because Macalester seemed to me be a sound liberal arts college, perhaps, not as distinguished as the institution from which you graduated as an undergraduate but moving rather strongly in that direction. I was very much interested in increasing rapport and, indeed, in the building of academic programs chaired by the university and by private colleges. That seemed to me to provide a real opportunity; so, I became what was called consultant to the board, which meant that I met with the board each time and spoke for the board or as a member of the board but had no voting privileges, which, by the way, is my status now as an honorary trustee.

CAC: How nice.

EZ: That led to a trusteeship and I felt rather strongly not only that the small private liberal arts college has a place in states such as Minnesota but that they complemented not competed with the university. I still feel that very strongly. About a week ago, I read, in a national journal, a paper which was based on a talk I gave to . . . I don't know, Macalester students and, maybe, trustees . . . I've forgotten who was there but it was a fairly large audience. The title was the unimaginative one, "Why am I a Trustee of Macalester College?" I recalled in that manuscript a number of the things I felt important both to Macalester and to the university. The university

could be enormously helpful because with our Graduate School, our research library, we could give centrally joint or joint-ish appointments—of which I think you had one—which would attract people to Macalester who could not otherwise be attracted to an undergraduate institution with no available research library, no major scholarly library in the immediate area. We established a few joint appointments there, and at Hamline as well, and at a couple of other institutions and I think, on the whole, they worked pretty well. We had one economist old Macalester could not conceivably have attracted without this kind of relationship. We had others.

CAC: The gentleman who wrote columns, did he not . . . what was his name, the economist who was at Minnesota and Macalester and, then, he wrote a weekly column?

EZ: Oh, yes. I can't recall his name either, I'm sorry. I should have been able to come up with it immediately. Oh, Arthur Upgren.

CAC: Yes, indeed.

EZ: Arthur Upgren was one. There was another economist, more of a mathematical economist than Arthur was and we had some very fine . . . In fact, Mulford Sibley did some lectures at Macalester and was very popular. That kind of cooperation would have occurred without my being on the board but the previous kind might not.

CAC: Just for the record and the tape, I should say, you mentioned my connection . . . it was not a regular joint appointment but I did participate in the World Press Institute for seventeen years. That to me was such a rewarding experience to work in a seminar in American History for ten weeks every fall with these fourteen or fifteen journalists from all over the world. What a wonderful program that was.

EZ: Many of them brilliant . . . many of them incisive.

CAC: Oh, my. They still have the program.

EZ: They still have the program. I have been associated with it in a slightly different fashion for a long time but I don't know anything about the program currently.

CAC: It has a different calendar and, I think, unhappily, it doesn't have the outreach to the academic community beyond Macalester [unclear] entirely. Now, there are very able people at Macalester but I think to have the outsiders come in, not only from the university but elsewhere provided a kind [unclear] program.

EZ: Yes, indeed.

CAC: I think that better than that was what I gained from it and people who were able to work with these established journalists, age twenty-five to forty. I'll bet there aren't many persons at

the university who played that role at other institutions. Walter Heller was on the board of Oberlin, I believe. I think that's a very rare kind of connection, isn't it?

EZ: It probably is.

CAC: I hope to catch Walter when he comes back from the [unclear].

EZ: I hope you can. He would be a very rich resource. My community relationships, which really underline what we've just been talking about in your question, were so multiple that I hesitate to . . . I've been on the Board of Trustees of the public television enterprise for more years than you are old, probably, and have been on the board of the Hennepin County Respiratory Disease Association, have been on the board of, oh, let's just say, a half dozen or a dozen enterprises, most of them not commercial. There was only one major commercial board on which I actually served and that turned out to be less than scintillating. Yes, [unclear] . . . I hate to mention speeches. Everybody listens to more speeches than he or she ever wants to hear but during many of these years—that is no longer the case, I'm not doing speeches at the moment . . . I do an occasional broadcast but not a speech; I don't like what's happened to my voice as a result of heart surgery—I would, probably, average two, maybe, three speeches a week.

CAC: Heavens! This would have been for twenty-five years you were doing that as well as the radio?

EZ: I suppose, probably.

CAC: Some of that would be commencement work in the spring with high schools?

EZ: Some of that and some commencement speeches at other universities and, indeed, at our university . . . University of Wisconsin, Indiana University, Illinois, and so on, and on. I wasn't thinking of that so much as I was thinking of speeches in the community on international affairs. I would often be asked, "How can you remember all these details?" Well, it was perfectly easy because I was dealing with them everyday in my broadcast. After Harold Deutch retired, I graduated to doing seven nights a week instead of three.

CAC: Heavens.

EZ: I suspect that carrying that kind of schedule with too little time to have dinner with my family, for example, or too little time to read—I'm a voracious reader, as I'm sure you know . . .

CAC: Even with one eye, you read more than most people with two eyes.

EZ: Perhaps, so. My reading rate has diminished considerably. It was 1400 to 1600 words per minute and now it's down to about 6700, which is still as fast or a little faster than average. That

was not the result of a speed reading course or any such effort, I just happen to read rapidly. To groups such as the Committee on Foreign Policy, such as the United Nations Association, and that kind of thing . . . going out into small communities . . . I did something in that connection which is personally really rather risky and I advised my son on the telephone last night not to do it. He's going to Canada tomorrow to go fishing and he's going in a small private plane with a single pilot.

CAC: Oh, my.

EZ: When I was commuting to Chicago for CBS, the stewardess came by and said, "Fasten your seat belts for a landing at Truax Field." I said, "We don't land at Truax Field. This is a through flight." She said, "It will be explained to you." We landed at Truax Field, which is just outside Madison. It was a perfectly uneventful landing, perfectly smooth. The ambulance attendants came in and carried out the body of the pilot; he had died at the controls. All the years that I went out to small towns to speak for the university and, also, for CBS, I would take a university plane if it were a distance because I would like by midnight if I could because I had a very heavy day coming up; so, I would take aircraft with single pilots, not very enthusiastically but nothing ever happened.

CAC: You must have an awfully good nervous and chemical system to have carried that kind of a routine for so many, many years.

EZ: I'm not sure that I have.

CAC: Harold Deutch—again, to talk about him—used to get by on four or five hours of sleep a night.

EZ: Harold had a talent I did not have. Harold could be right in the middle of an interview . . . I was seated with him one day in Russia with a very high official, and we had a terrible time getting the interview set up, and Harold asked a question, and I looked over and his eyes were closed. I said afterward, "Harold, you must have offended that man." I stepped in quickly to ask questions. He said, "Oh, 'Easy,' I'm a little like Hubert Humphrey. I can do it and, in fact, I have to do it because I get so little sleep at night." In Czechoslovakia when the Russian tanks came in, I could hear Harold Deutch's—he had the room next to mine at the hotel—typewriter going till two o'clock in the morning and he was fresh in the morning; but he would catch these little naps.

CAC: Known as catnaps.

EZ: Hubert Humphrey . . . one day when I was chatting with him, I said, "How can you possibly stand the pace you are keeping?" He said, "'Easy,' I nap anywhere at anytime time. If I'm being driven across town from one speech to another speech, I will sit in the back seat and go to sleep. Maybe, it's only five minutes but it is a great help."

CAC: Different people have different rates of metabolism and you're describing a very good set for yourself.

EZ: Well, for people like Hubert Humphrey and Harold Deutch.

CAC: "Easy," after some years as chairman of the Department of Speech and Theatre Arts, 1948 to 1954, you were asked to be dean of the Summer School. You did that for eight or nine years, 1954 on to 1963. Then, at the end of that, you picked up Extension Division for a year or so as well. What attracted you to Summer School and how did you see that role?

EZ: Nothing much attracted me to Summer School. [laughter]

CAC: You did it for nine years.

EZ: That was a shoehorning situation. Dr. Morrill was president of the university at that time and he was a man for whom I had enormous regard and great respect. He urged me, and I remember vividly the time I finally . . . I told him I thought not. I thought that that was something that I really wouldn't care to do. We drove together to St. Paul where we were making a speech. We were being initiated into some kind of honorary fraternity together and he spoke persuasively all the way over. Then, we spoke, and were initiated, and he spoke persuasively all the way back. I said, "If you really think I ought to do it and if you feel that I can do well, I will accept; but I will accept for only a five-year term." He said, "Sold!" I took it with the understanding that it would be for five years only; but, I found it a very great challenge.

CAC: Mr. Morrill must have had some kind of agenda in mind . . . the Summer School would do something different or something more than it had previously?

EZ: He did and apparently he felt that he knew from my past experience that I would wish to change the direction. Summer session, by the way, I didn't ever call summer session, I always called it summer quarter. I called it summer quarter because I wanted to symbolize even by that kind of language that this could be a regularized quarter. Preceding that, it had been a kind of refurbishment for teachers, a kind of enterprise which emphasized workshops, and symposiums, and evening work, and late afternoon work for teachers who were themselves teaching summer sessions. I felt that the summer quarter had a more significant role to play; so, I began by doing some rather hard-boiled research. One of the papers, which is still available I'm sure in the library, was published by the Bureau of Institutional Research and my collaborators were John Stecklein and Mary Corcoran. We did a really exhaustive, 200 page analysis of, who constituted our clientele, what was the age, what were the interests, how many graduate students, how many undergraduates . . . all of this mass of material. The other thing I tried very hard to do was talk to then Dean [Theodore] Blegen of the Graduate School about urging more graduate studies during the summer period. Graduate students were around but they weren't taking courses and they were not doing significant work on dissertations that had been formalized enough so that

whatever credit structure existed could be handled during the summer also. A number of other papers were published at that time which emphasized that sort of difference. The population is different. There are still a disproportionate of teachers, which is fine . . . I am not denigrating them in any way. On the contrary, I admire those who come. But to design in the College of Education courses for teachers who are going to be here for five weeks seemed to me to be at least a questionable procedure if not, indeed, one that could be challenged. In doing our research, we, in a sense, challenged it. We found a number of things. I will not go into detail because this alleged interview is becoming far too long.

