David Cooperman


Youth 1-
    education 2
    military service 2
Graduate work, political science, 1947 4
    Far Eastern Studies 4
Social Science program 5-
    role of McConnell, T.R. 6
    Nelson, Ben 7
    student constituents 8-
Government Studies at University of Minnesota, 1950s 10-12
Political Science 12-16
    Anderson, William 13
    Lippincott, Ben 14
    Short, Lloyd 14
    Sibley, Mulford 15
    Mills, Lennox 15
Social Science program 17-
    Hill, Reuben - Family Studies 19
    Rose, Arnold 20
    decline, 1970s 20-21
    change of governance 22
    Martindale, Don 23
AAUP 25
    Wilson, Meredith 25
    faculty unionization, 1970s 26
Student activism, 1960s 26-
Origins of CURA 30-
    Moos, Malcolm 31
    Communiversity 32
    police on University of Minnesota campus 37-38
Afro-American Studies 35
Wenberg, Stan 38-39
Interdisciplinary Studies 40

**Interview with David Cooperman**

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

**Interviewed on July 30, 1984**
**University of Minnesota Campus**

David Cooperman - DC
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers. I'm interviewing Professor David Cooperman of the Department of Sociology, a long-term member of the University of Minnesota, a graduate student here after the second World War, and a person whose career has touched many of the interdisciplinary programs. We have a long agenda and we will get to it. We are cutting the tape on Monday, July 30, 1984. We are in Mr. Cooperman's office on the eleventh floor of the Social Science Tower looking out over the city of Minneapolis.

Future historians may wonder about the way I address you this afternoon . . . I know that you are David Cooperman . . .

DC: Yes.

CAC: . . . but somewhere along the line, you were Dan and I know you best as Dan.

DC: Right. My parents called me Dan when I first came into this world and they put down, on the birth certificate, David.

CAC: [laughter]

DC: I was never able to figure it out; but, that's a fact of my life.

CAC: Is there a difference in people here . . . what name they use when they talk with you? Is David more formal?

DC: David tends to be more formal. I suggest to people who call me more than once, "Call me Dan;" although, it's been confusing to many friends. My advisor in Graduate School, Mulford Sibley, still meets me occasionally in the halls and says, "Well, David . . . um, um . . . Dan . . . "

CAC: [laughter] Where were you born, Dan?

DC: New York City . . . in the Bronx specifically.

CAC: Your undergraduate work was where?

DC: I did the equivalent of one and a half years at New York University and then went into the Army. The academic year I spent in the Army here was counted toward my B.A. [Bachelor of Arts] degree. Then, I completed my undergraduate work in 1946-1947 after I got out of the Army. My B.A. is from the University of Minnesota.

CAC: You really came to Minnesota because of the Army experience?

DC: Right.

CAC: Was that ASTP [Army Specialized Training Program] or what program?

DC: Yes, ASTP.

CAC: And just by chance, they sent you here?

DC: By absolute chance. I mean nothing could have been more chancy. After basic training in Fort Gordon, Georgia, I was slated to study Japanese at the University of Pennsylvania and came down, along with my total company, with amoebic dysentery. It took a month to just get back on my feet. At that point, they sent me to Minnesota.

CAC: You worked for the Japanese program here, too?

DC: Yes. That was the Japanese Language and Area Studies program.

CAC: How long were you engaged then . . . in the later months of the war?

DC: I came here in September of 1945 and stayed till spring of 1946.

CAC: Do you remember the Japanese Language?

DC: I learned it then and have forgotten it since. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] You probably met some of the professors that later you would have. I think Werner Levi was part of that program?

DC: Yes.

CAC: John Turner was, right? Perhaps, you didn't know him then?

DC: John was in an ASTP class that preceded mine. John was not an instructor or he was not connected with the instructional aspects of ASTP; but, Werner Levi was. It was Werner who began to stimulate me to get into the social sciences. Back in New York City, I had been in a pre-medical program.

CAC: It was really that stimulation that led you away from the health sciences into the social sciences then?

DC: Yes. It was not only Werner Levi but there was a remarkable anthropologist who taught us the structure of Japanese society and some anthropological aspects . . . a man named Walter Cline . . . C-L-I-N-E. He died of cancer in the early 1960s. He was so remarkable in his way of communicating cultural folkways in the context of social structure of Japan that it made a subject come alive for me as nothing having to do with pre-medical studies did.

CAC: In the interviews I've done and talking to so many people, somewhere along the line, there are one or two persons who turn on a young person and that kind of sets the direction.

DC: Yes, that's right.

CAC: Yet, among our own colleagues frequently, we kind of disparage that sense of influence over the young. [laughter]

DC: Absolutely. It's very funny.

CAC: When you get out of the Army, you had the GI Bill to give you a running start here.

DC: Right. I actually wanted to return to New York City. My mother was ill then with a fatal illness and I wanted to go back home and be with her; but, I was not accepted back to New York University. They argued that federal regulations made it mandatory for the college at which one received the last college credit to accept one and I said that was the University of Minnesota. I came back here, and suggested that, and they had not heard of this rule.

CAC: [laughter] It may not have existed.

DC: It may not have existed. Stan Wenberg—bless his soul—said, "Stay. We want you. We have thousands upon thousands of veterans; but, you're one of ours." He opened a simple door for me to come back here.

CAC: Where had you known Stan at that point?

DC: I just met him . . . his total affability, even then as a young man. He was assistant recorder.

CAC: Did you stay in touch with Stan over his career?

DC: Oh, sure. Throughout his and my stay at Minnesota, we were very much in touch.

CAC: We may come back to that because I think Wenberg was a person, as you might know, that many faculty knew at a distance, if at all, and then with a certain skeptical feeling.

DC: Right.

CAC: I had a great deal of affection and high regard for Stan.

DC: I did very much.

CAC: Let's come back to that because he is a misunderstood figure, I think, in the 1940s and 1950s. You had to complete your undergraduate work then before you could become a graduate student here?

DC: Yes.

CAC: Then, you chose political science?

DC: Actually, very literally, specifically, my B.A. was in Political Science with a Far Eastern Area Studies track. Harold Quigley was my advisor. That was 1947. Then, I was advised, both by Quigley and by Werner Levi, to go on for my graduate work at a different university, to change universities. I was accepted at Berkeley and at Columbia; and I decided to go to Berkeley. By that time, my mother had died. I went to Berkeley and couldn't stay there longer than two or three days. I just was totally turned off by the incredible, super large scale of those operations. My first encounter with the person who was assigned as my advisor was in a large gymnasium at which there were probably fifty tables and you had exactly ten minutes for an initial interview with the person who was to be your advisor. He never looked at me once, never once. He just looked at the cards, grunted, repeated my name. I said, "Yes, that's me." He told me what courses I would have the first year and then asked me to get up and make way for the next person. I came back to Minnesota immediately.

CAC: I was there in Berkeley at that very time and having quite the contrary relationship in the History Department where John Hicks took me under his wing, and was so gentle and understanding, and listened; so, they must have varied by department.

DC: They did. Just as a by-the-by, I was told when I was there and enrolled in Political Science that in History it was different; and the reason for it was that in History at Berkeley, in order to be admitted, some professor had to accept you personally, which was quite different.

CAC: John Hicks, who was a towering figure in his field, accepted me. He knew nothing about me except what was on paper; but, he accepted me because in 1911 when he was an undergraduate student at Northwestern University, he had roomed briefly with my second cousin who was much older than I. That was the only entrée I had. We had an interview for two hours and he said, "What are you going to study?" I said, "History." He said, "That won't do. What kind of history." I said, "Oh, I like all kinds of history." He said, "You better study with me." [laughter]

DC: Wonderful.

CAC: By such things . . . So, you came back and then you selected Mulford then as your advisor from the beginning or as a master's candidate?

DC: As a master's candidate. I was still in Far Eastern Area Studies. My master's lists me as a major in Far Eastern Area Studies. I continued with the Japanese language. Werner gave me over to Harold Quigley fully and I studied with Harold for my master's in that area. Then, what happened was I was looking for a teaching assistantship, having to support myself as the GI Bill was running out and there was one available in the Social Sciences program; so, I took that. That really changed the direction of my interests, career, and every which thing. It was out of that that I then changed to Political Science, per se, with a major in Political Theory and Mulford became my advisor.

CAC: That was a classical General Studies program?

DC: Right.

CAC: You were there not quite at its beginning but almost. Didn't that come in the mid 1940s?

DC: Right. The program in that form, in that particular form, came in 1946-1947. I was told, after I became a member of the Department of Sociology in 1967, by [Elio D.] Monachesi that a program of this sort had existed well back in the 1920s. I was unaware of it.

CAC: The program that is known in legendary fashion is the one that you entered as a very young man when it was very young.

DC: Yes.

CAC: Say a few more things about it. Were you assigned as a TA [teaching assistant] to a particular instructor, or a course, or a group of instructors?

DC: I was in the Social Sciences program, which then consisted of five senior professors. That included: Andreas Papandreou, now the prime minister of Greece; Arthur Naftalin, who was going to be mayor of Minneapolis soon thereafter and now Hubert Humphrey [Institute] professor; Benjamin Nelson who had gotten his degree in medieval history and was just publishing *The Idea of Usury, [from Tribal Brotherhood to Universal Otherhood]* and he became a stimulant for me to go into sociology very strongly; a sociologist named Don Calhoun, who is now teaching—almost nearing retirement—in a Florida university . . . I think the University of Miami but who was at that time an anarchial communitarian Wilhelm Reichian . . .

CAC: That's a good combination.

DC: Oh, god! it was. Yes, it was just crazy.

CAC: Wasn't Mulford part of that group?

