

Lloyd Lofquist

- Youth and education 1-
 - North High School, Minneapolis 1
 - University of Minnesota - Psychology, 1940 1
 - military service - Army, 1942- 1
 - psychologist in Veteran's Administration, 1946-56 1
- Mentors in psychology 2-
 - Paterson, Donald 2
 - Elliott, Richard 2
- Strength of Psychology Department, circa 1930-60 4
 - breadth, eclectic 4
 - focus on hard data 6
 - experimental, empirical 6
 - traditions of research 7
 - long terms for chairs 7-8
- Psychology outreach to University 8-14
 - Department of Industrial Relations 8
 - Institute of Child Development 9
 - College of Education 9
 - Student Counseling Bureau 9
 - Darley, Jack 9
 - Birdie, Ralph 9
 - Williamson, Ed 9
 - Health Services - Psychiatry 10
 - Center for Research in Human Learning 10-11
 - contracts and grants 12
- Lofquist becomes associate dean, CLA, 1967- 14
 - minority studies programs 15
 - abolition of Public Administration 15
 - origins of Afro-American Studies 16-17
 - Chicano Studies 18
- School of Statistics 18
- Public Administration - Public Affairs 19
- Lofquist goes to Central Administration, 1967-73 20-
 - Shepherd, Gerry - his role 22
 - student protests 23
 - Brinkerhoff, James - vice-president for Finance 23
 - Smith, Don 24
 - Moos, Malcolm 25-26, 28
 - relations with legislature 26
- Resignation of Shepherd, Lukermann, Lofquist 29-30
- Freedom and responsibility document 31
- Memorandum on promotion and tenure 32
- Pressures of office 33-35
- Humphrey, Hubert - brought in to University of Minnesota to teach 35-36

Interview with Lloyd Lofquist

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

**Interviewed on August 1, 1984
University of Minnesota Campus**

Lloyd Lofquist - LL
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers continuing with the creation of an oral archive of the University of Minnesota. I'm speaking this afternoon with Professor Lloyd Lofquist who was an undergraduate student at Minnesota many years ago. He subsequently earned his graduate degrees at the University of Minnesota. He was a distinguished professor of Psychology and occupied many administrative positions within the department, the college, and the university; so, we have our business cut out for us. It is August 1, 1984 and we are cutting the tape in Professor Lofquist's beautiful chairman's office in Elliott Hall looking out at a lovely oak tree and the summer sky.

Lloyd, I think it's fun to start with the individual. We don't want a full personal autobiography but kind of a quick academic autobiography. I see you got a B.A. [Bachelor of Arts] at Minnesota in 1940 and we can take it from there. Where did you come from as an undergraduate student? Were you a Minnesota boy?

LL: Yes, I was born in Minneapolis, came out of North High School, went with a handful of students in those days to the university in 1935 and got a B.A. in 1940. I stayed out one year to work and make money and then went on to graduate school from there. I got a master's in 1941 with Professor Donald G. Paterson. In those days, a student who wanted to go on for the Ph.D. and go the full route had to take the master's degree first. That was sort of the testing ground. Then, I went on from the master's in 1941 to continue the work toward the Ph.D. and had most of the course work done when, in early 1942, I was drafted and went into the service. I stayed in the service for four years in the Army as an enlisted man and, later, as an officer much of the time doing work related to psychology. When I came back, there was an hiatus in my academic career. I was married, had a daughter, built a house, went to work for the Veterans Administration [V.A.] and got to be the chief of the psychology service there. I stayed there

from 1946 until 1956 when Paterson and some others invited me over and said, "Won't you join us on the faculty? Will you come?" This was at lunch. I said, "Gee, Pat, I need at least a week to think about this." That's how hiring was done in those days. They had had faculty discussions I learned later and I even learned who they had considered later; but at that time, I knew nothing about that. They knew a little about me in terms of my student years, and also what I did in the Veterans Administration Hospital, and something about my teaching because I had been coming over on late Fridays and Saturdays to teach Rehabilitation Psychology courses for them as a lecturer. After about a week, Paul Meehl, who was then the chairman of the department, called up and said, "Lloyd, are you coming? Have you made up your mind? I said, "Yes, I'm coming." We had, by the way, not even talked about salary. That's another indication of how things were in those days. I was flattered at the thought of coming back here; although, I knew I was losing a good Veterans Administration retirement and a very secure position there with some status. I came here for, I think, it was \$9,000 in 1956, which I learned later was a very good salary. I was making about \$6,500 at the V.A., which was a good salary. In our conversation—again, an interesting comment on the way in which hiring was done—Paul said, "I wonder if we ought to bring you in as an assistant or an associate professor?" I said, "You better make it as good as you can." He said, "Okay, we'll make it associate professor and you won't have to go through musical chairs the first time with the faculty for promotion and tenure." So, I came with tenure as an associate and I've been here ever since.

CAC: Why do you suppose as an undergraduate you got excited about psychology in the first place?

LL: Because of Donald G. Paterson and his courses primarily. Even the introductory course was stimulating to me. It was taught in those days by Richard Elliott who was chairman of the department.

CAC: You had the two towering figures as an undergraduate.

LL: That's right. Charles Byrd also taught some of it and Miles Tinker, an experimental psychologist came in, and taught some of it.

CAC: So, it was the excitement of some really master teachers?

LL: I got excited about that but I still hadn't made up my mind. When, after my sophomore year, I took a year off and worked as a clerk in a railroad office, I came back, I was thinking about either psychology or zoology of all things. I had a friend who was a good friend of Dwight Minnick, whose course I'd had, who also stimulated me as a wonderful teacher.

CAC: Oh, yes.

LL: He could write on the blackboard and draw diagrams with each hand at the same time with different colors of chalk. He was just a fascinating person . . . very interested in worms, I remember.

CAC: And in fine prints. My, he had a beautiful collection.

LL: Yes, and his wife did a lot with fine prints, too.

CAC: Right.

LL: We went over and I talked to Minnick and I thought some more about it; but by then, I had taken Paterson's course in the Psychology of Individual Differences [I.D.], Differential Psychology now, which was Pat's main area and, after the first quarter, I was convinced I wanted to be a major. I had to declare as a junior. I went through the procedure which was quite different than it is now when we have anywhere from 800 to 1000 undergraduate majors. In those days, there were relatively few. In order to major, you had to go and have an appointment with the chairman, Dr. Elliott. I had an appointment with him. He wanted to know why I wanted to major in psychology and I said, "Because it was interesting, and I like what Paterson is doing, and I would like someday to be something like Paterson; although I don't think I could ever achieve that." He persisted and said, "Do you come from a professional family?" I said, "No, I come from a trades family." "Do your parents have a good deal of education?" "No. They came from Sweden after a grade school education." "Do you know any professional people?" I said, "The doctors, and dentists, and the minister." [laughter] "You don't know any psychologists?" I said, "No." I thought that I was not going to get permission to major; but, finally, Mr. Elliott, who was very formal—all professors were pretty formal in those days—sat there, and looked at me, and said, "Mr. Lofquist, you have my permission to see Mr. Paterson; but, mind you, he will not be impressed."

CAC: [laughter]

LL: I dragged myself out of the office and went down the hall to see Mr. Paterson. Pat said, "You look familiar. Are you in my I.D.s course?" I said, "Yes." He said, "What did you get this last quarter?" This was just between quarters. I said, "A B." He said, "If you get all As from now on, you may be my advisee." I did.

CAC: Did you have any idea . . . ?

LL: That's the [unclear].

CAC: Yes. Nice comment on standards. Did you have any idea of the national reputation, the quality of the department as it was in the 1930s and continued in the 1940s and 1950s?

LL: Not really in terms of having ever seen any comparative figures or ratings—there were ratings in those early days—but, I guess in terms of knowing that some of the professors were rated very, very highly, knowing some of their past experience. In other words, major figures in the field were at the same level as some of our people were. For example, William Herron in Animal Psychology was right up there with the leading animal comparative psychologists in the country because of his breeding of strains of bright and dull rats and that kind of thing. Elliott was the editor of the *Century Psychology* series, which was the most prestigious series in psychology, [unclear] Century [unclear]. Paterson was one of the first applied industrial psychologists in the country applying his individual differences commitment and knowledge to that field. So, I knew I was with a very good and a demanding group..