CAC: Oh, no.

EZ: We discovered that the summer quarter, or the fourth quarter as I preferred to call it, attracted more chronologically mature students, more students who had completed undergraduate work and, therefore, were eligible for graduate study if they were admissible to the Graduate School, more people who were adult in chronology and highly motivated either for professional or personal reasons. We tried very hard to make the summer quarter more attractive to the undergraduate student who was not there because he flunked something and needed an easier course during the summer to make it up. So, I think we tightened it very significantly and, again, while I can't pretend total objectivity because I was too much in the center of it, I feel that we did really rather well.

CAC: A large, very substantial, constituency was yours.

EZ: A very substantial increase in student numbers. The previous dean was not responsible for this and I don't mean to imply that in any measure; but, previously, one of the criteria for success of a summer quarter was the number of students you brought in and the number of dollars you brought in.

CAC: It was self-sustaining then?

EZ: Yes, of course. I would have none of it. There was another thing on the self-sustaining nature of the summer session, which, in my judgment, was sheer nonsense, was somebody administratively—I will not identify a person or even an office—had decided that there was to be a cap on summer salaries so that a full professor coming in for five weeks in the summer and doing a full course would not be paid as much as he would be paid for five weeks during the winter.

CAC: There were some faculty who were quite sensitive to that.

EZ: There certainly were, and they should have been, and I was sensitive along with them. The junior faculty was paid more during the summer . . . the senior faculty was paid less during the summer. We tried by steps to increase the salaries for senior faculty to meet what I felt to be my criteria of excellence. We simply needed the senior people and we needed them badly. We

got more, and more, and more of them, both senior people from our own institution and from other institutions. Those were directions in which we tried to go. We did rather high-powered symposia now and then. We did one on the Middle East, for example, in which Fred Lukermann, now dean of the College of Liberal Arts, participated, on problems of the Middle East. We published a book which—I had had a CBS assignment in the Middle East; I'd lived in Iran, and had been in Saudi Arabia, and other Middle Eastern nations—I found editing it fun. I had listened very carefully and I had taken notes but, when the papers were submitted to me, I found in, say, a dozen symposia—I don't know how many during our tenure, maybe we did twenty but in every case we required that papers be submitted and they be published—that no matter how carefully I'd listened, I learned something new from the paper when I read it.

CAC: There was cultural enrichment during the Summer School in those years as well, music, and arts, and so forth?

EZ: That's right. That program, I think, was reasonably successful. Our concerts with what is now the Minnesota Orchestra, then, was the Minneapolis Orchestra, were very well attended and in a kind of semi-bucolic atmosphere on the Mall, often at noon when . . .

CAC: You prayed the weather would be good.

EZ: Yes, yes. And God answered occasionally.

CAC: Yes. These kinds of initiatives . . . did President Morrill play a provoking role, a supportive role? Where did these initiatives come from? I mean, Jim must have also wanted you for some good reason.

EZ: That [unclear] is so interesting because when, after the first summer session—I don't really remember what month it was that I came into the office—I went to talk with President Morrill, he simply relaxed, and crossed his legs, and smoked a cigarette, and smiled. I said, "Dr. Morrill"—I tried to say much what you have just said—"you had some motivation for asking me to take this job besides the fact that you probably couldn't get anybody else to do it."

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: And he said, "I think the direction in which I perceive your movements are so much what I had in mind that I would very much prefer not to verbalize them lest somebody say, "This is what the president wants and the dean is doing it.'" I was doing it because of what I wanted, what I thought was wise and good, not because of what I thought the president wanted. He was supportive when there were controversies. I think the first one on which he was supportive was the one about the salary ceilings. I believe it probably was he who suggested—I may have suggested it; I know I did suggest it later—that we move step by step, which, indeed, we did.

We certainly moved in the right direction. We didn't move as rapidly as I would have liked but a monolithic enterprise is not terribly likely to be facile.

CAC: In the interviewing I've been doing and the reading I've been doing, it's very difficult to get President Morrill in focus and I think part of what you're saying here helps to explain that. I think he's much misunderstood as a leader of a large enterprise.

EZ: I think that is true.

CAC: He was here from 1945 to 1960 and those were pretty active years.

EZ: They certainly were active years.

CAC: There's a perception that Mr. Morrill removed himself [unclear] often did not engage in this but I suspect he was keeping pretty close track internally of what was going on.

EZ: He at least knew what was going on and externally what was going on, too. Whether he always pushed it in the direction he thought it ought to go, I really can't judge. In my case, I can make at least that kind of judgment. I must not let that pass without mentioning Malcolm Willey, who was then academic vice-president. Malcolm Willey was more actively a part. In fact, he was on my summer session committee for five years, perhaps . . . I've forgotten. He always had some kind of proposal to make, sometimes accepted by the committee, sometimes not, sometimes accepted by the dean, sometimes not. He was more imaginative than much of the faculty felt, much more creative. I remember the . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

EZ: . . . first symposium. He said, "'Easy,' last night you were talking about the Middle East. You have come from the Middle East within the last year or two. Why don't you do a symposium? Bring Walter Lipmann, bring [Philip K.] Hitti, bring F.R.C. Frahely, and people of that quality from Princeton, and Harvard, and Yale."

CAC: This required additional money then. It would have to come from his office?

EZ: No, actually, it came from the dean's office. We did establish some funds which we tried to make as flexible as we could. I suppose there were probably people on the faculty that felt that I overemphasized the desirable catholicity of the programs but I felt that they were important. I wanted, however, first to get permission from the Central Administration and the regents to use what funds were available to raise the salary of the most distinguished people on the faculty.

CAC: This took regential action?

EZ: It certainly required regential discussion.

CAC: I see.

EZ: I participated in many such discussions.

CAC: There were subcommittee in the regents you would meet with on an issue of that sort?

EZ: Yes, but also meet with a regent. Ray Quinlivan from St. Cloud was chair of the board at that time. He understood this immediately. Some other regents, who shall remain anonymous, did not. But then, one always finds with the regents, or the legislature, or the faculty, or the students differences of opinion and I think that's very helpful. And salaries required regential approval. Major policy changes required regential discussion and whether approval or not, it seems to me that that was a little uneven. Sometimes, there was formal approval and sometimes not.

CAC: You mentioned Mr. Willey as an initiating figure in this and in other affairs.

EZ: Yes.

CAC: There's also a perception that there were two very strong vice-presidents. Mr. [Bill] Middlebrook in, whatever it was called then, Finance and Physical Plant; and it is often said that Mr. Middlebrook was the senior and more powerful of the two in accomplishing things within the university community. You had opportunity to see both of them at work on matters of central importance.

EZ: I would tend to confirm that assumption. For example, Mr. Middlebrook, however, was adamantly opposed to—I don't mean just to emphasize that salary issue but it happens to be a convenient illustration—it. He said, "There ought to be a ceiling and this is not a place for faculty to come in because they can't feed their families on the salary they get during the year."

CAC: There was a good deal of moonlighting, that's right.

EZ: Of course. Malcolm Willey said, "We really ought to consider 'Easy's' repeated requests on this issue." And Malcolm Willey won but he won in a less obtrusive way. Bill Middlebrook would say, "No! Goddamn it!" [sound of pounding on the table] But if you said, "Goddamn it," back to him or "Yes, goddamn it," he would frequently retreat. You know my style well enough, certainly . . .

CAC: Listeners to this may not.

EZ: . . . to know that I didn't tend to pound the table . . .

CAC: Sure.

EZ: . . . or to scream or to shout but Middlebrook backed down several times when he saw reason, as, indeed, he did. I think one needn't always be discourteous and to lack civility in order to be firm. These may be retrospective rationalizations, I don't know.

CAC: Well, they often come very close to what the case was.

EZ: Is Malcolm's name on this committee?

CAC: Yes.

EZ: It is?

CAC: Yes. We're looking at a research pamphlet put out by summer quarter and it lists in the opening there your advisory committee. It's a rather distinguished list, including Gilbert Wren of Education, and Larry Steefel of History.

EZ: Malcolm Willey, it seemed to me, was always forceful enough, always a gentleman. It was Bill Middlebrook who came in carrying the big stick and flourishing it. Yet, you know, as well as anybody, that he had the foresight to do University Grove. It was really his baby, wasn't it?

CAC: I think so. "Easy" is saying this, I suspect, because Florence and I currently live in the house that Middlebrook built which was the first one in the Grove. He built it with a foundation that's about six foot wide. It's built like a fortress. I think he built the university in the same way. There was a kind of fiscal soundness that he had to insist on.

EZ: He did it without very much consultation.

CAC: Yes.

EZ: He certainly did the University Golf Course without very much consultation.

CAC: Oh, I didn't know that.

EZ: Is the tape running?

CAC: Yes.

EZ: Oh, I'm sorry. I was speaking at a very low level.

CAC: I'm sorry. Do you want me to erase it? [laughter]

EZ: No, no, not a bit. Maybe, when you edit it, you might edit out my goddamn for Bill Middlebrook.

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: Bill Middlebrook, Malcolm Willey, and the president pretty much ran the university in terms of its external relations and its broad direction.

CAC: Could I add a fourth one? Stan Wenberg in the 1950s certainly must have been playing a role there, too?

EZ: Yes, he did.

CAC: Perhaps, not at their level?

EZ: He played a very real role and Dr. Morrill rather sturdily defended Stan when Stan would get into a controversial matter. Stan was more creative, as was Malcolm Willey, than the faculty generally gave him credit for being.

CAC: I think that's true.

EZ: He was an able person. He was a good spokesman. He was pretty good with the legislature. Some of us were pretty good with the legislature, some of us were not. Here, Middlebrook played a very strong role. He would, if something in connection with the liberal arts or summer education in the liberal arts came up, try to answer but he would be quite likely say to a legislative committee, "This is not my field. I'm a financial officer. Let me bring in 'Easy' Ziebarth or Don Smith." So, we did a lot of that.