DC: Yes, and Mulford Sibley. Before that, Werner Levi had been involved in the establishment of this program and it was Werner who suggested that I try to get a teaching assistantship. Levi had, by then, left . . . had just left it.

CAC: How long did that program manage, with vigor, to serve the undergraduates?

DC: With the vigor that attended its birth, it lasted until the time that some of the major professors began to leave. Nelson left by 1954 and, at that point, it was on rocky roads. Naftalin was getting out of it and the only one left in it really was Mulford Sibley. It had already come under criticism from some of the major departments in the college. Within the context of the university, the person who, perhaps, more than anybody else insisted on its being founded was T. R. McConnell.

CAC: Did you know him?

DC: Yes, I knew him.

CAC: Please say . . . very few people's memory incorporate McConnell.

DC: The context in which I knew him were contexts in which he was <u>very</u> critical of orthodox or conventional higher education. His aim in life was to reorganize the higher education in Minnesota . . . very distinctly. He led from a combination of Midwestern grassroots common sense with regard to higher education and a John Dewey orientation to the social functions of

education. That brought him into a series of conflicts with—I don't know how else to label them—an inherited tradition of the higher education.

CAC: And I would guess all the departmental fiefdoms.

DC: Yes.

CAC: I know in History that Ben Nelson—I was a very young instructor and kept my ears and eyes open—was bright and very good; but, the signals I got from my colleagues was there was something strange about Ben Nelson.

DC: Oh, yes.

CAC: We would have nothing to do with him in an official sense.

DC: There were several reasons for that with Ben. Ben was something else. Only if you want to get me going for two hours anecdotally on Ben Nelson . . .

CAC: Let's take five minutes.

DC: Oh, gee!

CAC: It was personalities like that that really created the energy for the General Studies program.

DC: That's right. But, even to ordinary people, Ben would come through as having pretensions to learning and he came through in a way in which many of the signals were that he may not really have been able to substantiate such pretensions. I was his teaching assistant over a very difficult period in his life when his wife left him having run off with a teaching assistant.

CAC: That's a reversal.

DC: Oh, god! He was extremely traumatized and I was very close to him at that time. I got to know him very, very well. He was a man of infinite learning. What did appear as pretensions . . . underneath was learning of great depth and amazing catholicity.

CAC: Was he able to translate that for undergraduate students?

DC: Oh, yes. Ben's ambitions for himself were to found, that is to establish, a subfield in the Social Sciences called Comparative Civilizational Analysis. By the end of his life—he died of a heart attack suddenly on a German train . . . died <u>alone</u> on his way to deliver a notable lecture

on Max Weber and civilizational analysis—he just about made it. He was much better known in Europe than he is here . . . especially in Germany. There are now, this year, being published *Festschrift*.

CAC: Heavens.

DC: There's one being published in the United States and then one just has been published in Germany on his approach to comparative civilizational analysis. At the time that I knew him, he was a medieval historian, as I said, having just published *The Idea of Usury* and had come from the University of Chicago where he was a sociologist in the Chicago College Social Sciences program. At the same time, he was being certified as a lay psychoanalyst in the Theodore Reik—R-E-I-K—School. He was for many years, much more because of his personality, a defender of orthodoxies in psychoanalysis and in sociology; so, his two heroic figures for him were [Sigmund] Freud and Max Weber. He would defend all attacks against Freud, not on grounds that Freud was the last word in science . . . not at all, but on grounds that Freud's learning and his humanity outdistanced all of his competitors and the same with Weber.

CAC: With this kind of a background, what went on in the classroom?

DC: I'm glad you asked.

CAC: I assume sophomores were in the class.

DC: Clarke, I am glad you asked that because the thought that I had just a few moments ago when you said, "What happened in the class?" . . . these were freshman students. They were straight out of Sleepy Eye, and Bemidji, and south Minneapolis. I was his teaching assistant for the Social Science sequence called Personality, then Work, and then Community. The first day, he would walk in, come to the podium, lay his books on the table. He had control and command of silence. He would look in such a fashion toward the ceiling that the students would be focused on his eyes and riveted on the spot at which he was looking. Then there was silence, at which point, he would bend forward at a forty-five degree angle and his eyes would glaze over as he'd address no one in particular and everyone at the same time, "Who has worked lately?"

CAC: Ahhh.

DC: "Who has done what work lately?" in a whispering voice and the students initial reaction was the man must be crazy or else he's teasing us . . . but, within five minutes. To the simple soul who responded, "I have," Ben would say, "Tell us. Tell us, indeed, what you've been doing." No matter what the work was, whether it was a bank teller, or a fast food clerk, or what, Ben would talk to the student publicly and the student would feel that it was the most important thing he had ever done in his life. Gradually, but very gradually, Ben would talk about the nature of the work and its connection with other work so that by the end of the first hour, the students would catch a sense of the relationship between their individual lives and the social

milieu with regard to work. By the same token, in the Personality class—I assisted in the Personality class—he did the same thing the first day, only he would lean forward within five minutes of the start of the class and ask the class, "Who among you has a mother?"

CAC: [laughter]

DC: "Who among you has a father?" In our sessions, in the readings that we had on how to teach Freud, he would startle everybody by saying that he never mentioned the work Freud and he never mentioned the word Oedipus complex; and, indeed, that was true. He allowed the students to read the material and he would talk to them about the same thing but without any reference to . . .

CAC: Were you able to model your own teaching style, classroom style, on this or is this not really repeatable?

DC: I have tried occasionally to do this; but, I'm not as successful as he was . . . not really.

CAC: Whom else did you assist?

DC: I assisted Papandreou and that was a disaster for me because Papandreou began at the total other end of the spectrum in a class on Work. He would begin by writing left-wing Keynesian equations on the board and then trying to explain to the class of freshmen what a delta meant and what the proper formula for the relationship between investment, income, savings, unemployment is. Papandreou always talked to an audience of his peers, no matter who was in the room.

CAC: Why do you think these people left? Why did Ben leave? Why did Andreas leave?

DC: I know why Andreas left. Andreas left because he was looking to leave. He was looking to increase his salary and his status. He left because he had a fine temporary offer from Berkeley, which he believed would turn into a permanent offer; and within a few years, he was at Northwestern and then back to Berkeley. Papandreou was a master, within the ethics of the academic marketplace, of the manipulation of the properly received telegram. I was present. This is not gossip. It's firsthand information. I assisted Papandreou in the preparation of the second volume of the text that we use in the Social Sciences sequence. I forget the exact year of that summer—it was in the late 1940s—when Papandreou was renting the [Malcolm] Willey house, which is the Frank Lloyd Wright house in Prospect Park [Minneapolis] and I had to come there and meet with him regularly in the preparation of the text. I was around when the offers from various places came and he tutored me in how academically to arrange for and receive them properly.

CAC: [laughter] So career ambition accounts for him?

DC: Yes.

CAC: Ben Nelson left . . . ?

DC: Ben Nelson left to go to Hofstra [University] and then from Hofstra, he became chairman at [State University of New York at] Stony Brook when Stony Brook was just established. Ben Nelson wanted to return to the east. He did.

CAC: You're also recalling a kind of, if not hostile, inhospitable environment once McConnell was gone?

DC: Yes, right. Once McConnell was gone, there was a change in the context of the college such that the idea of, what Michigan State was to call, a basic college program, that is, the first two years spent in general education. That became rather unpopular in many quarters within the college. That resulted in a whole series of meetings and investigations. Ben Nelson told Dean Russell Cooper, who at that time was the associate dean of CLA [College of Liberal Arts] and the head of the Department of General Studies, "I did not accept an invitation to come here in 1948 to become a bull in a bullring." He left. Ben could never take the onslaughts of people about him.

CAC: Did you have contact with the people in the Humanities side of the General Studies program because they were often of the same kind of disposition and talent.

DC: We officed together and we all met, being in the same department, when it was the Department of General Studies and when the ideology was that there would be some kind of comprehensive interconnection among the humanities, and natural sciences, and the social sciences in this department, that is General Studies. We often met together. We were housed in Temporary North of Mines . . . that building. The building itself must contain memories.

CAC: Saul Bellow was here then?

DC: Bellow, and Jack Ludwig, Isaac Rosenfeld . . .

CAC: [gasp] Yes!

DC: Yes. And William Phillips even came for awhile. Ralph Ross, who was the head of it, made sure that many people were called and, of course, John Berryman.

CAC: John Berryman was here that early?

DC: Berryman came . . . I can't tell you immediately the exact year; but, Berryman was certainly here beyond . . .

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

CAC: We were talking about the people in the Humanities side of the program. It was, as I think back upon them, such a high level and high energy group.

DC: Incredible.

CAC: Think of the literary criticism with Bellow [unclear] that come out of this.

DC: Yes. Bellow was a good scholar. Berryman was an even finer scholar; but, the best scholar of all is now one of the most notable persons in his field. For a year of so, there was Joe Frank, the [Fyodor Mikhailovich] Dostoevsky scholar.

CAC: Heavens.

DC: He's gotten world renown for publishing the multi-volume literary biography of Dostoevsky, which everybody agrees is the finest thing. This is a very, very serious man who had a speech impediment; but, when he gave papers in closed faculty seminars, they were just magnificent. We all had to, in an attempt to develop an esprit de corps, all of us, had to research, write, and deliver papers in a seminar, in a joint Humanities/Social Sciences seminar because Nelson and Ross had a plan to merge somehow the intellectual content of the Social Sciences and the Humanities. It was okay with Bellow because Bellow said, "It means for awhile that I'm back to my old love, anthropology, and I like that." When we would hear papers by people like Joe Frank, they were just incredibly good.