CAC: Did you have a chance to work with [B.F.] Skinner when he was here in 1937 to 1945? Did you work with him?

LL: I didn't work with him as a research assistant [RA]; but, I had some course work with him. We were all very impressed with Skinner and with his productivity.

CAC: Would it have been known generally on campus what a latent genius Skinner was at that point?

LL: No. I can't document this; but, when Skinner was being considered to be brought onto the faculty, there was a certain amount of reservation on the part of the senior faculty—remember faculties were small.

CAC: Oh, yes.

LL: There may have been eight people on the faculty. That was understandable. Here was a young man who was approaching things in ways that were completely different than the standardized learning theory had been. He was kind of throwing out classical conditioning that went way back to [Ivan] Pavlov and was beginning to talk about instrumental conditioning or the analysis of behavior, a Skinnerian type psychology that he then developed later on. He did some of it while he was here. Elliott, as chairman, as I understand it, did not go to the dean with an overwhelming vote. In fact, he did what our constitution still requires; he told the dean about the reservations of the faculty but said, "I want to hire this young man. He's a comer." He was, of course; so, he hired him.

CAC: One of the legends of the Department of Psychology—it's a deeply rooted legend—is the way in which it is open to variety, and there is no party line, and there is no dogma. I hear you saying that that may have been the case early on . . . that although, it was a direction of a person with a strong personality . . .

LL: That goes back to the original building of the department. There was no department and in 1919, Elliott came out here and founded one. He first hired the traditional experimental type

psychologists. He brought eminent people through here . . . Skinner being a case in point and [Karl Spencer] Lashley being another one over the years. Then, he also wanted to bring in a person who was strong in individual differences so that there would be both experimental psychology, which was viewed as theoretical, and applied psychology, which was not viewed as theoretical—although, it is just as theoretical. It has just as good a base. He knew he wanted Paterson. He started the place in 1919. He brought Don Paterson in in 1921 as an associate professor and Paterson was made a full professor in 1923 in those conservative times. He just took off once he got here. The reason he knew Paterson is that he had worked for Paterson in the war. That's an interesting little aside. In World War I, the Army had its first major mobilization of people and it needed to do something about how to classify them. As Paterson used to describe it, they had to get away from the system where a major or a colonel stood by the train, and tapped a person on the shoulder, and said, "Cook, rifleman, clerk . . ." and so on, just looking at them. They developed tests and they set up a psychological testing unit. The Army didn't know what to do with it, and put it in the surgeon general's office, and the surgeon general didn't know what to do with it, and he put it in the sanitary core because they'd never had anything like that. The head of the whole thing, was Robert Yerkes, who was a prominent animal psychologist with the Yerkes Lab in the east, who, by the way, was first asked to be chairman but declined to do that and suggested Elliott, a young man from Harvard with a good Ph.D., as we say. The chief examiner in the group was Donald G. Paterson. One of his examiners was Mike Elliott, Richard Maurice Elliott. We never called him Mike in those days.

CAC: It was more formal in those days. You got around to calling him Mike?

LL: There's a little anecdote there, too. Once, as a graduate student, I was coming out of the main office and Paterson was down the hall in old Elliott Hall and he said, "Lloyd, come on in. I want to see you." What he wanted to do was give me a chore to do, a bunch of data to tally even though I didn't work for him. In those days, professors [unclear].

CAC: Sure, you learned.

LL: Once you learned, then you got to be a research assistant later. Elliott heard that, and called Paterson back, and I overheard him say, "Pat, do you think it's wise to speak to our graduate students by their first name before they have passed their final oral examination?" Pat said, "Okay, Mike." He shrugged his shoulders and said, "Come on in, Lloyd." [laughter]

CAC: When I came here in 1951, all the senior members of my department, I called mister.

LL: Yes.

CAC: It wasn't until they retired really that I knew them by first name. Somewhere into the late 1950s, that began to break.

LL: It was after I was on the faculty for awhile and Elliott was still coming around here after his retirement that I finally did call him Mike. It took a long time.

CAC: To get back to the theme that you suggested and I've inquired about . . . then, and persistingly, with a relatively small faculty, and an enormous undergraduate number of majors, and one of the largest graduate programs in the Arts College, the building of that small department went to variety rather than to intense specialization?

LL: We still subscribe to that. We have some goals statements for the department that include the statement that the department opts to continue with breadth in the areas of psychology and not to specialize in one or two areas, as is the case in so many departments.

CAC: Yes, many distinguished departments would have a much narrower range.

LL: Right.

CAC: You attribute that to history, which is why we're doing history, that the tradition gets established, and it works, and the reputation is there?

LL: That's right.

CAC: Then, your new people are socialized to this?

LL: Yes. There also are some hallmarks of Minnesota psychology that include things like a strong emphasis on individual differences, differential psychology, the Skinner influence, the analysis of behavior sequence courses, the research data orientation. Research is terribly important here. Data is terribly important. Soft activities are not. Hard data is valued very much, still.

CAC: Out of this experimental, empirical, you get Starke Hathaway's program, which probably did as much as any single thing—I'm asking a question—to establish the national reputation . . . the old MMPI [Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory] that Hathaway and company worked out?

LL: It certainly contributed a great deal to it; but, probably not as much as the Skinner orientation that went then to [Kenneth] MacCorquodale and through him to Travis Thompson at the present time. Then, there are, of course, behavior therapy people in the clinical area whose expertise comes out of that more theoretical Skinner type psychology.

CAC: This would include people like Paul Meehl, for example?

LL: Yes, Meehl contributed, certainly, a great deal to the reputation of the place, too; but, the department was rated highly even back in the 1930s before these people were [unclear] and well-known.

CAC: It's one of the departments in the college, as I'm sure you know, that has maintained that national distinction for fifty years or more and many other departments have cycles. It's true distinction, and finally it's recognized, and then they fall.

LL: I think it's the research productivity, too. For example, in a survey not too many years ago, about 1976 or 1977, of publication in the APA [American Psychological Association] monitor journals, the department was fourth in the volume of that kind of publication. There were a lot of books that had come out of here. Hathaway certainly did contribute a lot though. Interestingly enough, as a student, I took Physiological Psychology from Starke. This was before the multiphasic days. He became increasingly involved with people in the University Hospital before he moved over there even. Then, he and [C. Charnley] McKinley got interested in putting together an instrument like the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory and the student who did the most work on that as a graduate student RA was Paul Meehl. He was working with getting items and doing a lot of the work.

CAC: One of the things that historians would be interested in down the line is how the distinction of a department can be established and then maintained, which may be as difficult. As I look at it, I'm wondering whether the tradition in Psychology has had—I know you're chairman—except for a very brief period where you had rotating chairs, for the most part, relatively few leaders of the department. They've had long tenures. I just wonder whether there's a correlation between having a continuity of leadership to socialize young people and to build faculty that would contribute to that or is the administration irrelevant to what we're talking about?

LL: I think the tenured chairman is one thing. The people who have been chairman were part of the original scene for the most part. Elliott remained chairman for thirty-two years. I don't know how anybody could do that but he did.

CAC: Those were the days when Guy Stanton Ford was dean forever.

LL: Yes. It was clear long before Elliott stepped down as chairman that Paul Meehl was going to be the next chair. Paul came out of that in those student days. Then Paul's chairmanship was followed by Kenneth Clark. Clark was not a Minnesota Ph.D. and was not part of all that. He came out of Ohio State University and Paterson came out of Ohio State University, too. He also was active with a number of us during the war in what was called the Adjutant General's Department of Personnel Research Section in New York City, out of the Pentagon really but in New York City. We were so young we couldn't be in Washington in those days. [laughter] Really. After, Clark, it was MacCorquodale. MacCorquodale, and Meehl, and I were students together in graduate courses years ago; although, both of them were ahead of me, even though

I was older than both of them. After MacCorquodale, Jack Darley, who was a Paterson Ph.D., became chairman.

CAC: Then, he's a long time . . .

LL: He was chairman for either eleven or twelve years.

CAC: I see twelve years . . . 1963 to 1975.

LL: I'm going into my tenth year following Jack. I'm trying to step down.

CAC: That's an unusual pattern for government particularly because most colleges in the 1960s went to a rotating . . . sometimes, a two or three and that was it.