CAC: This was Don Smith when he was in the president's office?

EZ: That's correct.

CAC: Okay.

EZ: Although, I'm leaping ahead chronologically, that was particularly true in the [Malcolm] Moos Administration. Malcolm—whatever his virtues and he had a great many—did not do his homework very thoroughly and when tough . . .

CAC: This is Malcolm Moos not Malcolm Willey?

EZ: Malcolm Moos. Malcolm Willey on the contrary did his homework very carefully. Malcolm Moos made his points with me, at least, in other ways; but when he was under pressure at the legislature, he would have Don Smith, and "Easy," and Ted Blegen, when Ted was still around, right there. He would not say, "What are the data on that issue?" He would say, "Would you speak to that issue?" and so we would and we did.

CAC: Earlier when you were director of Summer School, the same thing was true? You were asked sometimes to testify and be there for the legislature?

EZ: Frequently but not regularly.

CAC: Sure.

EZ: Occasionally, Mr. Quinlivan would be at legislative hearings. He very rarely spoke before the legislature. That was something, oh, in the very early years . . . Joe Macy for the St. Paul campus and . . .

CAC: Mr. [Ray] Amberg for the hospitals was always . . .

EZ: . . . Harold Diehl for the Medical School and, later on, occasionally Athelstan Spilhaus for the Institute of Technology.

CAC: This was orchestrated through Wenberg's office by that time?

EZ: Pretty much. By the time Athel was involved, it tended to be orchestrated through Stan Wenberg's office.

CAC: The rest of you wouldn't testify on your own initiative?

EZ: No, no. No, but we might, in effect, if we knew that some specific issue in which we had a crucial interest was coming up. We might, in effect, speak at our own initiative because we would be there. Stan would be wise enough to know—we would think wise enough—that he ought to turn to whichever person was best qualified to respond.

CAC: After a number of years in the Summer School, then, you were asked to take on the Extension Division, too. That's an enormous empire, sprawling, and difficult, I should imagine, to understand. I never understood why they hoped to combine those two offices. They were separated right away again after you became dean of the Arts College. What was happening for that year and one half?

EZ: I can't even remember who was president at that time . . . it must have been Morrill. Was it?

CAC: I'm looking at the . . . No, it was [Meredith] Wilson. You took on the Extension Division in 1962, 1963.

EZ: Wilson had a feeling, a correct impulse, about that. It may not have been demonstrated but I guess I think everything Met Wilson tended to be pretty wise, and pretty shrewd, and awfully prudent. Dr. Wilson felt that maybe we should experiment for the first time in the history of the university with a double deanship because there were some comparable factors in General Extension being centrally self-supported and summer quarter being, essentially, also self-supported. I guess it would have worked but it was really—you used the word a *large empire*—an enormous enterprise and I think quite enough to keep busy any one administrator . . .

CAC: Oh, I should think so.

EZ: . . . without throwing in the complications of the summer session. That has nothing to do with the reason that I left the office after only, whatever it was, six months or a year. I left it for quite different reasons and I left it at the request of Meredith Wilson. I think the combination worked fairly well. I did bring in to the General Extension the beginnings, the kind of prelude, the variations on a theme of what I hoped would become academic excellence. There had been so much in General Extension done in the way of non-credit, alleged courses which were designed for the brighter dilettante rather than the serious student. That, I guess, was my first target. I did try very hard to persuade the General Extension committees and the administration that if General Extension were to be strong, and flourishing, and rich, and a genuine basic part of the institutional structure, we had to do more to bring in people of excellence and people of stature. For that, I had, of course, full and absolute support from Meredith Wilson as president. Meredith Wilson rarely did as Bill Middlebrook did and pound the table but he was very firm, he was very sure, he was very bright, he was very insightful, very knowledgeable. He would often carry a controversy by simply knowing more about it than anybody with whom there was controversy. He did that with great skill.

However, if I might leap ahead again—I certainly shouldn't do that so much—I do remember Met Wilson, after he left Minnesota and after the flames engulfed the sense of order during the 1960s, coming back to campus and coming into my office and saying, "'Easy,' I really don't think I could have done it through this time." To which my response was, "Oh, Met, you could . . ." I admired Meredith Wilson much as I admired Edward R. Murrow . . . the two people with whom I worked closely whom I admired most, I am convinced. I said, "You could do almost anything you set your mind to." He said, "That isn't really what I meant. What I meant is that my tolerance level for the kind of disorder would have been considerably lower than Malcolm Moos's, for example. I would have been more likely to retreat into some form of rigidity." I rather doubt that. I think that was just Met's way of being self-deprecating, perhaps, but I'm not sure about that.

CAC: That is an interesting commentary. I have taken the liberty from time to time and turned this into a conversation instead of an interview. I have a sense that Mac Moos was there for two

or three years when he was open to students in a way that would have been very difficult for Met to do.

EZ: I think that is perfectly true.

CAC: Met was very formal. I have the highest respect for Met Wilson and his presence as a human being but I really think that he would have a hard time in 1968, 1969, 1970.

EZ: I think he would.

CAC: Mac Moos was just open to those students for that time in a very rare way. This combined deanship didn't give you momentum toward the deanship of the Arts College; but there was a natural turnover in 1963 with [Errett W.] McDiarmid leaving. Could you comment on the circumstances, as you have for the Summer School and for the Extension Division, that led you to see this as an opportunity or your selection to do this?

EZ: I'm not sure I saw it as an opportunity which I welcomed but, in any event, again in this room, Malcolm Willey—it must have been in . . . I don't remember when Malcolm retired—
...

CAC: Well, [Gerry] Shepherd comes in in 1963; so, Willey is in his last year when you're coming in . . . that spring/summer of 1963

EZ: Okay, I thought that probably was true. On a Sunday morning, I had a telephone call from Malcolm Willey and he said, "Could I come over to see you?" I said, "Oh, of course, Malcolm." He said, "Are you planning to go to church?" I said, "No." He said, "I'd like to be there in about ten minutes." I said, "Fine, come." So, he came, and sat down, and talked about many things at the university, some things not at the university but most of them at the university. He said, "Have you ever thought that you would be willing to take a deanship of another kind?" I said, "Well, I'm not sure." I had just come back from California where I'd been offered a presidency, which I had turned down—not at the University of California.

CAC: You had not been an active candidate for the CLA deanship up to that time?

EZ: No, indeed not. I hadn't even thought about it.

CAC: Although, there was a Search Committee.

EZ: Were you on it?

CAC: No, no.

EZ: I thought you might have been; I didn't know. He said, "We have not offered the deanship of CLA to anybody from outside with the exception of a man named Dewey Stuit who is dean at Iowa. Dean Stuit decided that he had enough trouble there; so, he is not coming. We have interviewed a great many people. The Search Committee has been very active. You're probably aware that your name keeps surfacing." I said, "No, I wasn't aware of it," and that, no, I really was not interested and didn't feel that's really where I would fit the institutional pattern, its organizational structure, best. He said, "You've always had a primary interest in the liberal arts. The Social Sciences and the Humanities have been your focus in every way, inside the university, outside the university, wherever you are. The committee and I feel that you would do this job very well and, probably, better than most of the people who are around and better than anyone who has been either a nominee or a candidate." While I was modest enough to doubt that, I said, "Let me think of it. Maybe, I will go to church this morning." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: I thought about it for awhile, not in church, and, then—this was on a Sunday, of course—went over on a Monday morning and talked with Malcolm again. He said, "I really would like to take this proposal in to the president. I have not taken it to the president." I said, "Oh, I wouldn't consider accepting it without having some enthusiasm for it expressed by the president." He said, "Met's coming down the hall right now." He excused himself, and went in to the president's office, and when he came back, Dr. Wilson—as I recall, Dr. Wilson came in with him; although, I'm not absolutely sure that that was the point at which Dr. Wilson urged me to take it—told me about the experiences of the Search Committee, about the recommendations of the Search Committee, about the offer which had been made to Dewey Stuit, which was not known by anybody other than the committee, and Dr. Wilson, and, of course, Malcolm Willey. He was just so relaxed in his persuasion that I finally said, "I will take it with two provisos: (1) that if at the end of a three- to five-year term, I decide that someone else ought to do it, that there would be no pressure on me to stay and (2) that if I did accept it that it would be an approximately ten-year period maximum and that I would leave at the end of . . .

CAC: And by chance, it was ten years.

EZ: . . . by a kind of chance but, also, by a little more than chance. He was so flexible and he referred to one or two of the chair people in the college who had evidently talked with him, who were not on the Search Committee but were a chair of a department which is very close to you residentially, geographically, and some others for whom he had very high respect. He said, "In all cases, I'm getting affirmative signals. I have only one applicant who is a real candidate, who really wants it, and who is making his desire to become dean known everyday in my office and in Malcolm Willey's office. He's a very able man but I have reason to believe that he would be inappropriate for that post." I commented that I certainly didn't care to get into an immediate confrontational state with anybody, least of all with a person whom by that time I had been able to identify. He reassured me about that. He said, "What about your relationship with the outgoing dean?" I said, "That will not be a factor. His resignation has essentially been

announced and he is not going to feel that whoever comes in is doing him in the eye academically at all; so, I really have no concern about that." Then, I did agree to do it. Confrontational . . . my goodness! Almost immediately, I was in the most extended confrontation with the dean of the Institute of Technology, particularly and specifically, first about the location of the Department of Mathematics, which had traditionally been in the Liberal Arts and Sciences.

CAC: Wasn't that one of the carryover issues that really required a change of leadership at that time?