CAC: I suspect that the university community generally, even in the Arts College, had little appreciation or even knowledge of this going on.

DC: I think so.

CAC: It was perceived quite differently from the outside.

DC: Yes, it was. That's right.

CAC: How many young persons like yourself, do you suppose, shared that experience and would have been turned on? Was this a significant number of people who had that stimulus at the beginning of their career as apprentices?

DC: Yes, I'm sure of it. There were five of us who were teaching assistants in the Social Sciences and about seven or eight in the Humanities program. We just shared one large office in the basement of Temporary North of Mines together. We would always cross-discussing.

CAC: Was Phil Siegelman part of that group?

DC: Yes, Phil was part of the group.

CAC: But, by the early to mid 1950s, the instructors and that whole team is just gone?

DC: Beginning to disband, yes. By 1954-1955, that was it.

CAC: What's left is the Humanities program?

DC: That's right, which you know well.

CAC: Ralph Ross, uniquely, stayed on for a long time in that program; but, the others all fled.

DC: Yes, absolutely. I was the next to the penultimate chairman of the Social Sciences program. I came back to the university in 1955 after having left for a year. In 1960-1961, I became chairman of the program until 1966 when Hy Berman took over. After that, it just went under.

CAC: But, by that time, they were drawing primarily from persons in the disciplines on loan?

DC: Yes, that's right.

CAC: They didn't have that core staff. You're really talking about a core staff.

DC: The core staff was gone.

CAC: I remember my friend, John Wolf, who was one of the few persons from a department who participated in it, thought so well of Ralph Ross and the two of them worked out some of that Humanities business; but, I think John must have been a unique person—in that sense, coming from a department.

DC: There were a few others. Wasn't John Bowditch in History?

CAC: Oh, yes. But, he didn't have the force of John Wolf.

DC: No, that's quite true.

CAC: While all of this was going on, you were also having to leap all of the hurdles as a graduate student. Tell us a bit about your regular course work, and seminars, and work in collateral fields. You had this other excitement to your life.

DC: Right. That was total excitement always. I must say my graduate work in Political Science, for the most part, wasn't matched with that excitement. One would hope it wouldn't. I mean there's a good deal of just ordinary hard labor in the mines, as one knows. I put my time in that way in various Political Science courses. I must tell you, for an historian though, this

should get into the archives somewhere or other. I was taking a seminar from William Anderson, known as Mr. Minnesota.

CAC: Oh, yes.

DC: He was then the head of the Department of Political Science and quite notable around the state. His scientific ideology was straight Midwestern . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

DC: . . . progressivist Positivism with a capital *P*. He would preach at us about the need to learn the facts, the facts and nothing but the facts. He had a vague and most illogical inductive sense of things. One day, we were in seminar. It was a seminar in federalism and we were talking about intergovernmental relations and a student is giving a boring report, a terribly boring report on how the federal government records automobile license plates from lists produced by the states—only William Anderson is interested in this—when there's a knock on the door. Anderson looks a little perturbed, and he goes to the door, and opens it, and an old man, a <u>very</u> old man comes in with a bent neck wearing Victorian hightop shoes. It was like a visit from Saint Nicholas or someone else. William Anderson, who at that time must have been in his late fifties—I'm in my late fifties but I'm sure I wasn't as old as he was; he acted as if were a grand elder statesman of sorts—blushed to the roots of his white hair. His white hair started turning red as he brought this man in and introduced him to us as <u>his</u> teacher . . .

CAC: [gasp]

DC: . . . when William Anderson was an undergraduate at the University of Minnesota. This goes back years, and years, and years. The man is introduced to us as Frank Anderson.

CAC: Frank Malloy Anderson?

DC: Frank Malloy Anderson.

CAC: Ohhh!

DC: Right. In a crackling voice, the old man, Frank Malloy Anderson, told us about the antics of young Bill here and just embarrassed the life out of Bill Anderson telling tales of how Bill Anderson behaved as a younger man. Then, we got into his talking about American history. He said, "To tell you really how young this country is, let me tell you that my grandfather knew a man who knew George Washington."

CAC: Ahhh.

DC: All of us in the classroom started counting the generations. We were able to say, "I met a man whose grandfather knew a man who knew George Washington." [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] I think too often we say in America that we have no sense of place and no sense of time.

DC: Yes.

CAC: My memory goes way back because of ancestors. I feel quite at home with Lincoln's generation because my mother told stories. I would guess that Bill Anderson's—as you describe it—Midwestern positivism represented the mainline of the Political Science Department, with a few exceptions, at that time? This would have been a prevailing kind of confidence.

DC: It was one of the prevailing types. I also took seminars from and was very influenced, at that time, by Herbert McCloskey, now at Berkeley. McCloskey was making the transition from comparative political science as a discursive speculative study to his brand of empiricism, which wasn't the same as positivism. He's now, and for many years here at Minnesota before he left for Berkeley, doing survey research on attitudes and opinions. There's a story there. He especially wanted to show the truth about how conservatives really think. At the same time, Mulford Sibley, who was not a positivist nor an empiricist, and Benjamin Lippincott, who did not make his mark in empiricism or in positivism at all . . . in fact, for Lippincott, empiricism and positivism were adversaries, very strong adversaries. Most of the people in Political Science were people like Lennox Mills, who were interested in, call it, essayistic commentary on politics. Harold Quigley certainly was of this sort. Quigley and Lennox Mills taught that you can't do political science without history and almost all of us became history buffs. Most of my peers were minors in history—for various reasons, I minored in psychology—and that was the orientation. It was Anderson who spewed this rather evangelical species of positivism. I say evangelical advisedly because our major textbook, in the seminar that we all had to take called Scope and Methods of Political Science, was the sociologist George Lundberg's text, who had just left Minnesota and the title of the text was *Can Science Save Us*? Anderson taught that text as if he were the son of a minister or a minister himself . . . only science can save you.

CAC: Lloyd Short would have been of that camp?

DC: Yes. Lloyd was someone non-ideological.

CAC: More skeptical.

DC: Lloyd was in public administration.

CAC: You're really describing a pluralistic department.

DC: Yes, it was.

CAC: Yet, Bill Anderson, at least from the outside again, was the towering figure that people would have identified as Political Science at Minnesota.

DC: Absolutely. Right.

CAC: You worked with Mr. Sibley on what dissertation?

DC: My dissertation was called "Power, Force, and Violence." It was an analysis of, then, contemporary sociological theories, especially the theory of Weber and [Talcott] Parsons as it might apply to traditional political theory . . . [John] Locke, John Stuart Mill, and so on.

CAC: You really were interdisciplinary, in some part, by natural disposition and perhaps, in some part, because of your General Studies . . . ?

DC: It was the General Studies influence. That dissertation was inspired largely by Nelson and what Nelson taught me about the significance of Max Weber. It was that that did it.

CAC: You had work in Psychology but also some work in History?

DC: Yes, right. I had started, as a matter of fact, as a History minor. I took courses from Herbert Heaton and from—I like him so much—Rodney Loehr . . . American History, especially American economic history. I took quite a number of seminars from Rodney.

CAC: Rodney was a student of Herbert Heaton.

DC: Oh.

CAC: There you found the philosophical point of view empirical also?

DC: With Rodney . . . lots of what I would call historicist, that is, the exploration of the detailed, richly surfaced texture of a particular field. I don't think there were any epistemological presuppositions. With Heaton, I certainly began to in the first days of any course. I took a course from him in European civilization and it sounded very much like a social history version, a Toynbee-esque version, of western civilization.

CAC: He was a Yorkshire man . . . very British for all of that.

DC: Extremely British, yes . . . extremely so.

CAC: A. L. Burt was in the History Department then and Lennox Mills. There must have been quite a few of these Britishers.

DC: There was a British contingent that was quite strong. They gathered together. Lennox Mills . . . even the clothing that Mills wore was British Army clothing.

CAC: [laughter]

DC: He wore clodhoppers straight out of British Army issue and always with a military shirt, even though, I'm pretty sure, Mills was Canadian by birth.

CAC: A. L. Burt was, too.

DC: That's right.

CAC: These Britishers . . . a Yorkshire man and a couple of Canadians who were, perhaps, more British in their loyalty to the empire than any.

DC: Absolutely.

CAC: Lennox Mills taught the empire.

DC: That's what he taught . . . constantly.

CAC: With enthusiasm, one imagines.

DC: With great enthusiasm and much to the consternation and disdain of us returned vets who were sure that we hadn't fought World War II, even though it was in the United States, for the preservation of any empire, British, French, or otherwise.

CAC: After you got your degree, you then settled into what? You mentioned earlier that you were away for a year. Was that just after your dissertation?

DC: Right. I received a post-doctorate Rockefeller fellowship in law and totalitarian ideology. I went to Columbia University to study. I was supposed to have studied with Franz Neumann. The month I got to Columbia, he was killed in an automobile accident in Switzerland; so, I was largely on my own there.

CAC: But then, you came back to Minnesota? What was your career then as a very young apprentice?

DC: I came back as an instructor in the Social Science program. I had looked for a position and had actually been interviewed for one-year positions at the University of Rhode Island and at Clark University in Worcester, Massachusetts. Since those were temporary positions and the offer here in the Social Science program was on a tenure track, I decided to come back here.

CAC: Then, you achieved tenure within that program?

DC: Within that program, right.

CAC: Toward the tag end of that, then the program disappears. Was that the climate of the college? Did [Errett W.] McDiarmid play any role in that? Is this early [E.W.-"Easy"] Ziebarth or late McDiarmid?