LL: We, during all of my tenure and the last part of Jack's, were on the three-year term subject to the [unclear] if the faculty wants it.

CAC: Within the department, you have programs that I imagine are not autonomous but you certainly were influential in starting Industrial Relations. It's called a department. I don't quite understand what that . . .

LL: Back in my student days, there was the Industrial Relations Center [IRC]. It was put together by Paterson from this department, and Dale Yoder from the Business School, and Dean [Russell A.] Stevenson had some involvement in it. He used to be dean of the, then, College of Business, when it was on this bank of the campus. That was kind of a training ground for some of us as students. Then, we became active in it and became faculty members in the IRC, which was a research unit on special legislative funds not university budget. I was one of the people who did some planning with people like Herb Heneman, who directed the center. We set up a department and then we set up a graduate program; so, now there is a Department of Industrial Relations. It's not part of this department; but, they do have psychologists there as well as economists and other people. It was set up to be interdisciplinary; but, the economists and the psychologists kind of ran away with it and the sociologists never got into it very long or too much really. I think it failed in that sense. It was cross-departmental and still is in its inputs. For example, John Campbell and Marvin Dunnette, who are both very well-known nationally and our two primary people in Industrial Organizational Psychology, and Rene Dawis, who directs our counseling psychology graduate program which is very vocationally oriented rather than therapeutically oriented as in the College of Education . . . those folks are still members of the IR Department, voting members. I was, too, until some years ago. When I was in Morrill Hall, I resigned because I didn't have the time and I also sensed that some of the younger IR faculty were maybe getting a little tired of the old-timers having the vote. But, we still have three people who are active across and some of their people hold adjunct status with us.

CAC: This also would be one of the characteristics of the department. I see the number of external departmental relations you have to have with the Institute of Child Development, with the College of Education . . . This would be an unusual arrangement. Maybe you could say a bit more about the outreach in that case. You have to be linked into the Health Sciences, Student Counseling Bureau . . .

LL: I'll try to do that. We'll take the last one first. The Student Counseling Bureau was established by Ed Williamson, who was a psychologist and a Paterson Ph.D.

CAC: Heavens. Isn't that something?

LL: Paterson had a tremendous impact here. By the way, he had eighty Ph.D.s, and a little over 200 masters people in his tenure, and something like 300 publications at the time of his retirement party.

CAC: [laughter]

LL: I was brought in and that was very flattering and kind of harks back to my hopes in the Elliott days to begin to teach Pat's courses because he was going to retire in two years. We were very close. There he is up on the wall. When Paterson came here, Paterson established some things. He said, "We need to have a Student Testing Bureau; so, he was the person, the moving force, in establishing that. Later, that sounded too harsh and so it became the Student Counseling Bureau; they changed the name. Ed Williamson was its director till he became dean of students and then had several things under him. Jack Darley was the director of the Student Counseling Bureau, and Theda Hagenah was, and Ralph Berdie was for awhile. Berdie was a Minnesota Ph.D. as well, in the Paterson/Williamson tradition. That has been our training ground, and still is, for our second year graduate students in Counseling Psychology. They learn some techniques, and some theory, and some general psychology here; and then they spend a lot of time over there in practical the second year if they do well the first year in the other courses. We have a number of people that hold adjunct rank in the department in the Student Counseling Bureau. It also has that relationship with the College of Education.

Then, we've always had a less strong relationship over the years with the College of Education counseling people. I want to say this carefully. In the old days, there were two major figures in Counseling Psychology even though there wasn't a counseling program here. One was Paterson who educated some of the greatest national counselors like Leona Tyler who went on to become the dean at Oregon and is a real name in psychology. The other person, the father figure type, for the nation was Gilbert Wren over in Education.

CAC: Heavens, yes.

LL: In the 1940s, when Carl Rogers came on the scene in counseling and student personnel work and things became, as they were described, more completely relationship oriented, more

therapeutically oriented, more touchy-feely and less data oriented . . . don't use psychological tests. You can't tell a Paterson man that. We've generated more tests in Minnesota than anywhere else, I think, over the years.

CAC: [laughter]

LL: He and Gil Wren didn't get along too well until the later years and then they were much, much more friendly. The programs were quite separate even though Gilbert Rand lived for awhile in Elliott Hall for space reasons, I think. Those programs grew up and we have some relationships there; but, we don't have very strong ones there. We have strong relationships with the statistical types over there, like Ray[mond] Collier [Jr.] before he retired this last year, and [James] Terwilliger, [Mark] Davison, and people like that.

CAC: In Educational Psychology?

LL: Yes; but statistician types.

CAC: What of the outreach of to the Institute of Child Development, which here would date back well before the second world war?

LL: In the earliest days of the founding of that, Darley had some involvement . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

LL: . . . in that, too. There was a Laura Spellman Rockefeller Foundation grant, I believe.

CAC: You bet there was.

LL: I don't know all those details. There have always been relationships and adjunct professorships back and forth between us and the Institute of Child Development. We respect them very much. They are a top department in their own right in the country. They are very active in—it was started, I don't remember how many years ago . . . maybe fifteen or even more—the Center for Research in Human Learning, which is a unit that has relative autonomy but is centered in the Psychology Department . . . is a part of it administratively. It was set up to foster and enhance more the interrelationships across departments, and across colleges, and across disciplines that related to teaching and experience in research in human learning. So, the center has a core of Psychology Department members. We're not all members of it; I'm not a member of it. It has a core of people from the Institute of Child Development. It has some people from Communication Disorders. It has some affiliation, although it's smaller, with Linguistics. There have been a couple of people who were in Ed[ucational]-Psych[ology]. Paul Johnson is one active person who now has moved to the College of Management. He's still in

the center; so, it kind of stretches over there now, too. That fosters a lot of interrelationships. Instrumental in starting the center were people like James Jenkins who is here and Darley. In fact, when the building was planned, it was planned that there would be facilities for the center over in the part that is the old State Board of Health building. That was a part of Elliott Hall. They still have most of that building for their trainees, and research fellows, and post docs and pre-docs, and so on. They have grants to bring students in, and bring visiting professors in, and to do research.

CAC: You're suggesting, as I hear you, that these connections and with a variety of centers, and colleges, and departments . . . they must have their ups and downs but they do persist?

LL: Yes.

CAC: You're talking about things that start in the 1920s and 1930s and they still are active in the 1980s.

LL: Sure. This is an example of one that isn't that active anymore. I established relationships, too, with a number of people in the hospital center, particularly in physical medicine, in the days when I first came in and we had a very large rehabilitation training grant. At the peak, we had forty graduate students supported on it, which is a lot of students in one area. Rehabilitation Counseling Training, it was called. Then, another Minnesotan, Dabelstein, another Paterson Ph.D., became the research director of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation in Washington, D.C. and was starting a research program. He came out to see Pat and me the first year I was here and said, "We want Minnesota to do some research." We said, "What kind?" He said, "Any kind you want to." We said, "That's the way we'll do it; not any other way." We did that with the training grant, too. We said, "Rehabilitation is not a discipline. Psychology is. We will educate people for M.A.s and Ph.D.s in Psychology and Rehabilitation will be the overlay for their training. They'll get some experience in those settings." We did that for years and established relations there. We no longer have that program. During the [President Richard] Nixon years, that fell on bad times. There were still student stipends; but, there was no money to hire the people you needed to keep it going. We still have counseling students who want the rehab emphasis and go over there and get it. We can arrange that. We know the agencies. We still operate on a contract with the state—we, being Professor Rene Dawis and I—out of the counseling program, a state-wide vocational assessment project that does all of the testing for people coming to the Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. We're still active with Rehab; but, we don't have that strong emphasis we used to have.

CAC: There are links also with the Medical School?

LL: Yes, most of those started in Psychiatry and there are still some there . . . like Meehl holds a cross-appointment over there. Dave Lykken is budgeted there but holds a cross-appointment here and [William] Scofield over in Psychiatry holds a cross-appointment here in what used to be called Psychiatry Research over there. They don't have that anymore in Psychiatry; although,

the people are still doing their research. The hope of the new director was that if you didn't separate that out, maybe everybody would do research in the department; so, that was abolished. There are a lot of them arise on an individual basis, which is the best way, I think, to get the strongest ones. I don't think you can usually legislate interdisciplinary, cross-disciplinary programs and have them really work. Neal Viemeister, for example, is one of a small core of principal investigators on some very large grants in otolaryngology. Audition is Neal's research area in Experimental Psychology. Dwight Burkhardt, who does a lot of things studying the reactions of the rods and cones in the retina of walleyes and now in human donor eyes—they are just beginning that—works a good deal with Rick Purple over in the Medical School side.