EZ: Possibly, possibly. I think on that score—I really, up to this point, have been very candid and open—I would have to speculate and I would prefer not to speculate. But, yes, that's a reasonable inference to be drawn from the history of the situation. That was a bitter and protracted battle and the college committees, appointed by the dean of the college, were standing firmly in the dean's corner but the committees which were set up from the president's office and cut across, not only across disciplinary lines, which, of course, the college committees did, but which cut across collegiate lines, while not in enthusiastic about the change were inclined to accept it. I must surely not speak for President Wilson who speaks extremely well for himself but I'm perfectly confident that I draw a proper inference when I say that Meredith Wilson would have preferred to keep that department in the college. But by that time the committee structure was so complex, the forces at work were so strong, and a number of other strong departments which might conceivably have been in the Arts College were already in IT, notably Physics and Chemistry, that the juggernaut became almost irresistible; and I must admit that I got my toes run over by the juggernaut and I simply was not successful in my objective. It's conceivable that the objective itself was in error but, in any case, I lost the fight.

CAC: At the same time that this is going on, the Biological Sciences are being set up as a separate college and I gather this with the full support of Mr. Wilson?

EZ: That's right. The issues there were quite different; although, a number of the departments were in the college, Zoology, Botany, as the major departments in all probability; but there were reasons, some of which were even physical reasons, that is, the moving of that college to the St. Paul campus for reasons of collegiality in areas which impinged on the Biological Science but were not really central to them. I thought considerably less personal resistance to that move than to the other one. Those were the years of turmoil, and flames, and teargassing . . .

CAC: That's comes a bit later. Let me maintain a continuity here.

EZ: All right.

CAC: They are also years of faculty expansion. It starts just a bit before you and late McDiarmid's Administration, the early 1960s, but certainly, from 1963 to the first retrenchment of May 1971, were years in which the faculty, the whole enterprise, was increasing. The

numbers of students were going up. One of the questions I know other later historians will have is, how one plans for that kind of expansion. How do you set priorities within the college?

EZ: I think it . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[Tape 3, Side 1]

CAC: We're talking about Extension staff, and priorities within the college, and how one decides when there's a lot of money and a lot of students and they had to be served. How did the dean's office respond to those requests and demands?

EZ: The dean's office, if it has any sense at all, would respond in part by establishing a structure of democratized administration and, I think, more democratized than, perhaps, had been previously understood to be necessary and wise. That doesn't mean that I disagree with the assumption that if you want something not to be done, you assign it to a committee but committees—you'll forgive a parochial reference— . . . You chaired two committees which were enormously important in the direction taken by the college. You probably chaired a lot more than that; you certainly chaired more committees than the two to which I refer. We really tried deliberately to put into action a system which was genuinely democratic in nature without the foolishness of full vote on every minuscule issue, which can bring a working machine to a grinding halt in a hurry. Certainly, one of the problems which was a substantial one, faced both in Morrill Hall and Johnston Hall, is with a thrust for excellence, and limited resources, and a few areas of obvious competence and quality less than excellent . . . what do you do? Do you put your money in the excellent departments? Do you put your support in departments which need to be brought up toward excellence? My answer was a kind of straddling one, I must admit with some shame; but it wasn't really a straddle. It was more to continue to support departments of excellence than to try to bring up departments which may have been of doubtful value when begun, and may have been clinging by academic fingernails, and, perhaps, should have been phased out. Where the really tough decisions came for me—now, I'm speaking quite personally and in both roles—was where to phase out a program which was in some measure operating, not operating, perhaps, adequately, not operating toward central objectives in the central city of the university but operating on inertia. Believe me, that meant some very, very tough decisions.

CAC: Particularly after 1971, right, when you get the retrenchment? Before then, I kind of have a sense that there was lots of money. I'm asking a baiting question now in a different form—that down to 1970 or 1971, the dilemma that you're expressing now was not that acute, that there were good funds, enormous demands because of students enrollments but that you were operating with a pretty muscular budget?

EZ: I think that's a valid perception; the budget was muscular. But even in those years, which we consider to be the better years except for the enormous turmoil on campus, which were

comparatively affluent when compared with the 1971 and later years, a college such as CLA or any other college simply couldn't be all things to all departments. It meant that some programs and some departments did suffer some constrictions. I did speak personally and continue here to speak personally. I don't know how much difference my open support of, let's say, Economics, Psychology, History, Political Science, and the Social Sciences, and Classics, and English in the Humanities . . . I don't know how much that meant. It meant something . . . it meant something in recruitment, it meant something in approving personnel; but it may not have meant as much as what underlay those decanal decisions which were based on a very strong committee structure and very strong inter-relationships with what I regarded to be the best of the faculty opinion. I don't mean that I think a dean has to sway with each of the winds of the rhetoric of an academic department chair; but I do mean that without widespread consultation, I think a dean's decision are less likely to be sound. How often did I refuse to accept a committee recommendation or a divisional council recommendation? Not infrequently. I can—I won't name it—think immediately of a department which unanimously elected through its own constitution a chair, made the recommendation to the associate dean for that college who made with the committee the same recommendation to the dean, and the dean said, "Sorry, no chair there." Nor will I even explain here, other than to say what might be considered a rationalization, reasons were awfully good and they had to be awfully good to deny that kind of democratic function to a department. I think a dean can and should—I hope without being blatantly aggressive in the most unpleasant sense—by being rational and by explaining the reasons for a move . . . By the way, I couldn't explain to the department the reasons for the rule I just mentioned but it became apparent a year or two later. I do think that a dean needs and should have the guidance of significant, thoughtful, introspective academic statesmen on his staff and not to regard a faculty as his staff to begin with—they aren't.

CAC: When one thinks of a large college as a feudal kind of structure. Provinces are very strong, the overlords carry a good deal of weight. I don't know whether that metaphor appeals to you or not.

EZ: Yes, it does at that. [laughter]

CAC: Large departments—I'm thinking of Political Science, Economics, and History, just in the way of example, because I know them best—were setting their own internal priorities on addition of staff. To what degree did you and your office participate in a discussion to affirm, or to support, or to raise questions, skeptical questions, about whether those new directions were wise or not?

EZ: That depended a good deal upon the nature of the chairman or woman. In Economics, for example, which was a very strong department indeed, during my tenure as dean, there was almost continuous interaction with the chair, whether it be [Jim] Simler, whether it be Walt Heller. Wherever that happened to lie, there was continuing consultation but I was not foolish enough to think that if I said, "Let's not bring a Leonid Hurwicz to Minnesota" that I could get by with

it because I jolly well couldn't. In that case, I certainly wouldn't want to because Leo Hurwicz is certainly one of the most productive and magnificent academic statesman in the college. I would certainly know better than to feel that I could veto that kind of appointment decision by a department. Theoretically, I suppose a dean could and, occasionally, I did veto. I vetoed a number of recommended appointments in those programs and in departments, usually at junior levels, usually when I had some reason which either had not been shared with the department or which the department thought unimportant and I thought quite important but it was rare. It was very rare. I think it's even more rare now.

CAC: There are over forty departments and programs that you had to deal with?

EZ: Yes.

CAC: That's not an easy task to keep track of what their internal needs might be or what priorities they are setting.

EZ: Obviously, no dean can be sophisticated in even the majority of them.

CAC: Let me ask a question from my own personal experience. I know that in the 1960s, History, for example, was quite consciously and deliberately adding staff in the Third World, Latin America, Africa, South Asian and East Asia. I had no idea at that time, as a member of our department, to what degree the college was aware that this is really what we were doing. I assumed so but I don't know what your relationship with Harold Deutch and then with Stuart Hoyt was in what was a new direction. See, it wasn't happening elsewhere in the country in history departments. We were really doing this, not alone but it was an emphasis, What do you need here?

EZ: I'm not so sure about Professor Hoyt but I think with Harold Deutch at least, I not only recognized it, he pointed it out and said quite candidly that this was a direction in which the department wanted to move; and he wanted to know whether he would have decanal support and "Sure," I said, "certainly but I will certainly insist on taking a very intensively detailed view of the vitae that I get on these people and I will insist, as far as I'm able to, that there be no reduction in standards because this happens to be an African Studies specialist or whatever." I do think that the appointments were very strong and they were strong, in part, because the chair agreed—at least Harold Deutch and I think in many respects Stuart Hoyt did as well—that that kind of strength was absolutely necessary. I remember Stuart Hoyt bringing in a background vita on a person who seemed to me to be just head and shoulders above any other candidate. He happened to be the one the department wanted and obviously as dean, I wanted him, too; so, that was much more usual.

CAC: So, we really talk about shared commitments and perceptions.

EZ: Sure.

CAC: I know that you've mentioned before, off the tape . . . in our conversation last week, that once John Turnbull became associate dean that here also was an officer with whom you could share. Would you care to comment on that relationship?

EZ: May I just pay simply almost unlimited tribute to John? He was called in the college informally "Honest John." He was honest John. Working with him was never abrasive. His opinion was always candidly and strongly stated. Here I did have the authority, which I didn't always have with departments, to say yes or no. If I said, "No," John would not sulk in his tent with Achilles waiting for his heel to be wounded. He would simply smile and say, "All right, I understand." John had a great value to the college, not only because he was wise, and balanced, and thoughtful but because he was a bloody good financial officer. That certainly would not by any stretch of anybody's imagination be my strong area. I don't mean that I am unaware of fiscal problems, and fiscal needs, and the power that goes with fiscal control; but John had a kind of fiscal balance which was so delicately set up that he could make small shifts without causing enormous internal turmoil, I mean, literally physical turmoil for him—although, there was some of that, too. Of the people who reported to me with some degree of regularity, John Turnbull was one of the truly fine ones. There were many other people—I shouldn't say—so were Lloyd Lofquist, Fred Lukermann . . .

CAC: A number of associate deans.

EZ: . . . and John Howe and so on—because I'm going to forget one.

CAC: [laughter] There was quite a parade of associate deans through the Arts College, many of whom then carried on with university business.

EZ: Yes, indeed.

CAC: You mentioned Lofquist, and Lukermann, and Mr. Howe certainly . . . John Webb.

EZ: Yes, John Webb was another and Dennis Hurrell was still another. I hope John Howe is doing well at Pittsburgh . . .

CAC: No, he's not a Pittsburgh.

EZ: Oh, isn't he?