DC: It's really middle to late McDiarmid. Having said that, McDiarmid did not take any leadership role in disestablishing the Social Science program or the Department of General Studies. It was transformed, at a date that I do not remember, into the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, which meant basically that the linkage between Social Science and Humanities began to dissolve and there were not to be any core appointments. This occurred really at the behest of the conventional departments and as a result of several investigations and reports. McDiarmid just rubber-stamped that, more or less.

CAC: Why did the Humanities program, of these several, persist still?

DC: I don't know. Clarke, I really don't know. My memory suggests that, at least, the major report that disestablished the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies looked forward to the time when there would be a withering away of the Social Science and the Humanities programs; but, the Humanities program managed to linger on. One of the very legitimate reasons for it so doing was that it always attracted a fairly large number of students and very legitimately so; since the bread and butter Humanities courses consisted of the literature greats and the classics contemporaneous with the great books of literature in, say, social, and political, and economic thought. Hence, a freshman student was able to read in one quarter [Jean Jacques] Rousseau's *Social Contract* and [Leo] Tolstoy's *War and Peace* and have it make sense. They really got something out of it, which wasn't quite the same with a Social Science student being able to read [Émile] Durkheim and Max Weber and have this allegedly apply to some ongoing aspect of a community in the Twin Cities. That combination is harder to make intrinsically.

CAC: Yes, and yet, we seem almost every five or eight years in the college to reinvent ways to cross departments. We had Cross-Disciplinary Studies in the early 1970s as a way to try to pull this off again.

DC: That's right.

CAC: Russell Cooper left also, didn't he, somewhere in this?

DC: Yes.

CAC: I suppose because he saw the writing on the wall and didn't want to go down with the ship?

DC: No. With Russell—again, memory fails about the date when he left—left when the ship was already on the way down. He had to be told, "There's probably no future for you in anything having to do with interdisciplinary studies. If you want to stay on as some assistant to a dean in CLA, fine." That was not for him. He was always looking for a position where his own views of higher education could be administered; so, he went to the University of South Florida, where for the rest of his life, he was able to do what he wanted.

CAC: As I recall, his departure really left the program without the kind of leadership . . . it might have stuck on for awhile longer.

DC: Absolutely. Before Cooper—just to conclude this—the person who always gave General Studies some amount of stature was J. [W.] Buchta. Buchta chaired the department before Cooper. Buchta was a physicist from the Natural Sciences and his incredibly civilized and, yet, firm sense of administration managed to overcome and tie together a great amount of what otherwise would have been chaos.

CAC: It's interesting that mathematicians, astronomers, and physicists frequently rescue the Humanities, the other liberal arts better than others.

DC: Yes, right.

CAC: When the Social Science program faded, it was at that point that you came into Sociology?

DC: Yes. I was invited in at the end of 1966. The person who argued strenuously for me was my erstwhile colleague Greg Stone who always had a more multifaceted and dramatic vision of what Sociology should be than many others; although, several people who had been antagonistic to Social Science, as such, like Arnold Rose, were very eager to have people who had been in the Social Science program come into Sociology. I knew Arnold very well. We had spent a summer at Harvard together on a fellowship. Arnold was very insistent that I be admitted as well. So, between Stone, and Rose, and a few others . . .

CAC: These were the days of Monachesi's rule.

DC: Yes, indeed . . . although, I knew [Stuart] Chapin, too, who had antedated Monachesi.

CAC: We've talked a good deal about Political Science. Before we go on to college and university affairs, maybe we should pause to do some things with Sociology then. As I look at the names of persons who were here when you were entering Sociology—although, you would have known them as a member of the college before hand—it does include Arnold Rose and Greg Stone, certainly towering figures in their own, Henry Rieken, John Sirgimaki, Don Martindale, Lowry Nelson, George Vold, Ed Gross. That's a strong department.

DC: Yes, indeed. I knew all of them fairly well.

CAC: Yet, one gets a sense from the outside—I hope I'm not leading you too strongly . . . you're strong enough; you'll resist it—that it's a time in which there had been only two chairpersons for a hundred years: Chapin and Monachesi. Monachesi was there from 1949 to 1970!

DC: That's right.

CAC: Almost all of the accounts, the legends but also the archives, would document this. A department for all of its individual brilliance was terribly torn asunder. Am I leading you into areas that you'd like to comment on?

DC: It was torn asunder in the sense that there were always a fair number of individuals who chafed at Monachesi's management of the department. It was rather autocratic. What Monachesi said went and any independent scholar—he didn't have to be a sociologist—could not really have lived with that.

CAC: But, people lived with it for twenty years.

DC: It's my impression, Clarke—I'd love to do a little empirical investigation—that the turnover of personnel, especially of young personnel, was fairly rapid. Those people who stayed on for longer periods, like George Vold who was an estimable person, would just stay away from department management unless there was a severe crisis knowing that you really couldn't fight Monachesi for too long successfully. We had many people who came and went—it's like the Minnesota Twins.

CAC: Like Henry Riecken? Would he be an example?

DC: Henry would be an example. Yet another example would be Theodore Caplow.

CAC: Oh, yes.

DC: Caplow right now is a very well-known sociologist, not only well-known but a remarkable man with regard to the many, many different areas in which he's published and published very well. But, he left because of the Monachesi business. Murray Straus . . .

CAC: Of course.

DC: We got to the point where Murray couldn't stand the sight of Monachesi, absolutely. They cursed one another in the halls as they passed. There were stayers. Reuben Hill, who is just emeritus a little while ago, was here for quite some time; and although, Reuben and Monachesi

banged heads on quite a number of occasions, I think Reuben stayed on because Reuben was committed to the University of Minnesota very strongly.

CAC: And he had the autonomous center.

DC: That's right.

CAC: Or maybe, it wasn't autonomous. I don't know what that structure is.

DC: It was when Reuben was with it and it still is now in form; but, when Reuben was with it, it was autonomous in many more strenuous ways because it had a large research budget from the federal government and other grants, which it doesn't have quite now. So, not only was it somewhat autonomous in form but Reuben was able to do his research apart from what Monachesi was about.

CAC: You and I have been in this college a long time and I guess my question here is one I cannot answer for myself. I don't understand how the college, as a community, would allow the disintegration of a department because really of the leadership style of one person. I'm sure that what we're sharing is true.

DC: Yes.

CAC: In a Rankean sense true.

DC: [laughter] It is. When you say the disintegration of a department, the odd thing is that from the point of view, say, national reputation and national reputation scores, which are the weakest of all possible ways of judging a department . . .

CAC: They're the most unreliable.

DC: They're very unreliable, yes. From that point of view, if one considers that during the Monachesi rule, there was Arnold Rose who was publishing very widely, Martindale was here and publishing also, Vold was very well-known in criminology and then there was a person who was my own teacher, Cliff Kirkpatrick, who was publishing extensively in family studies. These were notable figures between the years 1945 to 1970. They stayed on during the Monachesi reign for reasons I don't quite understand. They all managed to do it. There was also residual in the reputation of the department—Chapin's reputation—so that the reputation of the department began to decline nationally after 1970, not until then . . . since one might figure that reputations decline at a lag rate after, in fact, a department begins to go under. The decade 1970 to 1980 was particularly difficult for Sociology. Monachesi retired in 1970; within a year, he died. Then, there was absolutely no strong hand in the department, nor did anyone in the department want a strong hand, having suffered under Monachesi. This now was when "Easy" Ziebarth was dean. Then "Easy" gave way to Frank Sorauf and Frank Sorauf subsequently gave way to [Fred]

Lukermann. This was the time of the first retrenchment and reallocations. That began in 1971. That was the time that Sociology began to do relatively poorly in the allocation of funds within the university and the college; so, within the college, the sense of Sociology as a department that's going under begins to appear in the mid 1970s. Arnold Rose dies of cancer. Carolyn Rose, his wife who is also very well-known, came on in 1967-1968. Then, she died of cancer in the mid 1970s.

CAC: Yes.

DC: I think the decline in the department, so far as reputation goes, is different than, say, the physical mobility of people in and out of the department.

CAC: Those are helpful observations. As you know, I've done some archival background reading for each of these interviews. I must say that one thing in the long list of things I can't really understand is your constitution. There are references to a council that apparently had authority rather than the department in the 1970s? It seemed to say that.

DC: That easily explainable.

CAC: Please, do.

DC: As my former student, Garrison Keillor, put it in a recent *New Yorker* story, "Most people are renown for very unremarkable kinds of things." One of my claims to fame is that I fathered the constitution of the department.

CAC: I see. I came to the right place.

DC: My secret, absolute culture hero in American life is James Madison; so, the idea that I may have done something like Madison . . . In fact, without telling my colleagues in Sociology, I had Madison's papers before me when I drafted the constitution.

CAC: [laughter]

DC: I thought it would be quite good for a department that had been ground up in factions to impose a Newtonian machinery that would result in liberty and not tyranny with such a constitution.

CAC: You started with Madison's "Number Ten."

DC: Right. But the word *council* simply means the combination of all faculty, who have a right to vote, and student representatives. Student representatives are not part of the department, per se, that's all; so, the word *council* simply means the student reps who had the right to vote.

CAC: This was in 1972 or 1973?

DC: That's right, 1972 or 1973.

CAC: This is the first time that students have been given a vote in departmental matters?

DC: The whole issue of students being given a vote was tightly connected with the civil rights movements and Vietnam at the end of the 1960s.

CAC: Sure. They vote on . . . not on personnel or hiring?

DC: No.

CAC: They vote on matters of curriculum?

DC: Largely educational policy matters.

CAC: You were able to engage students effectively?

DC: At that time, there was nothing that we could do to prevent it. At the end of the 1960s, there was quite a massive revolt of graduate students in the Department of Sociology.