CAC: This means from a research point of view that you really are a much larger faculty than those that are listed under the Psychology Department.

LL: Oh, yes.

CAC: For an outsider, you look at the staff of the Psychology Department over the years and it's relatively small for the missions that it carries.

LL: It is. It's too small. Actually, we have twenty-nine budgeted faculty people; that's all. We have three losses that we hope will come back; so, I guess we would say that we hope we're at thirty-two people who are the budgeted decision-making body in the department. But, if you look at adjunct faculty, the faculty budgeted on campus, and clinical faculty out in the community, there are quite a few more. There are twenty-nine budgeted faculty here now and there are fifty adjunct faculty, that is that are on campus in addition to those that we relate to.

CAC: Those would be primarily working on the graduate level not the undergraduate courses?

LL: Yes, graduate and research. Some are just working on research and not working with our students. Then, there are adjunct clinical rank faculty, forty eight of those, out in the Twin Cities area most of them.

CAC: Maybe you're saying—I'm going to make a hypothesis—that you have to have chairman who hang around a long time to understand this complexity. It's a large operation beyond the confines . . .

LL: It is a large operation.

CAC: It may be that no one can learn that in three years and do it successfully?

LL: Oh, I wouldn't say that.

CAC: You're describing an administrative structure far more complex than most departments I know well.

LL: Yes. For example, in 1982, 1983, we had forty-three sponsored projects, that is contracts and grants, coming into the department with only thirty-one faculty as of this time last year. I haven't put this together for this year.

CAC: Historically, it would be that kind of a pattern?

LL: Yes.

CAC: Lots of external research monies, a large number of persons associated with in an adjunct fashion?

LL: More outside research money than state budgeted money, yes. Administratively, there is a lot of paper that goes through here and lots of meetings and things.

CAC: You've also noted the influence of Paterson and the hiring of persons trained with him to stay here. That would run against a kind of university tradition the last twenty-five or thirty years of primarily seeking persons from the outside. Would you comment on that?

LL: Inbreeding, yes. I'd be happy to talk about inbreeding. That's been brought to our attention by some deans and some other people over time—not by our current dean, I must say. Fred [Lukermann] hasn't raised that maybe because we circulate this information to the deans as well. Yes, there's been inbreeding. However, we've always said that we thought that it worked pretty well. When you think of people like Meehl who became a Regents Professor and you think about Kenneth MacCorquodale, who won teaching awards and was a superb person, and when you think of Jenkins, a man of some stature. Lofquist, that's a different question . . . he stayed around a long time. [laughter] Dawis, who has stature in his field is a Paterson Ph.D.

CAC: This would not be the pattern in other great departments?

LL: It would not, except for, perhaps, somewhat for the University of Iowa. There has been some of that down there. I've kept track of this pattern of appointments of present budgeted faculty and as of last spring, it was like this: we were 31 percent, nine persons, inbred in terms of Minnesota and twenty outsiders over that time.

CAC: During this historical period, the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, it would have been a higher percentage?

LL: Oh, yes. Dunnette is a Minnesota Ph.D. Campbell is a Dunnette Ph.D.

CAC: In other great departments around the country, would there be the same kind of outreach, that you've described, to other departments, programs, and colleges? Is that inherent in Psychology or is there something special going on here at Minnesota over the years?

LL: That's hard for me to say. I think there would be a fair amount of outreach. Certainly, that's true at Michigan, which is one of our peers. People say there are psychologists all over the Michigan campus. You can say that about this place, too, I think. I think it would for the top rated places like Stanford and some of the others. Currently, our peer departments are viewed as seven of us who occupy the top four ranks in terms of quality of faculty in the ratings and they are: Stanford, Berkeley, Michigan, Harvard, Yale, Pennsylvania, and us—not in that order, except Stanford is on top in both cases, quality of faculty and quality of program. We're second in quality of program out of a 150.

CAC: Given what you've said—to get back to your own personal career—except for Mr. Darley who was associate dean of the Graduate School for a number of years with Mr. [Theodore] Blegen and has occupied, during his career, other administrative positions, you were one of the few who has gone on into college and Central Administration kinds of administrative work?

LL: Yes. The only other people I can think about are Kenneth Clark who became associate dean of the Graduate School, and became a dean out in Colorado, and then went on to the University of Rochester to become dean of the arts college and the graduate school, and now has left that, and is the president of the Center for Creative Leadership down in [Greensboro, North] Carolina. He went the administrative route. Wally Russell is the only other person I can think of who worked closely with Jenkins.

CAC: Ah, that's right.

LL: He was an experimental type psychologist and interested in language and linguistics, like Jenkins was, too. He, after considerable arm twisting—that was interesting; I was one of the twisters—became an associate dean for Dean [E.W. "Easy"] Ziebarth in the Arts College, and did some things like a college plan, and then went on to become dean at Iowa State of the arts college. Then, he left that and is now dean of the same kind of college at the University of South Florida.

CAC: I'm leading up to a question, Lloyd, as to why in 1967, I think it was—I can understand why the college would have wanted you—with the commitments you had in the department and in your research to become an associate dean for the Social Sciences, what was part of your perception of your own career at that time that you accepted what was a good invitation?

LL: I can say quickly that I had not planned it. I've had students in one of our seminars ask if I would spend a session on how one plans to become a successful administrator. I don't think you plan that in most cases. [laughter] I guess I was kind of flattered by the committee and by "Easy," and decided I would try it; and maybe I was a little gullible, too, because it was presented as a half time position. It became clear that it wasn't. It was full time, and I retained half time duties here, and directed a research unit, and the training program, and taught; and then finally, I couldn't do that anymore and so we changed to a different director of the Counseling

program. We have area directors in the department. Then, I guess I must have found the challenges reinforcing.

CAC: You weren't lacking in challenges. You came in in the fall of 1967 and then bango! you're right into . . . you were associate dean when the three minority studies programs were created.

LL: Yes. Right.

CAC: You couldn't have anticipated that. You didn't know that was going to be on the college's agenda when you took over?

LL: No, I certainly did not. There were a lot of meetings and they were very interesting. I guess maybe—it sounds kind of manipulative and maybe it is—one of the interesting things for me was how to manage people and their views. I can remember vividly presiding at the Social Sciences Council—I think we called it—meetings when there were presentations and finally approval of the Afro-American Studies program, and then the Chicano Studies program, and the American Indians Studies program . . . I think in about that order.

CAC: You're right.

LL: Then, later some non-ethnic things like the School of Statistics . . . I can remember when we abolished Public Administration. That was very painful and I was friendly with the person who ran it, too, who didn't feel very happy about that.

CAC: Was that Lloyd Short or was that George Warp by then?

LL: It was George Warp and he was very dedicated to doing what he was doing.

CAC: Yes, indeed.

LL: The faculties didn't think there was enough breadth in it and Poli[tical] Sci[ence] didn't feel it was going the right way. Then, I was on some committees when we were just establishing Public Affairs . . . the idea of it; although, I think I had moved on to Morrill Hall by the time we hired John Brandl.

CAC: I'd like to pause a minute here to pursue each of these. You won't be surprised that I have done a certain amount of work in the archives with manuscript materials, printed materials, reports, committee reports, etcetera. To try to piece together the dynamics of establishing the three ethnic departments and the furor over Statistics and Public Affairs is very difficult. I'm a very skilled historian. I'd have a hard time doing that. Why don't we take them up in chronological order, if that's okay? Where does the impulse come for Afro-American Studies and as associate dean, where does the initiative lie? What groups do you have to meet with?

What kind of support from the Central Administration . . . ? Those are the kinds of questions that are difficult to understand.

LL: Yes. I'm not sure I can shed much light on it. As I recall things, the community pressures were tremendous, at least for the Afro-American Studies program. The other programs kind of followed on in the wake of the establishment of Afro-American Studies. It was felt necessary for Central Administration and the college to be responsive in some ways. There were the sit-ins in Morrill Hall, for example.