CAC: No, no. It was John Modell who went . . .

EZ: Right.

CAC: Of this parade, Turnbull was there quite a long while, so in a sense, he really became chief of staff?

EZ: He certainly was . . .

CAC: Let me ask it in the form of a question . . . I'll make a statement. I have a sense that after that time, the dean of CLA had to have a chief of staff? I mean, there had to be an administrative dean and before that time, it was really divisional? I don't know how we got along without one before.

EZ: That's what I was just starting to say. I think had we been ideally organized, we would have had a chief executive officer long before working with the dean, reporting to the dean, informing the dean, but making many of the decisions which the dean really shouldn't have had to spend midnight oil worrying about. I guess that would apply particularly to fiscal decisions.

[break in the interview]

CAC: We're speaking of the administrative staff. I remember Met Wilson saying at the time and, then again, later in my interview that the University of Minnesota was one of the few places he knew that was under-administered. As I think about your early years as the dean that may have been the case. You're suggesting that Turnbull begins then to take some of that chief of staff burden?

EZ: Yes. I think President Wilson was quite right in saying what he did say. The whole university was administered, in a sense, as a kind triumvirate for a time with the president and that was true up till President Morrill, and Malcolm Willey as academic vice-president, and Bill Middlebrook as financial vice-president, and in areas which were specifically carved out for those two who then reported to the president and the regents. The power was not only, probably, too highly focused but the perception of power was greater than, in my judgment, would be ideal. People would come to me in my early years as, for example, dean of the summer quarter and say, "What do you think about this?" I would either say, "I think it's a good idea," or "I think it's a bad idea," or "It has some merit but here are some negative factors." The next question would be, "What do think Malcolm Willey would think about it?"

CAC: Ahhh.

EZ: My answer would be, "I don't know what Malcolm Willey would think about it but I'm not sure that what Malcolm Willey thinks about it is really a crucial matter," but it would seem so to almost every—at that time there were primarily *chairmen*—chairman in the college. If the matter was purely fiscal, it would be, "What is Bill Middlebrook thinking about it?" I think we can be under-administered to a fault and I think democratizing is essential in an academic community. I think democratization can also be carried too far and, in one or two instances, during the 1960s, I think it was carried too far. That happened not really to be true at Minnesota, in my judgment, and that is partly because for some god-given reason, we were blessed with administrators who did consult back even in the days of [Lotus] Coffman. One hears about authoritarianism in Morrill Hall. But the fact is, we had a handful of presidents who did consult

and they consulted beyond the deans and beyond the vice-presidents so that we have not had the concentration of authoritarianism which Clark Kerr at California tried to gather around himself with no success. Clark Kerr was an extremely able man . . . probably still is. I admired him enormously for what he knew and for what he believed but he also perceived himself as somehow the pinnacle of, perhaps, the greatest public cluster of institutions in the world, certainly in America. He really wasn't. He just wasn't quite, quite.

CAC: This may lead aside for a moment but let's try it. As dean for ten years and as active in other universities communities as you were saying earlier, the speaking that were doing, you had a chance to observe lots of universities and colleges. Very early in our interview, you mentioned Berkeley, Michigan, Wisconsin as three of the great ones. Can you distinguish the University of Minnesota as a community in that context? We know there's a *Wisconsin* idea and a *Wisconsin* spirit. Is there one, do you think, in Minnesota as well? You were mentioning presidents that consulted . . . that may be part of it but I don't know.

EZ: I think it was Dr. Morrill who said to me on one occasion—probably over a martini . . . I'm not sure; he was a civilized man—that he perceived a difference in the Minnesota spirit—to pick up your term—the Minnesota thrust which he felt resulted from the non-authoritarianism of Central Administration. Central Administration was his major interest, obviously, his major concern; his major observations were made there. But, I think that it is true, as I studied the history—which I haven't continued to do recently, by the way but I did study it with some care and I hope with some small insight—I did perceive more tendency to democratize or to move slightly toward democratization at Minnesota than I did at some other institutions with which I became familiar either as a consultant, or as a speaker, or as a member of a board.

CAC: The deans must have met in the Big Ten, didn't you, to share?

EZ: Oh, yes, indeed.

CAC: So, you had more than a casual . . .

EZ: Yes. We spoke of our administrations with great emotion, not always with great affirmative fervor. We described administrative styles as we perceived them in our superiors as administrators. I think at Minnesota in the—however many years . . . I hate to think of how many; I don't hate to think of how many because I would like to have been somewhere else . . . although my time at CBS was a very good time indeed, a very attractive, very stimulating, very rich time—forty odd years that I've been here, I have a perception of an almost continuous movement toward further democratization. That didn't come in great leaps. No single dean said, "If I am selected dean, I'm coming in and I'm going to democratize this college,"—at least I never heard anybody say that. Some people may have said it. I certainly didn't hear any president say it but there was that thrust and we were much, much in advance of our time in relation to Central Administration relationships with the various colleges and divisions of the institution.

CAC: You're attributing this to the insight and administrative style of particular presidents, Mr. Morrill and Mr. Wilson? Or is something else operating?

EZ: They would be examples. I think there is something else operating which I would be reluctant to try to define. Guy Stanton Ford had it in a highly intellectualized and understanding way. Dr. Morrill had it in a more instinctive way. Met Wilson had it in an insightful, intellectualized way. Presidents, whom I knew, preceding Guy Stanton Ford, may also have had it . . . I really don't know; but we were fortunate in the very early years to have people such as [William Watts] Folwell, [Marion LeRoy] Burton. I came during Coffman's Administration and got to know President Coffman quite well. It was easier then for lowly instructors to get to know presidents. There were other reasons that I interacted with Coffman. I think there is another factor which was a fortunate set of, probably, accidents. I don't know whether Herman Wells at Indiana who was really a great president and who was a great president in large part because of his understanding of the relationship between Indiana University and its constituency . . . He wasn't a great president in the intellectual or academic sense. He was not as great a president as—I knew him quite well—Glenn Frank. He was not as great a president in the intellectual sense as Guy Ford or as Meredith Wilson; but he, probably, was one of the greater Big Ten presidents in terms of his perception of those relationships. Sandy Boyd at Iowa was another who had a kind of gentle and not very complex view but a genuinely identifying view of his constituency. I think he succeeded as president at the University of Iowa, in part, for that reason. It's terribly difficult to say, "This person contributed these things," but that they [unclear] the climate was here somehow. I don't know how.

CAC: In the 1960s, when you were dean, I think not because you were dean but, again, these are things that are happening, it moves very quickly to incorporate student participation in governance as well?

EZ: Oh, yes. I think Minnesota was one of the first institutions to incorporate student opinion and to respect it . . .

CAC: Ahhh, that last.

EZ: . . . as, indeed, they should. I have found in my—I was going to say brief tenure but I guess combined it wasn't awfully brief, was it?—brief tenures, I found student input of great value and not infrequently when students differed with faculty on committees, the students were essentially making a valid judgment. I think of a chap name Derrick Kaiwatt, who was chairman of or president of the Student Intermediary Board, who was in my office about three times a week for all his term. He made some enormously helpful suggestions. I think of other student leaders, whom I will not name, who made totally asinine . . . not suggestions but demands . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[Tape 3, Side 2]

CAC: . . . to a related matter. You've mentioned several times the tumult of the late 1960s. It was the anti-war student concern. It was also, now in collegiate terms, the establishment of the ethnic departments: the Afro-American, Chicano, American Indian, and then Women's Studies.

EZ: Yes.

CAC: These all come in your tenure as dean. Can you recapture where those initiatives came from and how did your office—I say your office because I think there were other officers who had to deal it this on a day-to-day basis—handle this tumult?

EZ: Let me use illustratively Women's Studies. Three of us—all men, by the way—Dean Blegen, Dean Nolte, and Dean Ziebarth, began working on a program, which in no denigrating sense at all, became known as the Rusty Ladies Program, essentially first, through the General Extension Division. I think each of worked enormously hard. We did, eventually—at least I did eventually and Dean Blegen did—work with real affirmative enthusiasm for that program. It began with non-credit programs designed for—we hoped—intelligent and reasonably well-educated, but not necessarily collegiately educated, mature women. I believe—Elizabeth Cless was involved in that and, then, some others took over after she married and left—that the Women's Studies program profited heavily. I don't know whether the present people in that program have any idea of the roots or not . . . probably a very small . . . and they might hold it in something less than ultimate academic respect because at first we did a great many non-credit things. We did them because we were trying them out, because we wanted to see what would work. We wanted to know what would meet the perceived needs on the part of the adult women of the community and in the state. So, I think the Women's Studies program had at least some roots in the Rusty Ladies Program. That is not true, of course, of the Ethnic Studies programs which were different in their aegis, and in their nature, and in their objectives. They were sometimes parochial. There were years of parochialism in the Black Studies program.

CAC: Now, the initiative, the pressure, as I perceive it, and I may be wrong so I'm really asking a question, seemed to be more on the Central Administration of the university than on the Arts College where that program would have to be?

EZ: That's correct.

CAC: In order to be Black Studies or Afro-American Studies, it . . .

EZ: Or American Indian Studies.

CAC: I've never quite understood that.

EZ: I think I do. Part of the thrust came from, in the case of Black Studies, the Black community. The Black community perceived the university as a monolithic enterprise, not as

an academic community but as a monolithic enterprise and the way you get to it is to put pressure on its top offices. The way you persuade, to inaugurate American Indian Studies, is to go to the top. That means first to go to the president and if you can't talk to him, you bloody well better not go below a vice-president.

CAC: The students were in alliance then with the community in that strategy?

EZ: Students in that moment—if that's not too pretentious a term—had perceptions of the structure of authority which matched almost precisely the perceptions which existed outside.

CAC: Okay.

EZ: Very rarely did the people, let's say, from the Urban League come to me first. They would try to get first to Meredith Wilson or to Mac Moos. That was almost equally true of American Indian Studies . . . not quite. The American Indians were a little more diffuse in their thrust. They were not as well organized.