CAC: So, this is primarily graduate students and not undergraduates who are represented?

DC: Almost totally graduate students. Now, however, undergraduates do have a single representative or a single vote in the department.

CAC: It's at this time that you go into a rotating chairmanship instead of a headship?

DC: That's right. George Bjornstad became the first chair and I was the associate chair in 1970 to 1973.

CAC: One should not ask the author of the constitution but . . . Do you have a feeling that with the troubles, at least administratively, that the department had that this was a positive step?

DC: Oh, Clarke, any constitution would have been a positive step. [laughter] There was no constitution before then.

CAC: Down to 1970 or to your constitution of 1973, how were tenure and promotion decisions made within the department?

DC: Similar to the way in which they are made now. A committee on promotion and tenure . . .

CAC: Which there was even under Monachesi?

DC: Yes . . . would review a candidate's work and then report it out to the department. There certainly are major differences, largely because of the events in the college and university that you're well aware of in recent years.

CAC: Yes, yes.

DC: The Department of Sociology falls under the same strictures that other departments do. When I was chair from 1980 to 1983, we got [unclear], [unclear], whatever you want with regard to the obsessive kinds of regulations that we had to follow; but, the principle was the same.

CAC: How were matters of salary and merit determined under Monachesi and then these were changed? Do you open up or what happens in the early 1970s?

DC: Under Monachesi, Monachesi determined who would get what amount of money. The executive committee and a committee on promotion and tenure under Monachesi's reign would give advice to Monachesi. The advice, very often, consisted of people who were close to Monachesi at the time—that would vary—who would recommend to him that *X* get paid such and such, or why did Smith get such and such, Jones get such and such? It was very messy, extremely so and with lots of loss of morale, especially among younger people. By 1970, this had been changed. George Bjornstad, who is now the chair at Indiana, tried very quickly . . . his aim was, within a comparatively short period of time, to remake the department into an absolute number one department. For George, that meant increase the rate of publications, increase the status of the department at Minnesota around the nation, and bring the reputation back to what it was, say, ten years previously.

CAC: That was some order.

DC: It was. He was very ambitious about doing it.

CAC: As I read the documents—correct me—at that time, Mr. Martindale had, all by himself, more graduate students to advise than the rest of the department put together.

DC: Right.

CAC: How did one handle that? I assume that Bjornstad had to worry about that.

DC: Bjornstad simply put a moratorium on the number of students Martindale would have. As you well know, that resulted in the writing and publication of a book by Martindale, *The Romance of a Profession.*

CAC: Yes, I read that in preparation.

DC: [laughter]

CAC: Should the readers of that be alerted to any particular . . . it's rather clear what Don is up to; but, are there any hidden agendas there that the readers should know about?

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

DC: I can remember the first time I opened it with some consternation because some of my colleagues, who had already read it, were furious. Some were seriously thinking of suing Martindale and had already hired attorneys to review the book for slander and libel. No one ever sued. I must say, I was personally relieved to find that I was not listed among the Satans of the Department of Sociology, nor was I listed as a saint. The reference to me was neutral. The plot of the book is very Hegelian. The whole sense of the book is the rise and decline of the Department of Sociology. Chapter one starts with references to the birth of the republic with the founding fathers and, soon thereafter, it continues, if I can parse it in Hegelian fashion . . . the absolute spirit hovers around Chicago . . .

CAC: [laughter]

DC: . . . and all right reason seems to be flourishing at Chicago with the Chicago School of Sociologists in the 1920s. Then, what Martindale is suggesting, among other things, is that the absolute spirit seems to be drifting westward in its Frederick Jackson Turner course for the most energetic frontier. The department in the early 1920s with such people as [Pitirim] Sorokin, and Zimmerman, and other greats here, Martindale is saying that really Minnesota would have been a number one department. Then, midway through Chapin's administration, his first wife died, he meets and marries someone else; and it's at that point that you get a [unclear] decline in the department. I don't want to sound supercilious.

CAC: I read it. That's what he says.

DC: That's indeed what he says. Then, he very seriously marks and measures the decline of the department with the advent of Bjornstad and with Monachesi moving away; although, the last five years or so of Monachesi's administration allegedly is filled with corruption of every which sort, not necessarily on Monachesi's part but on the part of some of Martindale's colleagues who are still living and whom he claims received extra benefits in regards to salary advances under the table.

CAC: Why did your colleagues not sue? That question occurred to me as I read parts of it.

DC: I don't know. I never talked with them much further about that. I just never did and I just don't know, Clarke. Knowing one of them, I think that he felt that a dramatic display of dirty

linen in the courts and in public is not the route for his particular religious path; but, I never talked with him about that. I don't know why Bjornstad never sued because Bjornstad was furious.

CAC: And Roy Francis doesn't come off very well.

DC: No, and I've never talked with Roy about it. I don't know.

CAC: I think maybe we should turn to other related matters. To go back to the mid 1960s, now you were a member of the Sociology Department but also very active in college affairs and, perhaps, partly because of the Social Science program connection?

DC: Yes.

CAC: That puts you beyond the usual departmental territory. As I look at the record, it takes several forms. One is participation in leadership in organizations like the AAUP [American Association of University Professors] and the Federation, the union. Maybe that would be the next item agenda. Do you recall how you got into the AAUP, and what you thought one could do with it, and how successful it was in dealing with college and university-wide programs?

DC: My interest in the AAUP goes way back to the 1950s when I received the Rockefeller fellowship. When I spent it in New York City, I got to know very well some people who were at Columbia University and involved with the AAUP, just in general talking with them about higher education and so on. I got involved in their doings. Then, when I came back here, as you've said, many of my friends especially outside the Social Science program and in other departments, in Political Science and History, were members of the AAUP . . . and in other colleges. I knew Bob Beck very well; Bob was deeply involved. I knew Burnham Terrell. My interest was always high in that area. Exactly how I rose through the ranks of the local AAUP, I don't remember, to tell you the truth. You may even have had something to do with it?

CAC: I think you succeeded me as president, somewhere like in 1966.

DC: I succeeded you as president in 1966-1967. Why and how . . . I must confess, I am somewhat unclear.

CAC: Do you have a sense of the AAUP's agenda during the mid 1960s . . . of its relationship with the university, the issues that we were concerned with? Mr. [Meredith] Wilson was the president.

DC: I don't have a sharp sense. Among the issues certainly was academic freedom and that was one of the things that always related me to the AAUP. Through the McCarthy era, it seemed to me that the AAUP was a catholic institution. It wasn't only a place where intellectual social scientists circulated but people from Medicine participated and IT [Institute of Technology]. It

was a way in which we could feel certain and secure in our own defense of academic and scholarly values. That was always a part of the attractiveness of it to me. I remember receiving a shock—just to get anecdotal a bit—when I became chair of AAUP on campus. I formally wrote a note to O. Meredith Wilson asking for a meeting with him, and didn't received a reply for some weeks, and then I called his secretary. The secretary said, "Oh, yes. He's been busy. He has received your letter and he will acknowledge it." I got an acknowledgment, which was very brief, and quite formal, even though I knew Meredith Wilson. I had known him fairly well before that. Then, when I came into his office after the interview had been set up, he said to me very distinctly—the first words were—"I want you to know that I am receiving you not because you're president of the AAUP but because we knew one another as scholars in academics. I don't recognize the validity of an organization of academics aside from the individual members of the organization." That kind of startled me because the AAUP was not a union. It was a guild, at best, trying to behave occasionally like the AMA [American Medical Association]. I knew the logic of what he was trying to say; but, I never suspected that he had that attitude. Incidentally, had you had any relationships of that sort with him? Yes?

CAC: I also remember—to make this a conversation as well as an interview—that within seven or eight days of Mr. Wilson's coming to campus in the summer of 1960 that Ben Lippincott, who was then president, I think, or at least an officer, and a former friend and colleague of yours, invited Mr. Wilson for a steak fry in his backyard of that lovely home that he had. One issue emerged more than others connected with the planning of the West Bank and that was the desperate need, seeing the die was cast and we were going to go across the river, to have a large major library on the West Bank. I am just certain that was the first exposure Mr. Wilson had had to such a vehement presentation of that point view. As I recall, within six weeks, he made that his first priority of his administration. I think the same thing was true on the faculty retirement. He had advice not only from the AAUP but from the Faculty Welfare Committee of the Senate and many other places; but, I would suspect that he listened to the AAUP, maybe just because they were individuals—what you're saying—and not because they represented a power block.

DC: Quite true.

CAC: Some years later you were active in the union?

DC: Oh, yes, much more recently. I was a vice-president in the UMEA, the University of Minnesota Educational Association, in our efforts to unionize.

CAC: You weren't on the UMFT [University of Minnesota Federation of Teachers] side?

DC: No, no. I only came on after the UMFT had been dropped; although, there was a brief period <u>way</u> back in 1940. It must have been in the very 1940s when Art Naftalin tried to organize . . .

CAC: Bravo!

DC: . . . an AFT [American Federation of Teachers] chapter in order to have representation against the Communist wing of the DFL [Democratic Farmer Labor Party] on guise that if we could get a chapter up and a chartered chapter, at which Art Naftalin might be some kind of officer, then this would be another vote in some Twin Cities area or a Minnesota union fight within the DFL.

CAC: It would help Mr. Humphrey down his side, right?

DC: That's right.

CAC: How marvelous.

DC: But, that was very short-lived.

CAC: When you come into it in the 1970s, it's on the side of the UMEA?

DC: The UMEA.

CAC: Your expectation was for collective bargaining at that time?

DC: That's right . . . that is, I was hoping that unionization might result in some effective collective bargaining. My basic economic fear was that faculty salaries were quickly eroding.