CAC: But, they went to Morrill Hall and not to Johnston [Hall], except on one occasion, as I recall.

LL: That's true; but, you see, then that went to the president's office. I know [Malcolm "Mac"] Moos was very concerned. I was not in Morrill Hall in the [O. Meredith "Met"] Wilson days. I wish I had been; it sounds good. I know that he was very concerned and as associate dean, I was summoned over more than once to report on how things were going. There was no dictating to us; but, there certainly were anxieties and pressures that something had to be done. What would it be was the question. Would it be some courses? Would it be a program? Would it be a department? There were meetings with the Social Science Curriculum Committee. The dean, "Easy" Ziebarth, was also concerned and wanted to be kept informed. He wanted me to do most of the negotiating and I did. There were questions that would come up not only in the curriculum committee meetings but in the larger council meetings, too . . . questions like, Is there a discipline here? Is this really a discipline? Should it really be department status? Should it even be program status? There were a lot of reservations; but, there also was a lot of sympathy, I think, toward having something in the system that would relate to the culture of these special groups. In some cases, some people were kind of appalled at the way they thought the minority groups had been treated by higher education, namely by us. There were these sets of pressures. The community pressures were very, very strong. I remember in the meetings . . .

CAC: Excuse me . . . you had the portfolio though? You had to be the functioning person on a day to day, week to week basis?

LL: That's right.

CAC: For whatever support you had from President Moos or Dean Ziebarth . . . ?

LL: Yes.

CAC: Okay.

LL: I think it was out of the Curriculum Committee, in consultation with the dean, there would come a proposal to be brought to the council. It would be circulated ahead of time and we'd call a meeting. We'd first have to deal, in those days, with whether or not we wanted to admit the

Daily reporters. [laughter] We'd take a vote on that. There was very, very lively discussion. I remember sitting in those three meetings for those ethnic departments writing down first names of people in order as fast as I could so I could call on them in order when it became their turn. It was that much discussion with a number of interruptions. Someone would raise the question about, is it a discipline and somebody bounce up, a bright person but now with a militant suit on—figuratively—and counter that. The faculty person would sit down and think for awhile. The outside pressure was pretty tremendous. I think the man who changed his name later . . . Milt Williams was his name then . . . out in the community . . . what was his . . . ?

CAC: El-Kati . . . Mahmoud El-Kati.

LL: Yes. I never internalized the El-Kati name. I had him over, in fact, to some of my graduate seminars to talk about little things that are useful to know when you're dealing with a minority person, about how to make appointments with them. The answer to that is see him now. Don't make one later because he probably won't come. There were a whole lot of things like that. He was very bright. I don't know about his formal education; he seemed very well-educated. He was articulate, not at all militant. I remember asking him, "Milt, how could you appear the way you appeared in the council when I was chairing it some of those days and now appear this way?" [laughter] He said, "I can be militant when I need to." It was outside pressures but certainly some sympathy for the need for teaching of the culture of the group and some feeling of equal treatment for different folks, too. It resulted then in the departments being established and then approved, of course, by the vice-president and the Board of Regents.

CAC: Within the faculty, were there clusters of persons more supportive of these moves than otherwise, people who helped move this agenda along? It would have to be inside as well outside?

LL: Yes. There were the two sides really. It came down on the side of establishing the departments. I'm not sure that that could be the case in these times. I think it would come off as a program or less.

CAC: Were there leaders within the faculty that you could work with in the establishment, down the affirming side of taking this kind of initiative?

LL: I don't want to ascribe affirmative or negative sides; but, you could always call on people like Hy Berman, a person like yourself, and others that you knew would have something substantial to say to move discussion along so that we could get to some kind of closure. Actually, I was playing it, I guess as democratically as I could. I felt that was the only thing I could do; that is, I was not taking a pro or a con stance on any of these things.

CAC: Sure. Once the Afro-American Department had been established, then that established a kind of model for the Chicano, which came soon thereafter and the American Indian?

LL: The Chicanos felt they ought to deserve as much and the American Indians felt they ought to deserve as much. The same forces operated; although, there wasn't the same degree or the same kind of militancy or demonstrations out of the community. The Chicanos had some pretty well-organized demonstrations; the American Indians didn't but would kind of—quote—demonstrate—unquote—in committees.

CAC: In the meantime, Dean Ziebarth and Central Administration in Morrill Hall were prepared to be supportive for whatever details were brought in to them out of the process that you were directing?

LL: That's right. I think Gerry Shepherd and Fred Lukermann, who were in the vice-president for academic administration office, could see the need and were ready to be supportive if this came forth from the faculty and it did. On the School of Statistics the thrust came from Morrill Hall.

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: Let's pick up with School of Statistics where there wouldn't have been a community pressure but a problem internal to the college.

LL: I was still an associate dean then and got involved in talking with "Easy" who then wanted me to talk with Gerry Shepherd and Fred Lukermann in Academic Affairs. The thrust, as I see it, came mostly from the vice-president for academic administration, Shepherd. The thought was that we might have stronger offerings in Statistics and a better coordinated total sequence of courses in Statistics if we centralized it somehow and didn't have the metastasis of Statistics courses in all the departments across the university, which grew rapidly. Psychology always taught some, not a lot, still does. Sociology began teaching quite a bit, more than we did over here. We also had kind of a research assistant center—I think it was called the Statistical Center—under Bernie Lindgren. We had people like Collier in Ed-Psych. These people were not very closely related. It was thought maybe some of those would affiliate with a school or a department if we had one; so, a school was proposed. We brought that through our college machinery to the Social Sciences Council. There was a great deal of discussion because departments were afraid that then their courses would be abolished and they would be prohibited from hiring people who taught statistics using the kinds of examples and the kind of research problems that were salient in their particular disciplines. There was a fair amount of resistance. I can remember chairing the meeting and inviting Gerry Shepherd—I think Fred was there, too—to come up, and sit with me, and help answer questions, which he was happy to do. He was beginning to mutter under his beard a little bit worried about it. I remember writing him a note saying, "Relax. It's going to pass." It did. The faculty did buy it and the vote was substantial. That went into effect, and then we started searching, and found [Seymour] Geisser. It has grown.

However, what we thought about in terms of the metastasis then has not gone away. It's still there; that is, we still have teaching in the separate departments. In fact, Seymour Geisser, the director of the school, and I are good friends. We lunch frequently together just by chance. We are always kidding. He's saying, "There's nothing worse than a statistics course, [unclear] course, taught by a psychologist." I say, "You're entitled to your own opinions, Seymour, but it's better than if we end up taking yours." [laughter] However, they have a good strong faculty and a good school, both theoretical and applied departments within the school.

CAC: You think that melding has worked well over the fifteen years?

LL: I think it has. Some of the people . . . like Collier was kind of related to it. Collier following out of the Ed-Psych statistics, Palmer Johnson era . . . Collier, Don MacEachern, and later Terwilliger, and later Davison were all kind of an institution in themselves; so, they've never been completely melded into Seymour's School of Statistics.

CAC: Like everything else, it's a series of compromises; but, it comes off rather well.

LL: Yes. There was a question where to put the school, too. We decided to put it in the College of Liberal Arts [CLA]. "Easy" Ziebarth agreed to that. I think the school sees itself as more closely related to the Institute of Technology than to the College of Liberal Arts.

CAC: This was again a portfolio you had with support from "Easy"; but, it was in a functional sense?"

LL: Yes.

CAC: There were more internal difficulties in dropping Public Administration and then into Public Affairs or not?

LL: Yes, there were there because Public Administration had become . . . It was run by a hardworking man, who had a lot of things going and worked very hard at it, was very dedicated, and turned out some good people; but, he was turning out people who were felt to be at a lower level. What he was doing was giving the state a lot of service and not giving the academic community and the subject matter area of public administration all that much substance. It was hard, I think, for George [Warp] to see that maybe there should be a change. I remember there were discussions and I had discussions with him and with the political scientists since they never really fully embraced it—Lloyd Short did, I think. Ted Mitau certainly embraced what he was doing. As I say that, I don't know why Ted Mitau pops in there; but, he was in some of those discussions and was not a part of us, of the university—this was before he became chancellor of the state system—working on behalf of the state agencies probably more than anything and publishing in that area.