CAC: An even smaller demographic base.

EZ: Of course, of course. There, there was a little more. There was—this is just historic and not really a policy comment at all—a period, following the earliest thrust toward the highest levels . . . I don't know whether this applied regential level or not; I suspect it probably did not because the regents have so little direct influence on programmatic policy but at the presidential level. The Black community very quickly had recalled *for* it during my decanal years at least that I had been, if not primarily responsible, at least one of those responsible for the series, which won the Peabody Award, called *Neither Free nor Equal*, in which we took up the cudgel for the minority, for the Blacks, for the Hispanics, for the American Indians. Then, the pressure began funneling through my office.

When that happened, I very quickly called in the associate dean for the Social Sciences, very quickly consulted with the various committees, and one doesn't wish to feel that he was pushed by the winds of the rhetoric of any given group or any special interest group but the fact is that the communities probably were at least as quick if not quicker to recognize what contributions could be made than those of us who were internal were able to recognize; but the fact is they also recognized so bloody many things that were totally irrelevant toward which they would thrust with equal strength, and equal apostolic zeal, and evangelical fervor that it became a very mixed bag.

CAC: Did you have to meet with community groups yourself?

EZ: Oh, yes.

CAC: At first, the pressure was primarily on Morrill Hall?

EZ: Oh, indeed, indeed.

CAC: I can't get a sense how long this went on and what the temper of those meetings was.

EZ: I would think maybe three years . . .

CAC: That long?

EZ: . . . would be a time I could relate to in terms of these things. I began working with the Urban League earlier than that in the administration of the college. I established something called the Community Committee on the Liberal Arts. The director of the Urban League was on it. The mayor of Minneapolis was on it. The mayor of St. Paul was on it. The superintendent of schools of Minneapolis was on it. Generally speaking—although, I dislike the term—opinion leaders, about a dozen of them, would meet with me for a luncheon once every two weeks for the entire academic year.

CAC: Gracious.

EZ: They would make very strong supportive statements, very strong denigrating statements as well, about what they perceived to be the directions being taken, not so much by the college as by the university. This reflects, again, what I take to be a community minority group, or even majority group, perception of the nature of the organization of the institution. It took at least a year for me to develop in the committee some understanding of the way we operate, that we are different from a business. The president of one of the largest corporations in the city was a member and he was very critical of the president—I won't give the precise date because I don't want to identify the president—and he said, "I have run a multi, multi, multi, multimillion dollar enterprise for years and I didn't have to consult anybody." That was just an opening for me to leap in to try in some measure to get these people to understand the differences between a business enterprise and an academic institution, what a community of scholars might mean in a business community would not mean; so, there were lots of efforts of that kind about which my colleagues probably . . .

CAC: The documented record doesn't . . . I haven't found any mention of this sort of communication outside the university at all. Did you initiate these meetings yourself?

EZ: This particular group was initiated after I had been in office about a year.

CAC: Perhaps, in part, because you had that community sense that the academic people do not.

EZ: Possibly. Certainly, I got a lot more cooperation in the community because . . .

CAC: When it came time for the crisis, you had these lines out?

EZ: That's right. Also, I was an executive in a medium which had enormous power . . .

CAC: Yes.

EZ: . . . although, that turned around and bit me a number of times, too. Yes, that was one of my contributions and I think it was a contribution. These people representing those enterprises they represented were very important during the legislative sessions.

CAC: Of course.

EZ: I'm not a bit surprised that you find no reference to it. I looked through my notes a year or two ago—I keep an office, by the way, at the university in the Psychology Department—and I went through my files to see if there was some other stuff that ought to go to the archives. I found no minutes of what was called the Community Committee on the Liberal Arts, something of that kind. Our meetings would sometimes be so exciting that people would forget to eat their lunch, and simply sit and argue, and then say, "Oh, my god! I've got to be back at my office."

CAC: Were there community groups like this that came to you then when the Afro-American crisis was really severe? Again, from the printed record, it's not clear. I suppose it's happening everywhere at once, which makes for a confusion. It was Morrill Hall that was occupied and not Johnston Hall?

EZ: That's correct; although Johnston Hall was occupied shortly after Morrill Hall was occupied and the president of the university and the chairman of the Board of Regents made my office their—this is not a term of which I approved—field headquarters. Our doors were blockaded. I leaned out the window one day during this period and a canister of teargas was thrown . . . I rather imagine by the police not by the students.

CAC: That was undoubtedly on the war not on the . . .

EZ: Oh, yes, yes. It broke immediately beneath my window and I inhaled a full set of lung capacity . . .

CAC: Excuse me for interrupting. It was the war and not the Black that led to Johnston Hall being barricaded?

EZ: I think so. There were probably a disproportionate number of Blacks in that group which blockaded us, too, but that may have been an accident of the kind of chronology which meant that they were upset at that time. They were angry at that time. They wanted a Black Studies Department. They wanted more recognition than they had and, indeed, they should have had more recognition than they had . . . it's hard to tell. This may have been an offshoot because, as I said, the president and the chairman of the Board of Regents made my office . . .

CAC: Who was the chairman at the time?

EZ: Les Malkerson. That preceded Elmer Andersen as chair.

CAC: In guiding the response of the university community—it had to be in the Arts College because if there were to be Afro-American that's where it would be located—who were the chief negotiators on the university side? Who are making these decisions and the responses on a day-to-day, week-to-week, month-to-month basis?

EZ: There was a substantial responsibility taken in the academic vice-president's office; although, it was less detailed and more diffuse in nature than the decisions which were made in the college offices. The first line of . . . Let me retract what I seem to be starting to say because if I say it the other way, then I'm going to have to go back and [unclear] it. The first line of attack after it was recognized that Central Administration was not an effective first line was certainly the dean. Therefore, the next . . . I started to say the next shots were fired in my direction and I revise that, too, because they were not shots in an unfriendly sense but they were shots in an intelligent but diffuse and emotional sense. Then, when I would bring the associate dean for the Social Sciences and, at least, the chairs of the various collegiate committees on programmatic matters, there would be some anger. The dean is trying to push this off and that was not my intention at all because had I tried to make the decisions about those programs, the faculty simply would not have accepted them and they would have had a very difficult time, to put it euphemistically. While the first shots came my way, then, the collegiate committees were established, the divisional councils became involved, as you know so well. I'm telling you things you know better than I.

CAC: But listeners of the tape don't.

EZ: The divisional deans, the associate deans, for the Social Sciences and for the Humanities, played a part and in the case of the Social Sciences a very substantial, very substantial, and a very helpful part.

CAC: How about Mac Moos? What is the relationship of the college to him? As you mentioned earlier, the pressure was directly on his office in the very beginning.

EZ: I think to respond with honesty to that question, I'm going to have to say, at least, one thing that might sound to somebody self-serving. I don't mean it to at all. I think it is true that I probably, perhaps, because I had known Mac Moos for many years, perhaps because I had worked with him a little bit in Washington . . . perhaps not, perhaps for other reasons, I very quickly became his, perhaps, chief adviser. That was not always a happy business either. I know that I was criticized in some collegial quarters for having done so. Mac Moos was enormously interested in minorities and minority opinion. He was interested in the American Indians. He had a place, up at Hackensack. He was interested in the Black movement. He tried to be helpful in the [Dwight D.] Eisenhower Administration in converting the president of the

United States to a more sympathetic view of Black problems. This is a rather dramatic illustration . . . there was one thoughtless element that turned to bite me in the seat of the pants. The night of his inauguration, I chaired the inaugural ceremonies. Kingman Brewster, the president of Yale, was one of the speakers. Walter Heller was there. I think Walter was then economic adviser to President . . .

CAC: I think he's retired and resigned from that by then; but he has a long connection. This would have been 1967.

EZ: Yes.

CAC: I think Walter was through in 1967 . . . he's back in Washington.

EZ: Probably so. Walt Heller was on the stage. I rose to open the meeting. This was in Northrop Auditorium and Northrop was jammed. Malcolm Moos was a very impressive figure with that enormous head of beautiful white hair and really had some Australian type fizz. People wanted to know more about Mac Moos; so, they thought they ought to come hear him speak and the auditorium was jammed. There was a minority group in the back of the first floor and they would not permit my voice to be heard. I was speaking a little bit about the transition, and the presidency, and about the function of the presidential office, and what we could or should be able to expect of a new president. They began to rattle spears, and baseball bats, and whatnot. Malcolm Moos—this was typical of him and is something I think no other president I'd known would ever have been able to do . . . maybe Peter Magrath would have, I'm not sure—leapt off the platform in Northrop Auditorium, ran back in the aisle, and said, "I recognize that you have grievances. If you people will allow Dean Ziebarth to speak, if you people will allow the president of Yale University to speak, and Walter Heller to speak" —Walter spoke quite briefly; I can't remember what it was about—"I will see to it that the microphone is turned over to you at the end of the program, and you may speak to the entire auditorium." Quiet prevailed immediately. Mac Moos came back, sat down on the stage, and forgot to tell me. There were six or seven minority people standing gathered with locked arms behind my chair on the stage. There was some disorder in the auditorium as we finished and I said, "The meeting is now closed." I would never have thought of saying that but Mac just was under sufficient tension not to tell me that he'd made that promise. It worked out fairly well. I can't remember whether Anna Stanley was one of them or not; I think she may have been but it doesn't matter. They felt they'd been sold down the river and absolutely properly, they felt that they had been given a bad deal. I turned to Mac and said, "What's going on?" He said, "Oh, 'Easy,' I forgot to tell you I told them they could have the microphone." I leapt back for the microphone and signaled the engineer to turn up the gain and said, "Ladies and gentlemen, I'm sorry. I was unaware that minority groups were given permission to use the microphone to speak and to present their points of view. I apologize to them and to you for not having known that." Some of them did speak but the audience, of course, began to drift out. Mac Moos was very—to come back to your question which I've not lost—flexible and Regent Malkerson less. Mac Moos and I stayed up all

night . . . I mean, literally all night at the house because there were minority groups coming over to make presentations to the president. The three of us stayed there all night . . .