CAC: They certainly were.

DC: That was significant in my move away from the AAUP and in the direction of the union.

CAC: You were also advisor to the student Americans for Democratic Action [ADA]?

DC: That's right.

CAC: What dates are those?

DC: Something like 1964, 1965, 1966, or maybe even a little earlier than that. I'm not sure if I have any documentary letters or evidence of it left. There was a student Americans for Democratic Action group on campus.

CAC: These were mostly undergraduates?

DC: Seniors and graduate students.

CAC: How did you find working with them? What were their concerns? This is before the real student activism?

DC: It was before the real student activism. It was at a time . . . the late [President John F.] Kennedy years, which gave rise to a residual liberalism, a very, very late New Deal liberalism. There were young student leaders whose careers were set on becoming attorneys and then politicians in the Hubert Humphrey sense or just slightly to the left of Hubert Humphrey. At that same time, there were some members of the SDS [Students for a Democratic Society]. It was going strongly, too. It was just starting up. There were struggles between the SDS and the student chapter of the ADA. There was an attempt to infiltrate the ADA by some members of the SDS; so, I was involved as an advisor for the ADA. I think a colleague of yours was, too, involved in one way or another . . . David Noble.

CAC: I see. You were able to help the students identify those who were presumably infiltrating?

DC: We knew those who were. They didn't make a secret of them.

CAC: So, what could be done?

DC: I can remember pleading, at meetings that lasted for a long period of time, with the students from the SDS to stay in their own organization, not try to be double members of the SDS and the ADA, not to try to absorb the ADA. I was involved also, at the same time, in student NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] and the beginning of black militant, Black Power movements.

CAC: These were overlapping memberships and leaderships among the students?

DC: Yes, very much so.

CAC: Did you meet the same characters in different settings?

DC: Some people were tripley and quadrupley membered and would go to the same meetings. I also worked, at the time, with people in the dean of students' office in a rather odd and contorted way because these were the [Edmund] Williamson years—I know I'm rambling a bit.

CAC: Oh, no!

DC: These were the Dean Williamson years and I had many, many . . . as a matter of fact, my first run-ins with Dean Williamson came about in the following way: the NAACP had attempted to be infiltrated by people I had then identified as members of the Communist Party, that is, these were student members. I became an officer of the campus chapter of the NAACP in a successful move to resist Communist infiltration. Almost within the same year, some black students

discovered—called then Negro students—that Dean Williamson's housing office was noting on cards any communication from a landlord, "No Negroes accepted in this house." We went to Dean Williamson and said, "This is discrimination." I remember meeting with him in his office as he said, "You're absolutely stupid! This isn't discrimination and so long as I'm dean of students, we're going to continue to make these notations." The arguments were just fantastic. This was early on. This was in the late 1940s because I was a teaching assistant yet in the Social Science program.

CAC: Heavens.

DC: I can tell you an anecdote.

CAC: Please, do.

DC: No, no. [laughter] I signed this release form. This should be off the record. It really should; although, it's absolutely true. It involves the graduate student who seduced Ben Nelson's wife.

CAC: Oh, yes.

It was at just about the same year that Dean Williamson prevented this graduate student from enrolling as a graduate student on grounds that this said graduate student had been a conscientious objector, which he had been. The graduate student then insisted on enrolling as a student. Williamson objected and Williamson brought charges against the graduate student on grounds that he had committed an immoral action, namely, he had spent two nights with his girlfriend. These great scholars, Art Naftalin, and Ben Nelson, and Don Calhoun appeared at a hearing in support of this particular graduate student, who has since become a noted English professor at the University of San Diego. The hearing resulted in Williamson being overturned, much to Williamson's consternation. It turned out that this male graduate student was married to the girlfriend and had been putting all of these professors on.

CAC: [laughter]

DC: It was just incredible. In that same year, it was either 1948 or 1949, Williamson had insisted that where a call came in from a landlord or [unclear] specifying "No Blacks," that that would be taken down [on the cards]. One of our victories was that Williamson was told to stop it.

CAC: By whom?

DC: By President [James Lewis] Morrill. Indeed, he backed down and subsequently, within the next few years, Williamson had a distinct change of heart and, as you probably know, was very much in favor of rights for all minorities.

CAC: I would imagine all this activity led you logically to be the choice of President Wilson then to chair what I see as an ad hoc committee on the univerisity's role on social problems in the mid 1960s. That, in turn, led to the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs [CURA]. This is an important kind of development. I invite you to comment on your relationship with President Wilson in that regard, what his expectations were, what this ad hoc committee was able to do, etcetera.

DC: The committee that I chaired recommended that the university did become involved in the social context in which the university then found itself, not in civil rights absolutely. It had been the sense of committee that the university was not presenting itself in an accessible way to members of the community that we thought needed it. For example, an analysis of the income levels of people attending the university, as undergraduates enrolling in the university, indicated that income had a lot to do with who would, would not, become a member of the university. The results of our investigation also indicated that simply providing more scholarship aid would not really do it since young blacks, at the time . . . their high school education and the drop-out rate did not make them probably successful candidates for university enrollment. The upshot of our recommendation was to ask the university to become involved at one step preliminary to where students enrolled, namely, to present itself in local communities in an attractive fashion to people who just didn't know beforehand what the university was about. After Wilson received our report, he appointed another committee to review our findings and to see if our report could be made part of a more comprehensive effort of the university.

CAC: May I interpose just for a moment?

DC: Yes.

CAC: You were some of the other important members of that original committee that would work with you? Were there students on it?

DC: There were some students.

CAC: And some blacks?

DC: I'm terribly sorry, at this point, my memory fails. I'm pretty sure Burnham Terrell was on the committee because Burnham became one of the early members of the University Senate's Social Policy Committee. Beyond Burnham, I have a rough time remembering.

CAC: Do you think that the appointment of another committee was because Mr. Wilson was skeptical or it was so new?

DC: My impression . . . he was a little skeptical of the university developing direct ties with neighborhoods, with community activists, or with agencies that were not scholarly agencies in

that way. Looking back on it, I can see why; but, on the other hand, it was my feeling that his normal amount of social conservatism in these matters made him very reluctant to take that step.

CAC: What had he expected when he appointed the committee with that kind of a charge?

DC: I just don't know. I know that we took our charge very seriously.

CAC: Sure.

DC: The outcome of the second committee was to recommend the establishment of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs, which would coordinate programs of the sort that our committee recommended as well as become a focal point in the university for doing research that might aid the university in its contacts with other groups.

CAC: You had a role in CURA once it was established?

DC: Even before it was established, I was a member of the search committee to try to find someone to become the first chair of CURA. I can remember I was interviewing quite a number of candidates including F. Stuart Chapin Jr., who had become an urban planner and who well knew the [unclear] at that time, and quite a number of other people. As you know, we finally decided that John Borchert of our own faculty should be the first chair.

CAC: In the meantime, Lukermann was holding the position, so to speak?

DC: On a temporary basis.

CAC: You participated in some of these early programs in the neighborhoods. That will be so frequently missed in the formal record. Tell me a bit about that.

DC: When O. Meredith Wilson left the presidency and Malcolm Moos came on, Malcolm Moos's predispositions were much more broad-gauged than Wilson's. Moos was far less conservative and far less wary, let me put it that way, about the university's contact with community. In fact, it titillated Moos to sense a more adventuresome foray of the university and to the community. Moos tended to use the word communiversity.

CAC: Was that his coinage? One sees it so often.

DC: It's my memory that it was his coinage, right.

CAC: That was an implicit assumption of your original report in 1966. You didn't use the term.

DC: Yes, that's right. We didn't use the term; but, it was an assumption. Exactly. As well you know, Moos's phrase is *the military industrial complex*. He favored these joined terms. It goes

back to his being a minion and a participant witness of H.L. Mencken's latter days. You mentioned the date of this interview at the beginning. I opened a *New York Times* yesterday and I'm looking in the *Sunday Times* book section . . . books newly published . . . a gathering of Menckeniana, Mencken's works, and the author of the book [*A Carnival of Buncombe: Writings on Politics/H.L. Mencken*] is listed as Malcolm Moos! I thought, my god! [laughter] Don't they know that he died some time ago?

CAC: He did this. He did a work on Mencken earlier on. Maybe, it's a reprinting of that.

DC: I looked for it as a reprinting but its publication date is 1984.

CAC: How curious.

DC: It could be a posthumous work. Moos adored Mencken and Menckeniana of every which kind. Moos had a private collection of Mencken's dirty jokes, for example.

CAC: Heavens.

DC: He pulled them out occasionally. They were very scatological jokes, which Mencken occasionally attributed to Abraham Lincoln . . . enter Lincoln again.

CAC: More scatological than sexual?

DC: Yes, that's right, earthy, country farmer jokes. Moos asked Fred Lukermann to head up the first communiversity that would be a part of a pilot project and the university had appropriated then some pilot monies for the development of a variety of communiversity projects that had a very experimental quality to them, a limited life period. Fred was the coordinator of all such. Fred was a remarkable entrepreneur. He found people largely on the faculty but including some graduate students with talents of certain orders. Then, he would ask them to come up with a certain project that might be helpful in the communiversity orbit. They did and when they did, he would then say, "All right," such and such an amount of money for salaries of this kind. We had very regular meetings. Fred tried to organize and arrange from ties among the various projects and programs so that there would be a minimum of money spent on logistic secretaries and telephone, anything of that sort. John Borchert was also a kind of ultimate supervisor of all of this. One of the projects—just as a contrast to the one that I supervised—was one that Marian Hall of the College of Education headed up. It was a summer project in which high school students, minorities, largely black, would spend an intensive time studying in a kind of college prep program. The students would be identified by black agency leaders both on the near north side and the on the south side. I remember it being, so far as I could tell, extremely successful. I went to several of the meetings because one of the things I did was on the near north side as well; so, we tried to work jointly on this effort. My own work was to inaugurate and supervise the establishment of, what were called, Storefront Universities. This meant, basically, that I made contact with community leaders, largely again minority, in some, I suppose you might call it

loosely, ghetto area. I would try literally to get faculty to teach, on a voluntary basis for a period of five to ten weeks, some course that they felt would legitimately attract college-level students but to teach it in a slightly different way. Students could sign up for such courses who had never taken college credits before. They could get college credit without paying tuition. That was a kind of university subsidization. We established one such venture in what is now the Pilot City Center before the Pilot City Center was there. It's the old Beth-El Synagogue at Plymouth and Penn Avenue North. We established another one on the west side of St. Paul in a Mexican-American community with the help of Sister Giovanni.