CAC: There was that outside interest at least?

LL: It became clear that it was not going to be resolved and the best thing to do was to abolish it; and then we all became concerned about the feelings of the hardworking professor, George Warp.

CAC: Sure.

LL: There were, what amount to, hearings in the council. They went off kind of difficultly because George did not seem to see what was happening; that is, I couldn't guide him gracefully out of it. There was an action to—I don't know that we used the word abolish—discontinue the program of Public Administration and then to explore the establishment of a school of public affairs.

CAC: That's the school that becomes the Humphrey Institute down the line?

LL: Yes. It seems to me Carl Auerbach was pretty central . . . maybe as chairman of the committee to do that. There were other people on it like me as an associate dean with some relevance to it. Brandl, of course, wasn't on the scene yet. John Borchert might have been a university citizen on that committee as well.

CAC: By that time, the initiative was shifted from Johnston Hall to Morrill Hall?

LL: Yes, right. These were simply committee meetings doing some planning. Charlie Backstrom was on that committee, too, from Political Science.

CAC: The initiative on that shifted to Central Administration but so did you. In the fall of 1969, you transferred over to the office of vice-president for Academic Administration.

LL: Right.

CAC: Could you say a bit about that appointment? What expectations or what opportunities there were at that point . . . now you're really getting into administration.

LL: Oh, yes. [laughter] Little did I know. I think the way that happened was, as I recall, I got a call from Gerry Shepherd who wondered if I could come over and meet with him on a Saturday morning. It's the first time I discovered they worked Saturdays and Sundays, too, and evenings.

CAC: That should have been a warning to you.

LL: [laughter] I remember talking to John Turnbull wondering what was up and what I ought to be informed about. John said, "Oh, hell. There you go." I met with Gerry and Fred, of course. I knew them pretty well by this time. Gerry wondered if I would come over as an assistant v.p. [vice-president] and simply pointed out that they kind of split . . . There was kind of a clear split of duties on some things like outreach type things and CURA [Center for Urban

and Regional Affairs] type things . . . that was Fred. They wanted me to work with curriculum proposals, and HECC, the Higher Education Coordinating Commission, and things like that in the office. We kind of split up, Fred Lukermann, and Anne Wirt who was there, and I—Anne was an assistant to the v.p. and very central to the office, too—to review things like appointments, consulting, signing salary forms. Promotion and tenure, we all reviewed. It was felt that I would probably do a lot of work with things that came out of the Arts College. Then, once you got in there, you suddenly learned much more than you wanted to know about a very, very complex and large institution. I even knew that you shouldn't give young heifers cold water, for example; that was bad. We got this deluge of county agent release materials from the St. Paul campus. Everything flowed through Morrill Hall. It was kind of fun. It was really interesting.

CAC: I thought you were speaking figuratively, talking about cold water to young heifers.

LL: [laughter] No, I wasn't.

CAC: Because there were some young heifers causing a good deal of uproar at that time.

LL: Oh, yes.

CAC: You get the anti-war movement, the continuing of the ethnic . . .

LL: We have a lot of things, the Experimental College . . . It fell to me to be the ad hoc person on a lot of those things. I remember that because I had difficulty even at that younger age sitting on the floor with everybody. I'd go looking for a chair. They met in a rented church building across the street from the university; and they would always refer to that awful place across the street, which is where I came from, of course.

CAC: [laughter]

LL: It was kind of interesting to watch that develop. They developed procedures, and procedures, and procedures until they had so many procedures that graduating from it was like taking a Ph.D. oral exam at the end. They bureaucratized themselves out of the freedom that they had sought with such fervor.

CAC: Working with that group, Mr. [Roger] Jones of Physics was one of . . .

LL: Oh, yes, Jones of Physics.

CAC: Your relationship with him . . . what really was your role? To listen and then to carry it back to the vice-president's office?

LL: It would be to listen. People like that, I got involved with early on as associate dean, too, somehow. I don't know quite how; but, they were probably people who were advocating some

of the things that were coming through CLA, some of the minority programs, perhaps, too. To listen, to use your judgment, resolve it if you could, not just channel back . . . you had a lot of authority with Gerry and Fred to do things. We had a system where, at least, one secretary would always remain at closing time, and the three and for awhile, Anne worked, too, the four of us would gather and we would try to take care of the work that hadn't gotten done that day. We'd also inform each other of things we had done and occasionally Gerry would dictate a letter, or Fred would, or I would because we knew that pile would just grow—Morrill Hall is like that—if we didn't try to keep it within bounds, and get things done, and make decisions.. We would argue like mad sometimes. Fred and I would get into a big discussion. We always liked each other and still do; but, we had different views on some things. Mr. Shepherd would then say, "All right, you guys, we've got to resolve this. We're going to do this." He had been listening. Then, our agreement was that once we had made these decisions that we spoke in one voice as Gerry put it, which is the only way you can function.

CAC: How would the office then relate to the presidential office on affairs of that sort? I have a sense that Mr. Moos, at least, was engaged in the student protests—I say that plural—more than many presidents, that he wanted to keep closer to it. Did he work through Mr. Shepherd or did they have a separate line to the president's office? How were those lines resolved?

LL: I don't think that he wanted to be that close to it. I think he was concerned that there were problems and those problems needed to be resolved; but, I don't believe that he wanted the president's office to resolve them. In one instance, for example, there was a point, maybe you recall, where the teaching assistants decided to follow the model of the Madison teaching assistants and to kind of revolt in a way.

CAC: Yes.

LL: We went to a meeting with their leaders, Gerry and I, at the invitation of Mr. Moos. The meeting started out and Mr. Moos announced that he didn't have much time. He couldn't stay very long; but, he trusted that things would get resolved and that he had asked Mr. Lofquist, the administration representative, to solve these problems. It was the first I ever heard of it. Gerry and I looked at each other. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

LL: We scheduled a long series of meetings, and things did work out, and we did get things that they wanted.

CAC: I recall meetings when Mr. Moos, on a Sunday afternoon, would be present, and stay for four hours to listen through, and then to respond for the Central Administration.

LL: With what kind of . . . ?

CAC: On the anti-war, on the Experimental College.

LL: Yes, there were some of those but . . . I may be selectively recalling a part that I saw that was late Moos instead of early Moos. I wasn't there when he came in. My first meeting with him was about Afro-American Studies, I think. What were we doing in the Arts College and what did I think would happen?

CAC: You were there during the mass protests of students on the war, and the occupation there, and the coming of the police?

LL: Yes, there were a few times when we certainly were there and were asked to be there. I was asked to be there in case I was needed because some others were going to be gone for some of those meetings. [laughter] Later on, it was kind of difficult in the first retrenchment. Remember, the colleges and departments . . .

CAC: Yes, indeed, I do. I was going to come to that later.

LL: . . . and everybody had to plan and these plans had to come forward to us. Then, there was kind of a hearing where the dean and whoever he brought along as staff could explain things, amplify things and we could ask questions. It was a meeting with the president and the Central Administration not only just with Gerry. I think for everyone of those meetings, the people present were Gerry Shepherd, Fred Lukermann, Lloyd Lofquist, and Jim Brinkerhoff.

CAC: I didn't know that. Say something about Mr. Brinkerhoff's role.

LL: Mr. Brinkerhoff's role was beautiful. As vice-president for Finance, he . . . It seems to me it's rare when you find a person who has the kind of resource control in the large administrative problems in a place this large and this complex who will make very clear both in statement and in his actions in the central group, when there were discussions about things, that the only reason for the office of vice-president for financial planning, or affairs, or whatever it was called was to support the academic enterprise. Period. And he would do that. People would turn to him and ask questions that had a tinge of academic in them. He'd turn to Gerry. That's the way it needed to be and it was beautiful working with Jim. I was very sorry to see him leave this place. He was a very good vice-president for an institution whose primary mission is academic.

CAC: Were you in Morrill Hall when the police came on campus for the first and only time?

LL: I was holding a meeting in the conference room next to Gerry's office. That was the day that I almost quit smoking. I don't know what we were meeting about, but we were all in a narrow, long office sitting around a table there, and I lit a cigarette, and it tasted just awful! Then, we realized the window was open and tear gas was coming in.