CAC: You mean at the president's house?

EZ: At the president's home . . . and in the morning when about eight o'clock came, I said, "Mac, I've got to go. I've got to go get a shower and change my shirt." He laughed and he said, "I'm the only person who wears the same size shirt you do. Have a shower, take one of my shirts, and go back to the office." Then, Mr. Malkerson and Mac Moos did take refuge—that was the first time—in my office the next day. Shortly after that, the blockade to which I referred did take place. That followed the blockade of Morrill Hall when the invasion . . .

CAC: In the meantime, the college committees are working, as they do, slowly and prudently to work out a way to establish programs?

EZ: Yes, and they worked very well. There was an almost unique balance on the part of those committees between responding to what the man on the street would call pressure from outside and responding to genuine academic needs. I think the programs which developed turned out to be much better and much longer living programs here than at many of our sister institutions as a result of the care we took in preparing ground to let them grow.

[End of Tape 3, Side 2]

[Tape 4, Side 1]

CAC: Here we are again. We broke for lunch, in case the listeners to the tape are interested in that. I would guess we have some minutes of unfinished parts of your career at the university.

EZ: If the listeners should be interested, I had a quick peanut butter sandwich.

CAC: [laughter] I had bacon, lettuce, and tomato. It being August, the garden is in the harvest has never been better. I think when we cut off our conversation, we were talking about the end of your deanship. You were there ten years . . . came on in 1963 and by 1973, it's a decade. Yet, there was also turmoil and change over in the university generally at that time. Then, after your leaving the Arts College in September of 1973, in six months you become interim president; so, I think those are the things we need to pick up on. I would await your pleasure. You did have ten years in the deanship.

EZ: The turmoil in the college was not really related to my resignation . . .

CAC: I was thinking more of the university than the college. That's what you meant? There wasn't much turmoil in the college?

EZ: No.

CAC: You said college . . . I think you meant university.

EZ: Yes, I guess I did mean university. The general feeling that there was a plethora of resignations in administrative office as a result of conflict and disagreement did not really apply in my case. I was not insensitive to the conflict and the disagreement. I think, perhaps, in the tapes, I have not said enough about what an enormously supporting person the academic vice-president was during that period and how much I valued my relationship with him. So, there was nothing about my relationship either with the academic . . .

CAC: The reference is to Gerry Shepherd . . .

EZ: I'm talking about Gerry Shepherd.

CAC: . . . whom we haven't talked about before.

EZ: That's right . . . and that certainly was one of the things I should have emphasized before. I also admired many things about President Moos very much. He was, as I think I may have implied earlier on one of the tapes, flexible. He did swing with students. He had a genuine respect for student opinion. He had a genuine liking for students personally and he interacted with them very well, as some other presidents might not have or might have found more difficult than he did. I think it is also fair to say that President Moos, not infrequently, would be something less than perfectly prepared when meeting with members of the legislature, or legislative committee, or even with the regents and, yet, he was articulate. He had a kind of inherent poise which served him in good stead. I admired him very much in many ways and liked him personally enormously. We became very close friends . . . I felt in a kind of advisory capacity, at least as far as the liberal arts were concerned—he was a political scientist and, therefore, interested in the liberal disciplines.

I know that there was speculation in the press, I know that there was speculation among many colleagues that, perhaps, I had resigned the deanship as a result of disagreements with Central Administration. That is not the fact. I was not only fond personally of Gerry Shepherd but I respected him enormously. He was tough. He was fair. He was honest. He was well balanced; and although, he came from a technological field, he had a recognition of the liberal arts as the central city of the university. I felt very close to President Moos both as I've indicated—probably have indicated repeatedly—personally and professionally. We did sometimes disagree as I think is inevitable and is good. I would hate to think that I had gone through my professional life without rather substantive disagreements with both colleagues, and administrative officers, and people who were, perhaps, my administrative superiors as well as administrative friends and colleagues.

[break in the interview]

CAC: Your relationships with Morrill Hall, as we say in shorthand, were good, both with Gerry Shepherd and with Malcolm Moos. Gerry and his team resigned in, I think, March of 1973 and your resignation takes place in September of 1973.

EZ: Somewhat later, in any case.

CAC: In the meantime, Hal Chase is acting vice-president. Mr. Moos has persuaded Mr. Chase of Political Science to do that?

EZ: That's quite right. Hal was an excellent academic vice-president. In making my comments to the regents at the time I was chosen, Hal and I had a misunderstanding which it took a little while to straighten out; and I'll comment about that later on, if you'd like. The interim presidency was a relatively short term, not quite as short as some of the retrospective press comments now indicate but it was a short term. I was never known as acting president and that was partly the result of my request and partly the result of the regents insistence because there were, despite the fact that it was a short term, many very difficult decisions to be made. An acting president or an acting manager never has quite the authority of the permanent . . . I suppose there is nothing quite so temporary as a permanent job as president.

CAC: Hal Chase was *acting* vice-president, however?

EZ: That's correct.

CAC: That's a difference . . . ?

EZ: That's correct.

CAC: And appropriately so.

EZ: I think it didn't make any difference to him but it did make a difference to me. Regent Elmer Andersen, previously governor of the state, was equally adamant about that. It might be of some small, again almost anecdotal, interest because we've been talking a good bit about disruption, disturbance, revolutionary fervor that there was almost none of that just preceding the day that the regents met to invite me to take the presidency. When I came into the regents room, the whole regents' table was surrounded by people whom I suppose would have been regarded on the downtown streets as looking pretty disreputable, carrying wooden spears . . .

CAC: Heavens sakes.

EZ: . . . standing behind every regential chair in the room, standing behind the then President Moos's chair, and Elmer Andersen's chair. It didn't particularly disturb me because there was nothing . . .

CAC: Was this the war or was this the Black? Who were these people?

EZ: It was really a group of undergraduate dissidents . . .

CAC: Heavens. I've never have heard this story.

EZ: . . . who had some things to demand. Elmer Andersen was superb. He was patient. He was balanced. He said, "We have business to conduct. I wish you would state your demands and leave." I had not yet been introduced.

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: There may have been a widespread assumption that this was an objection to the new interim president.

CAC: I see. No, I've never heard the story at all.

EZ: But, it turned out not to be. Somebody turned to me, either President Moos or Chairman Andersen—I'm not sure which—and said, "Do you, Dean Ziebarth, have anything to say to these people?" [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: I laughed and said, "No, I have nothing to say to them. At the moment, I'd like to know what their demands and dissatisfactions are so that we could discuss it." There was a little discussion but some spear pounding and fist on the table pounding. Then, finally, they left. Malcolm Moos introduced me as an old friend and a consultant in his presidential years. Then, I spoke fairly briefly—I would guess five minutes, possibly ten—and I talked about excellence and my devotion to excellence within the university but I pointed out that there were also other needs within the university. Dr. Chase, whom you mentioned, who was a political scientist and was acting academic vice-president, took me by the arm after the meeting was over and said, "'Easy,' if you meant that you did not approve excellence, I'm going to fight you every inch of the way, even though we're very old and very close friends." I said, "Hal, that's the way it ought to be. I, obviously, didn't make myself clear. Let's just look at my notes on what I think I said or, indeed, from which I spoke." He said, "All right." He looked at them and said, "Oh, I misinterpreted." The reasonably good relations with Central Administration continued. The regential relationships were almost better than anyone could expect. Not only was Regent Andersen supportive, I think I had support on every major issue which came before the regents and about which there may have been disagreements preceding the regents' meetings. I think I had virtually full support; so, I have nothing but pleasant memories of that period.

CAC: I have a sense just before you came in that Governor Andersen and Neil Sherburne, and, perhaps, a few others had really had to fill a kind of vacuum in the latter days of the Moos

Administration and were, perhaps, playing a more assertive role in the university than normally regents do?

EZ: I think that was the feeling of many people on the Board of Regents as well as within the university and in the community. Oh! I would interject one other thing which I had completely forgotten until this moment. When Elmer Andersen urged me, I said, "Elmer, how long do I have to make up my mind? How soon do I have to give you an answer?" He said, "You have as long as it will take you to say yes."

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: I think the comment you made may be an accurate one, at least it correlates highly with the impression which was rather general both among the regents and I think rather widely within the university, students and faculty alike, and, certainly, in the community . . . or as I perceive the community attitudes as shared in the community . . . and I think, perhaps, right from the beginning. I remember so well the evening Malcolm Moos was inaugurated . . .

[break in the interview]

EZ: From the beginning Lester Malkerson, who was then chair of the board, took a very active role. He was very conscientious about his regential responsibilities and he tried to be helpful in every way he possibly could; and in both Lester Malkerson and in Elmer Andersen, we had enormously effective regents. I think the single most substantive question which had to be answered, and had to be answered in some measure in the president's office but also elsewhere, was the question which goes back to what I said about, Do you put resources where there is excellence, or do you put it into other areas in which excellence is a potential but not a current fact, or do you put it in disadvantaged programs? There were innumerable cases of that kind in which much as the interim president might try to avoid decisions which would imprison his successor, some decisions simply had to be made, some decisions about space allocation. You can say we have a Space Allocation Committee and we have an effective Space Allocation Agency but still, they come pounding at the door and want to know what the president is going to do about it or what he is going to say about it.

CAC: Sure. I'm embarrassed to say I was part of that delegation seeking an archives center, not all by myself but there were three archives that wanted space that summer. There you are . . . an illustration.

EZ: Indeed, not by yourself . . . with other colleagues of almost equal distinction. We were able to make provide at least some temporary solutions. These questions—I won't go into detail about them individually; in fact, I've gone into too much detail and this is long and labored as it is . . .

[break in the interview]

If anybody ever listens to this, as I hope someone will . . .

CAC: Oh, you bet they will.