CAC: Oh, yes.

DC: We talked of establishing more but those were the only two that we were able to develop. I worked very hard to try to get one in some Native American community context but the arguments within the Native American community at the time were too vociferous for us to do it successfully; so, we never really got one started there.

CAC: What happened from week to week and quarter to quarter in these two programs you mention on the north side of Minneapolis and the west side of St. Paul?

DC: One of the first things that I discovered was that we couldn't just open a storefront, throw open the doors, and as a result of some leafleting or communication among agencies expect that hoards of minority people would flood in eager to partake of this university cornucopia. Indeed, it took us awhile before word got around that this was available. There were quite a number of people who were apprehensive about what was happening. They thought that the whites from the white tower, the university, were again in some benevolent way throwing things at the people that the people didn't need. We spent the summer of 1968, I believe it was, doing community organization work, both on the west side and here. On the west side, there was a young Sociology Department faculty member who was in charge of the community organization work there and I worked closely with him. Among other things, we simply had to do a survey of households in order to find out how many people of college age were interested at all in doing university work. We had some interesting experiences.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

DC: The white principal of the local high school, Humboldt High School, at the time ensured us that we wouldn't get anywhere because these Mexican-Americans are basically shiftless, lazy, and didn't care a damn about the university. I thought those times had passed. Where I was immediately involved on the north side, I discovered that I really had to become much more closely tied with the community than I was; so, I became a board member of the old Way, with the new Way, and worked closely with Syl and Gwen Davis who then managed that operation.

There were some difficult times. That was a time of growing civil rights and the Black Power people were very, very antagonistic to the university's operation; but, gradually it did take hold.

CAC: How long was that sustained and what were the results?

DC: It was sustained for two years; but, there was a period of a year and a half when it flourished, meaning that the number of people in the neighborhoods who signed up for courses and who did attend and did serious work in such subjects as a General College course in Everyday Law led by a faculty member who is still in General College, Dennis Hower. He came and taught a course—it was very much like an Extension Division course—on citizen's law. Then, there was a course in communication that a member of the . . . remember the program in communication that was also part of General Studies and Interdisciplinary Studies? That was taught there. Then, there was a course in American Society that was taught by several members of the Sociology Department, including graduate students. Those were all taught at the near north side in the early Pilot Center building. We got as high an enrollment in one quarter of ten students.

CAC: Do you have any sense that this was an entering arena for very many of these students who then came to the university?

DC: About seven of the students in that particular course in the near north side ended up half of them in General College and half of them in CLA. They said to me afterward that they never would have gone to the university had that not occurred.

CAC: What happened in two years, and three years, and four years then? These Storefront programs did not continue as a central part of CURA?

DC: Not as a central part, no. They continued though, at a much diminished level of funding with a coordinator, I think until about four years ago but not as a major part. CURA's idea under John Borchert and now under Tom Scott was to rotate and to circulate operations of this sort among people who would be interested. Wherever a faculty member or a member of some community agency that could make contact somehow with a faculty member was interested in doing this sort of thing, then they were quite liberal and university support . . .

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

CAC: In the meantime, some of these programs in CURA probably led you into an interest in the student movement and community movement that led toward the establishment of Afro-American Studies?

DC: That's right.

CAC: Is there a direct connection, one for one, or is it just part of a climate? What happens?

DC: I think we were, most of us, more the objects of history than any . . . The fact that I had been involved in these things was known to deans and I was asked to become a member then of the committee that investigated the possibility of setting up a department to program [unclear] in Black Studies. The connection is that, by that time, I had made friends with people in the more militant aspect of the black community. Since they were pressing the university very strongly to do something in the field, I think then that's the way in which I ended up on the committee; although, I must say, I resigned. There was a big set of arguments among the board of directors of the Way and I resigned ultimately, long years ago, I forget exactly when. There was an argument between blacks and whites who were members of the board. It was something that was happening all over the country at that time. That was about the time that I was asked to be a member of what became the Afro-American Studies committee. I was somewhat apprehensive that my role in the Way was going to interfere with what happened here but it didn't. It didn't occur.

CAC: What were the dynamics of that committee? Who had the initiative? Did Moos have the initiative? Is this out of the vice-president's office? Is it the black community? Is it black students, concerned faculty, or all of them? What relative weight did they have?

DC: Immediately it was black student leaders, such people as Lester Cannon. Cannon, I remember so very well. There were quite a number of other black . . .

CAC: Anna Stanley was one.

DC: Anna came a little later than that. There was a man who is now, of course, a member of the legislature, Randy Staten. At that time, he was a student leader, and he was involved, and I was involved with him on it. There were then white students as well, of course, who were participating in anti-Vietnam and the Civil Rights Movement.

CAC: Both?

DC: Both. They were eagerly lobbying for some university activity and a standard program or department in this area. The spirit of the times was very favorable to this sort of thing, if I can use the phrase. By that time, I was in the Department of Sociology and I had not only come to grips with but had laid completely to rest the notion of an interdisciplinary effort that would be something like a department apart from the traditional department organizations; so, my own position in that whole operation was that Black Studies should be a program, very much like the Humanities program or American Studies program and not a separate department. I can remember quite a number of arguments that we had.

CAC: Would the black militants largely be opposed to that?

DC: Yes, the black militants insisted on a department. Directly, the rationale on their part was for status reasons. A program meant lesser status than a department and they were not willing to take anything less than a department.

CAC: In a complex historical situation like that where there are many pressures and many groups, very often however, there will be some group or some figures that play a more crucial role. Mr. Ziebarth was dean?

DC: Yes.

CAC: Was it he?

DC: No, no.

CAC: His was largely a responsive and encouraging role?

DC: Right. Dean Ziebarth would say on the one hand that he was very open to any suggestion that came out of the committee; but, on the other hand, he pleaded with many of us privately against the establishment of a department and he urged that an interdisciplinary level operation, probably at the level of a program, would be, he thought, much more successful in an educational sense because he almost certified that he could members of separate departments to work cooperatively in a programmatic setting. He thought—I think quite wisely—that the establishment of a department would keep regular members of the faculties away from interacting very cooperatively.

CAC: And you see that as one of the consequences of having a departmental structure?

DC: I think so. Sure. I think the recent experience with Black Studies Department . .

CAC: You spoke early of the Mr. Lukermann's role in CURA and setting up the Storefront programs. In the vice-president's office, although it was a college matter, was there this kind of leadership or not? What role does the vice-president's office for academic administration play?

DC: I'm trying to remember clearly. I'm pretty sure Don Smith was involved in many of these sorts of efforts. I'm not quite sure how Don felt about these things or what specific role he played.

CAC: But, the Central Administration was not directly represented on the committee?

DC: Not directly on the committee. Malcolm Moos's heart was always with Black Studies of one kind or another. I don't think that Moos cared very much about what form it would take. He was eager to have established something that would give more than symbolic presence to

black students; that certainly was the case. Don was always very much more cautious about these matters; but, I don't remember a direct role that the president's office played in this.

CAC: So many things pile up in the late 1960s and early 1970s as we think about them.

DC: Oh, yes.

CAC: We've talked about the Civil Rights. We've talked about CURA and the community outreach. We've talking now about the agitation that would lead to the Afro-American Studies Department. There's the anti-war movement. Did you have a connection with the anti-war movement on campus?

DC: The series of incidents that I can remember clearly . . . there were demonstrations on campus and, at a certain point, the Central Administration was very concerned that the demonstrations would really and massively get out of hand conceivably into a Kent State situation. I remember riding in Moos's limousine, the university limousine. At that time I was still head of the AAUP; so, it was Moos's first year. Moos had invited me—it was such a very different treatment than O. Meredith Wilson—to have dinner with him at the Minneapolis Club.

CAC: [laughter]

DC: There Moos was introducing me to all of the really high mucky mucks at Minneapolis, the power elite. "Mr. Dayton, I'd like to introduce you to one of our leading scholars and head of the AAUP," and Moos would slap me on the back and say, "and I have the greatest respect for him." So, on the way back from this lunch, Moos was getting reports by mobile radio from some command center in Morrill Hall. It was a very critical day in which students were blocking off Morrill Hall and Moos wondered if he'd be able to get through; so, he was in contact with the police chief at that time. Moos was extremely worried. I had never seen him so worried. My image of him before that was that his kindness and his great sensitivity to what was going on would prevent him from taking precipitant action that was stupid. He was obviously losing control. He obviously was. He didn't know what to do. By the time we had gotten back, he asked the driver to leave me off several blocks before so that I would have no trouble making my way around. The sense of things that I had from that and other experiences like this was that Central Administration, at least so far as Malcolm Moos was concerned, was not necessarily in command of things. Rather, events were taking over. Knowing the campus at that time, it was quite easy to [unclear] about what would happen.