CAC: [gasp]

LL: We knew that the helicopters were buzzing around. We could hear the noise out there. We knew there was rioting going on and the police were there.

CAC: But, you were just going ahead with your committee meeting?

LL: We had to kind of adopt a business-as-usual policy. There were times when the secretaries wanted us to lock the doors out to the main hall because it was filled. I can't remember the man's name . . . he used to bring a bullhorn and they would sing old labor songs. That noise was frightening. They didn't dare walk out there and they were afraid these people were going to come in and gobble them up. We said, "Leave the doors unlocked. It will be business-as-usual. You stay in here. Fred, and Gerry, and I will go anyplace we need to go." We did. We went out to Don Smith's office or somewhere else. They weren't about to bother you that way. It's kind of like when the building was barricaded more than once. You would have been a fool in the heat of it to have gone out the regular doors down on the ground level of Morrill or the front door because of the crowds and the fervor; but, you could go through the garages and around. I went out to lunch. I went and held a meeting of the Council on Liberal Education. That was one of my jobs to chair that during those days. It used to always be chaired by one of the vice-presidents.

CAC: You mentioned Don Smith's names. Could you tell me about his role in these affairs were talking about?

LL: Yes, I think during Don Smith's days the central officer's meetings were attended, except for these retrenchment ones, by Moos and by all the vice-presidents. Later on, there got to be a few too many people there . . . people from the budget office, people from the Foundation, all kinds of people. While they didn't vote in a formal sense, it was a consensus that came out of something and they would be much a part of the conversation and the consensus and really shouldn't have been, some of them, unless it was an item relating to them. That central officer's group got a little too large. Other central people would be there and the assistant v.p.s would be there. Deans weren't there. The president would be there; but, Don Smith would really run the meeting and keep it going very effectively. He was a good administrator and I think he wrote most of the policies in the university in those days.

CAC: What as the relationship between Shepherd's office and Smith's on matters of that sort? Who did what?

LL: I think it was good because Don, of course, came out of Gerry's office to be the administrative v.p. He was an assistant vice-president like Fred and me; although, I didn't succeed him. I succeeded Jim Hogg, as I remember.

CAC: Right.

LL: I think it was good because they were friends and we understood, all of us, the university pretty well. It's gratuitous to say that; but, I think we did. Although, there were some times when it would be a little touchy if someone took something that was clearly Shepherd's to Don Smith; but then, they must have been able to chat about that personally. We got along fine. We did hate to see him go.

CAC: Gerry had a sense of his office—I'm making a statement which is really a question—being the chief among the vice-presidents?

LL: That's right, yes.

CAC: I'm wondering to what degree. Do you have any sense of the continuity of that . . . whether it was Shepherd that really established that priority in Central Administration, that expectation?

LL: I think it was Shepherd who did, yes—unless it was Met Wilson.

CAC: I see.

LL: It could have been. Shepherd came in for Met Wilson.

CAC: That's right. Wilson comes in 1960 and I think Shepherd comes in in 1963.

LL: Yes.

CAC: And perhaps with that understanding? I don't know.

LL: I think Gerry said he'd been there six years or so when I came. I think that is probably what Met wanted, and that's what Gerry wanted, and that's what is needed still in this institution.

CAC: President Moos recognized that when he became president?

LL: He did; but, it became diluted on two primary occasions. First of all, there was to be a v.p. for the Health Sciences and we opposed that in Academic Affairs. We didn't oppose having a senior officer in charge of it. We opposed it being a companion v.p. level job, which it became. Then, there was great pressure for a vice-president for Agriculture and we opposed that. Then, they did the deputy thing and that person began to meet with the vice-presidents and in effect had practically equal power. We've gotten to the point where we have a budget executive instead of *an* executive operating officer, which we felt ought to be the academic v.p. I think [unclear] still feel that way.

CAC: This was one source of difference between Shepherd and his office and Moos as president?

LL: Yes. I think Moos was responding to the pressures, which were considerable, that came out of the Health Sciences, and the medical community in the state, and the ones in St. Paul. That has a large support community throughout the state [unclear]. He felt that was the way to respond to it. We felt that was not really the thing to do; but, we lost on that. It was simply announced at one meeting that Lyle [French] would be v.p. We got on very well with Lyle. He's still a good friend and I admire him. We did not think the Health Sciences ought to have that kind of position. We felt it would, first of all, it would obfuscate some of the clear lines of authority we thought there needed to be in a total university, and secondly, related to that, it would enhance we felt—I think it has—the separation across Washington Avenue of one university from another university. I'll say that even on a recording if you don't let the *Daily* get it. [laughter]

CAC: Shepherd's office . . . what role did it play at times of budget preparation, but presentation to the legislature? Did Gerry or the office play any role in the . . . ?

LL: Oh, yes. Gerry Shepherd's office played a strong role in that. I know because I used to go along with him as kind of a resource person who had things that we might want . . . data or we could talk a little when there was a chance to do that. He would get up to the podium out in the middle of the floor there and testify before committees on various things and answer questions about things like faculty workload, faculty consulting, and a lot of things the legislature was interested in in those days. Moos would also be there and would make presentations. On some occasions the presentations countered each other somewhat.

CAC: Who orchestrated the presentation to the legislature then?

LL: The scheduling and all of that behind the scenes activity was [Stan] Wenberg and [Stan] Kegler. Kegler [unclear] it pretty much . . . the same role that Kegler's been playing, I think. Gerry was very active in that. He was a person who was very direct on things and I think persuasive with the legislature, with the regents, too. Sometimes one has to do that. The regents may say, "Why don't we fire a certain person?" You can't do that maybe.

CAC: That's a very delicate matter of administration with the board of regents and really the president has to deal with them; but, you're suggesting . . . Would the individual members of the board of regents seek out Mr. Shepherd or what was that relationship of that office with the regents?

LL: Individual members would seek us out, yes. They'd even seek me out. I had many conversations with people like John Ingve, and [Fred] Hughes, and some of those people.

CAC: This was considered part of a regular procedure? There was no question . . . ?

LL: It wasn't considered irregular, let me put it that way. If John wanted some more information about a certain point, he would call up, for example. In other words, contacts

weren't limited only to regents receiving complaints, which then were brought to our office and which then we brought to deans, to departments. You know the kind of thing. Where do I get all this wisdom? I don't really have that much. I think the delicate role of a president—I understand that Met Wilson did that very well—is to present issues of broad university policy to the regents, and to be able to articulate these, and to be able to with them shape these policies

...

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

LL: . . . and not always to be in agreement, and sometimes to lay your job on the line if necessary but not to let those meetings, and those activities, and those committees get into the day to day operation of the university. I think there was some erosion of that in the period that I spent in Morrill Hall, which led to us leaving.

CAC: Right. We'll come to that before we close our conversation. What you're saying about President Wilson is largely what you would have picked up from other persons who were in the office before you came?

LL: Yes, I didn't experience that directly. I met the man and enjoyed him immensely. Many times at lunch, he would come and join the faculty; that's another nice thing for a person to do. He didn't want to talk about university affairs. He didn't want to talk about anything. Your discipline . . . he knew something about your discipline, you suddenly found out.

CAC: But, you've not found that true of subsequent presidents?

LL: No, only in very small measure, a little bit but not much. That's very hard for a president to do, too, to find the time; but, I think it's terribly important to find that time.

CAC: It's where you set a priority—if I can have a conversation here for a moment.

LL: Yes.

CAC: I did interview Mr. Wilson in his home in Eugene [Oregon] last year. One of the things he volunteered—I did not ask it—was the notion that the first priority of a president was to work closely with the regents, and to make it clear to them what their role was, and to work with them . . . precisely what you're saying.

LL: I was trying to say . . . he said it much better.

CAC: He was very self conscious about that.

LL: Rather than to take kind of a what is your pleasure, gentlemen? . . . and then go with that.

CAC: Why do you think that began to happen in the middle years of the Moos administration?

LL: When I stop to think about it, I'm not all that critical of Mac. I think Mac did not really understand his role. He saw himself as an important—rightly so—much higher figure than anyone in the place. I'm reasonably sure that one reason that he did not want to come to those retrenchment meetings where we felt it was important for the tenor of the thing . . . to have the top people there to hear the deans out, was that his model of governance was more a federal one. The president doesn't go to the budget committee meetings; someone else does that. He didn't say that; but, I don't think he ever clearly ever saw that role. I think he saw his role more as a functionary out in the community and that sort of thing than he did as a person who ought to relate a lot to the faculty here. I don't think he denigrated the faculty. I just don't think he understood his role from the first time I knew him.