EZ: . . . I hope it won't seem totally ungracious if I comment about what will seem a totally strange voice to them. I have had two open heart surgeries and following each of them, tubes were kept down my trachea between the thyroid muscles, which most people call vocal cords, and they were kept down there for days. After the second open heart surgery, my normal voice, which was a fairly full and professional one, simply has not returned.

CAC: It's cruel to keep you on this tape for four hours in a row. You're doing heroically.

EZ: I'm not doing heroically. I know I'm doing ramblingly. Those months—there were only, I think, five months—were fascinating and to my amazement, I enjoyed them.

CAC: They didn't include a legislative? This would have been late spring to early autumn in 1974?

EZ: That's quite right but there were legislative committees which in—I can recall immediately—five instances either came to the office, not to be critical, not to examine the university's program but to try to determine my perception of the needs of the institution preceding the beginning of the fall legislative session. Those were interesting. I had just a splendid time. I just really thoroughly enjoyed dealing with the legislature. Most of the legislators I knew because of my outside associations and I enjoyed the regents.

CAC: You knew most of them by then.

EZ: I knew most of them.

CAC: Let me interpose here. I have just always imagined that your selection as interim president was so logical that it happened. There wasn't a search committee. The regents just had to find *a* person and you were, obviously, that person?

EZ: As far as I know. I didn't ever ask what the procedure had been. I did say that I would not even consider it unless Malcolm Moos would feel that it was acceptable to him and that I had in no way been searching for the appointment; so, they said, "By all means talk with Mac." I went over, and Mac and I had a cocktail, and chatted about it a little bit. He said, "'Easy,' if I am not going to be here, there is nobody I would rather have that you in the chair," . . .

CAC: Good.

EZ: . . . which was gracious of him and decent and he was a decent human being.

CAC: One of my great regrets for this project is that he died. I would just have loved to have interviewed him.

EZ: Isn't that a shame?

CAC: Yes, and Frank Boddy and Hal Chase. Just since I got the idea, a lot of people have died.

EZ: Oh, yes. Frank Boddy and Hal Chase both would have given you . . .

CAC: Frank knew the university going way back.

EZ: Of course, he did, very well, indeed. After that term, I went back to teaching and research. I was rather pleased when I saw—I don't know whether this is now an obligation of chairs of departments . . . I guess it may be constitutionally that their evaluation of the teaching and research and public service of a faculty member be made known to that faculty member— . . .

CAC: Oh, yes . . . a long time.

EZ: . . . a copy of my chairman's . . .

CAC: The old blue sheet.

EZ: Yes . . . blue sheets came to my desk. I thought, my gosh! I'm not supposed to see this! So, I called the office and said, "Tell Bob that I have a copy of the blue sheets and I shouldn't have them, I'm sure." He said, "For heavens sake, of course, you're supposed to see them." The first thing I saw was, We like to hear our colleagues who return from administrative posts say that they're coming back to teaching and research; but it is especially gratifying to find that one administrative colleague actually does it!

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: He was referring to some research papers which I had done.

CAC: Did you come back to teaching then in 1974, 1975?

EZ: Yes. I guess in the autumn of 1975.

CAC: Wonderful.

EZ: I took early retirement but only a couple of years early. I don't, frankly, remember when that was but those who know how desperately, frantically busy I was all my professional life say, "Aren't you lost?" I'm not a bit lost. I love it! I like doing reviews for the *Tribune*, and other magazines, and periodicals. I enjoy working with . . .

CAC: And you still get to Hawaii in the winter time.

EZ: Yes, indeed, and work with satellite research, international research there. We travel a good deal, and I still take an occasional assignment for CBS, and I do some consulting. I've kept an office, as I mentioned to you on the tape, in the Psychology Building which I visit not every day and, indeed, never at regular hours so that they're predictable. I don't mind being called by students who often call me at home. In fact, when we broke for my peanut butter sandwich, my telephone began ringing and there were at least five or six from former students or students who wanted to get my reaction to some things.

CAC: Mr. Magrath came on in the fall of 1974.

EZ: That's correct.

CAC: Transition periods are always interesting. How elaborate and how detailed was your orientation of him when he came in? Was there an overlap between you? I'm sure your relationships were cordial but were they elaborate?

EZ: I don't know that they were elaborate. They were pretty informal. There was an overlap. I remained in Morrill Hall . . . indeed, in the office for a time. Peter would come in each day, obviously. He put in very long days. We would talk about a great many of the problems and I would make what I hoped would be a persuasive case for things in which I believed deeply. One piece of advice he was unable to take . . . I advised him to have lunch not less than once a week at the Campus Club with colleagues, not with appointees, not with administrators, simply to go through the line, and sit down with three, four, five colleagues from various disciplines, and join in a general conversation. That, to my disappointment, was advice which was taken by neither Dr. Moos nor Dr. Magrath.

CAC: Isn't that interesting? Very senior persons I've interviewed remember Met Wilson doing that . . . but not Morrill . . .

EZ: Of course.

CAC: . . . and not Moos and not Magrath.

EZ: That's right. Mac Moos said when I suggested it to him, "Why, 'Easy,' of course I'm going to do that" and for two, or three, or four weeks, he did.

CAC: He entertained people off campus for lunch.

EZ: That's true. He frequently went to the Minnesota Club or the Minneapolis Club for lunch and he did some constituency bridge mending there, too.

CAC: Now, when you were dean, this was a regular kind of bridge mending or bridge building that you would have done at the Campus Club?

EZ: I hope it amounted to that.

CAC: John Turnbull was almost always there.

EZ: Yes, he was.

CAC: I think people felt they had access informally in that fashion.

EZ: Frequently, luncheons would become professional discussions.

CAC: Sure.

EZ: I think that probably about does it.

CAC: Let me ask one final thing. It keeps coming back to another theme of comparison. You've commented on it in two different places in our four hours together and that's regarding the place of Minnesota and other Land-Grant good, Big Ten, plus the other giants. Minnesota has its peculiar and unique kinds of strengths. Where do place Minnesota . . . forty, fifty years now that you've been in this?

EZ: One hesitates to make a ranking.

CAC: Yes, I don't want a ranking.

EZ: It's always artificial and based upon inadequate criteria. I think Minnesota would rank, in my judgment, among public, great graduate universities, just a minuscule amount below California, Michigan, and Wisconsin. When I speak of Wisconsin, I'm speaking of Wisconsin at Madison, I'm speaking of Michigan at Ann Arbor, speaking of California at Berkeley. The outstate institutions are important to the states. They're important to the students. They're important to the constituency. But, they simply are not quite the same. I would rank Minnesota with Illinois as just a slight bit below Wisconsin and Ann Arbor. My reason for that is not a truly basically academic one; although, it's reflected, I think, in graduate school quality particularly. I say that because we are a largely commuter campus. We are an urban institution. Our traditions are not quite as strong as those in an Ann Arbor or a Berkeley . . . certainly not as a Madison. I'm sure I'm reflecting some prejudice because I happened to go to Wisconsin at Madison but not entirely. I do think that we have had the top ranking in America in one or two departments. They happen not to be in the Arts College. Although Economics, Psychology, History, Political Science, rank . . .

CAC: And Geography.

EZ: Yes, Geography, certainly, I should not have omitted Geography. These departments are ranked by any measure in the very top.

CAC: They're all from the Social Sciences which is, perhaps, kind of a final cluster of questions. Within the Arts College, again, there is a perception and it's been stated on these tapes frequently, that the Social Sciences are so strong and, oh, from 1950 to 1980, that Humanities had a hard time and that was a political disbalance as well an academic one?

EZ: Oh, that is so accurate. It is so difficult and one of my major administrative frustrations was searching for ways to persuade a constituency which didn't understand really what the Humanities were about. It was very difficult to get funding for the Classics and, yet, we had one of the most distinguished departments of Classics anywhere in the country. Some of our Grecian digs are among the most notable in the world. Yet, it is so difficult to persuade somebody who—I was about to pick occupations but I'll avoid that because it will seem a derogatory comment and I don't mean it to—lives in northern Minnesota in a totally bucolic atmosphere and who really wants to know why you teach people Greek and why you teach Latin. I thought of what the famous Roman [Marcus Porcius] Cato said when someone asked him on his eightieth birthday, "Why are you studying Greek at your age?" He said, "What other age have I?"

CAC: [laughter]

EZ: The Humanities are enormously important. The work in Art History . . .

[End of Tape 4, Side 1]

[Tape 4, Side 2]

EZ: . . . in Art, in English and English Literature, indeed, in our classical rhetorical tradition, all of these things are important. The latter is a little bit easier to explain because rhetoric tends to be translated into political skill and speech. While the Department of Speech Communication has come a very long way from that kind of tradition, at least occasionally, that's an application to grab.

CAC: Many people have commented, you see, that in the Arts College when you were dean, that the associate deans for the Social Sciences in those divisions almost without exception went on to play a large role in college and university affairs . . .

EZ: Yes.

CAC: . . . and the rotating associate deans in the Humanities would be there for three years and, then, would return.

EZ: That's right.

CAC: It was just a disbalance of political influence [unclear].

EZ: That's quite right.

CAC: It's hard to deal with. 'Easy,' you've extended yourself, as always, beyond what a visitor should ask for. I do think that these kinds of tapes are not for *an* historian ten years from now but for a variety of people—I would hope—who would find them very useful to clue into. I thank you very much.

EZ: I thank you. I would hope with you that they will be useful. You may even recall that a few years ago, three or four years ago, that I chatted with you briefly, I think, down at Ad Hoebel's . . .

CAC: Yes.

EZ: . . . about the desirability of doing a program of this kind and, then, it was sidetracked. I think it is important. I think oral history itself is an important research method. Harold Deutch, as much as any of your colleagues, demonstrated the importance of that device. I think it is important. I am sorry to inflict upon you, and especially sorry to inflict upon people you may listen to this, a laryngitic voice which is a hangover from open heart surgery and not a hangover from too many martinis. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] Thank you very much.

[End of Tape 4, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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