CAC: Yet, I remember and have studied some of the records which indicate that as far as the anti-war movement was concerned that Mr. Moos, perhaps, was—although he had to respond to things that were beyond his control—more skilled at meeting with these groups and pulling the sting.

DC: Right, absolutely.

CAC: You were present at some of those?

DC: Yes. It was his personal sense from relationships with human beings, I think more than anything else, that in your terms defanged or destung what could otherwise be very serious events . . . again, very typically. Les Cannon, whom Moos had reacted to at a personal level, inviting him over to the presidential manse, sitting down with him on a buddy basis and talking with him, had insisted on attending an anti-war rally in Northrop Auditorium, and wanted to come up to the microphone, and take the microphone away from some invited speaker. Malcolm Moos came up and said this before thousands of people, "Les, if you could only wait a little while. I'm asking you, as a friend of yours, just to wait a bit and I'll give you as much time before this audience as you want. Just take your turn a little bit less." Cannon said, "Okay, Malcolm. Sure, I will but if you promise." "I promise." Whatever speakers there were came, and took their turn and then they had finished their turn, and the audience was getting up to leave. A dean, whose name I won't even mention came up to the microphone and said, "I now declare the program over." Les Cannon was furious. Malcolm Moos rushed over to the microphone and said, "I'm asking all of you to wait and give Mr. Cannon his turn in all fairness. This has been promised to him." The audience just went back to their seats and listened to Cannon talk. That was typical of Moos's relationships with a wide variety of anti-war types as well as, conceivably, pro-war types.

CAC: You describe a very appealing person and, yet, by 1972- 1973, he's in trouble.

DC: He's in deep trouble. Right. I knew, watching him work, that his sense of running a large and complex organization in an environment of lessening resources was just not there. He did not have the talent to do that. His talents were great in relationships one-on-one with individuals; but, when it came to anything that had to do with organization and reorganization, he just wasn't there. That's what the university was facing by 1972-1973: retrenchment, reallocation, a completely different organizational environment. He wasn't good at it.

CAC: He probably knew that he had no taste nor talent for it.

DC: Yes, that's right.

CAC: We said earlier we'd come back to say a few things about Stan Wenberg.

DC: Oh, yes.

CAC: Be my guest.

DC: After my entry as an undergraduate, I would encounter him from time to time on campus. He knew quite a number of people in the Department of Political Science, like Lloyd Short and William Anderson, who were very helpful with the legislature and would prepare important reports for the university. He was <u>very</u> close to significant faculty members, like Frank Boddy

in Economics, John Turnbull who knew him in many respects well. My witnessing was that whenever the university needed some kinds of gestures from the legislature, partially budgetary, he would be very helpful with Morrill in cementing relationships between the legislature and faculty who could be helpful. Even when he was in the recorder's office, he managed to work very sensitively and delicately through informal networks to pull things together. Hence, by the time he had the position of legislative liaison, he had already an informal network of people. What he had the capacity to do was to walk blindly across factional lines in the University Senate, obviously in the legislature, and over a range of university organizations . . . to knock on doors, pick up the phone, again call people on a personal basis. He had his own Stan Wenberg informal network. If you'd take the trouble to list who the people were in that network, you'd see that they included people who were snobbish intellectuals, people who had a great capacity to do quick research on matters having to do with taxes or planning, people who were in the College of Agriculture as agricultural extension agents but who were are decidedly non-intellectuals. He managed to package his private project teams for finger-in-the-dike efforts and he did that magnificently well; but, where do you get the publicity for doing that or the renown for doing it? All through the late 1960s and early 1970s, I'd watch as, behind the scenes, he did the job of power brokerage very, very well.

CAC: It's interesting that the faculty who knew him well, as you're describing it so ably, have the same response that you do. Those who knew him at a distance share that skeptical notion that he was a wheeler and dealer and a glad hander, which, indeed, he was also.

DC: Oh, yes, he surely was that.

CAC: He had to be.

DC: He had to be. Indeed, there are some of our colleagues, especially in Political Science who when you mention the name Stan Wenberg, their nose would go way up in the air. My god! what kind of a character are you talking about . . . a country hillbilly type. He wasn't at all. In no respect was he that.

CAC: We've talked about presidents, vice-presidents, and deans of the Arts College but nothing about the Graduate School—not that we need to. I just want to give you the opportunity if you have any insights there.

DC: No, I really do not. I don't have any immediate insights into the academic leadership of the Graduate School. I knew Gerry Shepherd and Bryce Crawford fairly well. I knew them very well when I was president of the AAUP. There were some faculty personnel situations that were very delicate that we had some tiffs about; but, I was not privy to their leadership styles or policies with regard to the search. I was here with Dean Blegen of the Graduate School and I knew Theodore Blegen. I remember his academic style more than I have knowledge of Crawford's or even Warren Ibele's style.

CAC: So much of your work has been interdisciplinary within the college and the university. You have been an active member of American Studies but also Jewish Studies.

DC: Oh, yes.

CAC: Maybe you'd like to comment on those two?

DC: In the American Studies program, I taught several of the sequences in American Studies. I participated in many meetings and I know of the research interests of many of my colleagues and their research production of them. The constant difficulties did have to do with the way in which resources were always limited and the way in which whatever American Studies there was, whether it was Barney Bowron or Mary Turpie, had to rely on the goodwill of faculty in other departments. There was a constant invitation of faculty to teach and to do administrative work in American Studies on a not for pay basis, on a goodwill basis. I think many of us who did the work did it eagerly because we wanted to . . . many times over. It was a very sad thing. Part of the solidarity of faculty or feelings of togetherness of faculty who did that work came from the fact that we did it on pro bono basis and we weren't being paid for it.

CAC: Pro bono and I hear you saying—perhaps I'm reading myself into it—without a clear system of crediting the contribution in the department where these persons were located?

DC: Oh, quite true.

CAC: There was no direct financial advantage. There was probably very little indirect advantage?

DC: No. There were, at least so far as I was concerned, some disadvantages. When I was still teaching in American Studies, I was told, first by Monachesi and then by Bjornstad, that this wasn't going to be very helpful in my career as a sociologist. It was all good and well but it was taking time away from my proper work as a sociologist. Now, take into consideration that Arnold Rose was a very vigorous member of the American Studies program.

CAC: You bet.

DC: When Monachesi told him that, he said, "So much the worse for my career as a sociologist."

CAC: [laughter]

DC: He could afford to do it . . .

CAC: Yes.

DC: . . . he being an incoming chair of the American Sociological Association before he died. With Jewish Studies, in one sense, in one comparatively limited sense, there's a way in which people on campus, who were interested in Jewish Studies as separate individuals when Afro-American Studies was established and Chicano Studies was established, felt that if those groups were established for militant ethnic reasons, why not Jewish Studies? Several of us who identified ourselves as Jews tried to talk that down on grounds that we didn't need a department in order to certify our ethnic identity, our ethnic—dash—religious identity. What we emphasized instead was the validity of some scholarly endeavor. I felt and other colleagues of mine felt, Hy Berman and certainly a number of others, that a more coherent program in Jewish Studies would enable some of the profound characteristics of Jewish study and Jewish academic investigation to be substantiated in some distinct sense. Dean Ziebarth appointed me to chair a committee to investigate the establishment of a Jewish Studies unit of some kind. We came up with a report that said there should be a Jewish Studies program, not a department, since it should receive the attention of faculty already established in other areas. That's indeed what it is . . . such, that now there are three core appointments but quite a number of adjunct appointments. The aim of the group . . .

CAC: I didn't realize they were core appointments.

DC: Yes, Jonathan Paradise, and Daniel Reisman, and Tzee Zahavy; so, it looks very much like the Humanities program.

CAC: Dan, as I review the things we've discussed the last two hours, it would seem that you were so often present at very exciting and changing moments with the Social Science program and then the furor over Civil Rights, and Afro-American Studies, and outreach, and then again with the Sociology Department in the 1970s. That's just a remarkable thirty years.

DC: Yes. In many ways, I witnessed a lot of these. The events that we've covered on tape in the interview, I think, place me at significant points, very often however at what turn out to be somewhat by the peripheral or marginal businesses or operations relating to the university. I was never close to power centers—I didn't wish to be. My own sense of myself is, if anything, that of a scholar, a too, perhaps, stereotyped view. I tended to think of power-wielding as somehow alien to the things I wanted to do really. In the last decade, for example, the power institutions of the university and the power organization of the university has shifted drastically, very much in response to external influences. I witnessed that. I became angry at it. The closest chance I had, I suppose, to do something about it would have been had the faculty unionized. But in the last few years, with the failure of the effort at unionization, I've just absented myself from many of these things. During the time shortly after I was AAUP chair, because my name was known more in that generation, I also, for example, was a member of the University Senate Committee on Committees. I was a member of the Senate Judicial Committee. I actually wrote a very important report for a Judicial Committee case. Then, my movement to the slightly more critical role came shortly thereafter when I was asked by the AAUP . . . Something I forgot. My transition away from the AAUP and toward the union came when the chairman of the

AAUP—I forget who it was—after I stepped down asked if I couldn't become the faculty counselor for a faculty member who had appealed to the AAUP for aid in a case. I considered the matter and agreed. This was in 1973 or 1974. Since I was chair of the campus AAUP in 1967, indeed, it was sometime thereafter. The case came to a hearing in 1974. I was involved in 1973 then. That had a slight radicalization effect on me. It was after that case that I became closer to the union than ever and the developing unionization efforts.

CAC: My friend, the tape is within thirty seconds of giving out. I want to thank you very much. This has been a fun project for me as you might guess.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[End of the Interview]

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