CAC: I sometimes thought that, perhaps, Mr. Moos, who was a speech writer and administrative assistant for Mr. [President Dwight D. "Ike"] Eisenhower may really have perceived the presidency of the university as "Ike" did for the country, as above the tussle of daily or even monthly administration..

LL: I think that's true.

CAC: I just wish he were living. It's an interesting perception.

LL: So, he would not have gotten as involved. I imagine in the central officer's meetings that Wilson—I don't know this firsthand—would have probably gotten very involved in the discussion. He would listen and I think he would ask some questions instead of adjourning the meeting.

CAC: Moos stopped chairing the senate meetings while president.

LL: Yes.

CAC: There was another opportunity to have the president's presence.

LL: Yes. In fairness to him, I think that's how he saw his role. He must have found it difficult why his people were quitting on him . . . for example, when we did. There is a little something to back that up, too. I think a couple of days after we had done that . . . That wasn't very enjoyable for me; I had never really been a part of anything like that in my life before . . . coming to work and seeing our pictures in the *Daily*. [laughter] "Vice-Presidents resign en masse." Something that supports that notion, too, is that even though we did—you probably saw those in the archives—wrote letters indicating why we were resigning to him, and to the regents, and to the archives but not to the total university, I got a call about two days after that from Stan Kegler saying he was calling, and he didn't chuckle either, for Mr. Moos and Mr. Moos would

be very interested in my acting as vice-president for academic administration. So, he didn't perceive what was up. I said, "Stanley, you know the answer to that." He said, "Yes, I do, Lloyd. See you later." He had to make the call. I don't think Stan did that just for fun. That is an inability to perceive what was really happening.

CAC: I think he was surprised. Even the written documents would suggest that.

LL: Yes.

CAC: Why I'm doing this is to get an informal history, which comes closer to felt realities.

LL: Sure.

CAC: I would imagine—this is a speculative guess and question—that Shepherd, and Lukermann, and Lofquist must have talked a good deal about that resignation.?

LL: We did.

CAC: Over how long a period and what really were the essential issues at hand there?

LL: I think the central issue was really that we could not function effectively anymore the way things were going; that is, some things were happening at cross purposes, be it actions that we recommended being recommended differently by someone else who wasn't in charge of academic administration or a promise made in the legislature that could not possibly be carried out. There was a legislator once—I think I can say this—who wanted complete information on all of the earnings from whatever source of every faculty member in the university. This was about the time when there was a team of investigative reporters coming out of the legislature looking into consulting and all of those things . . . who wrote books, and whether they got royalties, and that kind of thing. The answer to that question—this was on a Thursday or Friday—was "I imagine it will take us until about Monday or Tuesday morning to get you a print out of that.

CAC: [laughter]

LL: Whereupon Gerry Shepherd leaped out of his chair and said, "Gentlemen, I'm sorry. You cannot have that information. Only the IRS [Internal Revenue Service] can have that information." I'm not sure whether I should have said that; but, it happened.

CAC: How do you account for Shepherd's strength? You knew him very well. He's out of the Institute of Technology where one does not imagine there are persons of great political skill and, yet, Gerry felt his way toward these positions. Do you have any sense of Shepherd as a human being and as an administrator and how he reached this kind of style?

LL: Only that he is a very good administrator. He certainly is not a person who is limited to the stereotype of, say, a computer programmer, or an electrical engineer, or a physicist, that is almost completely data oriented and non-people oriented . . . which is true when people measure the needs of these different kinds of occupational groups. Part of that may have been due to the fact that he was just terribly committed to liberal education and could hold forth on that warmly and at some length—and did sometimes with groups.

CAC: That must have been deep in his experience somewhere.

LL: Don Smith wrote the policies that established the Council on Liberal Education as I recall.

CAC: Right.

LL: He got all those things going but he and Gerry must have talked at length about that. Gerry was very, very imbued with that notion, that requirement really of liberal education as being terribly important here. In other ways, he, of course, in his own research career was very data oriented and probably still carries his little slide rule. He would take that out once in awhile after we'd figure it out on the calculator. [laughter]

CAC: Bravo.

LL: So, he's data oriented; but, he is also very people oriented. He also had a strength; he doesn't pale in the face of criticism. He might become angry; but, he might not show it probably.

CAC: I'm thinking of the persons that Mr. Moos would have been gathering faculty attitudes and pressures from. Gene Eidenberg was part of his staff when you were in the vice-president's office.

LL: Gene was really brought in to academic administration as kind of an intern known mostly by Fred, and did some very good things for us, and then got know to Don Smith, and then he went as an assistant v.p. to Don Smith, and for a short while was acting v.p., I think, before he went to Chicago. Fred's interest in Gene, I think, was Gene's connections with the community, the city and Art Naftalin's staff. I think about the first time I met Gene, I met him down in the mayor's office as a staffer there on some program that they wanted to with the university and maybe Fred couldn't go and I went that day. Fred has always had a love for outreach and dealing with the community and that turned him on to Gene. I think people were impressed at Gene's brightness and maturity for a very young guy. He was able to stand up and do it when it needed doing. That brought him in with Don.

CAC: Would Moos have been . . . ?

LL: Moos would have been involved in the fact that . . . if you remember the physical layout, too . . . I guess Mac's perception of the job would probably lead him, both because of the geography and his perception, down to the vice-president for administration when there was something coming up, who would then refer it across the hall to us. He would come across the hall rarely; but, he would come and see me sometimes if he had to give a talk or something and wondered what I thought about certain paragraphs or if he didn't like them, could I straighten them out somehow so I would try to do that.

CAC: We've talked about various pressures on the vice-president's office and you speak of this flow of information and persons.

LL: Oh, yes.

CAC: Were there faculty issues that were sharp and controversial and brought to the office during this period of general turmoil with student protest [unclear]?

LL: Yes, there were faculty issues where some faculty member would decided that he wasn't going to teach his class.

CAC: I see . . . that level.

LL: Then, there would be a person who when told that he had to do that, teach his class and carry on as usual, would schedule his class for three in the morning or something like that. We might have to call that person in—we did.

CAC: You aren't making that up? That's a real case?

LL: Oh, yes.

CAC: [laughter]

LL: No names.

CAC: How many such cases would your office have to handle of that sort?

LL: Of that particular sort, probably not too many. That's when the policy on faculty responsibility was written.

CAC: I see.

LL: Freedom and responsibility. We wrote that there.

CAC: That was out of the initiative of Shepherd's office?

LL: Sure.

CAC: To create that?

LL: Oh, yes . . . and on promotion and tenure. You hear about the [Henry] Koffler/[Warren] Ibele Memorandum . . . that's the Shepherd Memorandum, that then became the Shepherd/Koffler one, and then Ibele got in there and it became the Koffler/Ibele. We wrote that in Central Administration, much as it is now. There's been a little added by [Kenneth] Keller about service.

CAC: You wrote it on your own initiative? There weren't a lot of . . . ?

LL: Oh yes, yes, because we had problems. We did actually look at all these files that came in for promotion and tenure; and we immediately discovered more and more of the cases where, say, in the Medical School, you had people doing very well but what were they doing for service? They were not doing scholarship and research and maybe not much teaching either. Do you promote them then? In some colleges, things were pretty squishy and the data weren't there. We would sort these out and it would become our jobs. We would divide them up. I would call a dean and say, "These from X Department don't seem to be supported. We're not going to recommend promotion. I'll send them back to you. Either don't send them forward and they'll come up next time or give us more documentation. We'll give you more time; but, we need them by X date." That would make some people furious; but, we would do that. You would run into problems. My first chore when I got in there was to write a policy on political activity. That had been Jim Hogg's duty and Gerry was mad because nothing had happened for a year or so. That was to embrace things like Allan Spear getting elected to the legislature. What do you do? Walter Heller being on appointments . . . things like that. We wrote a policy and took it to faculty first, committee of the senate, and had go-arounds here and there, and changed some things; and then it became a regents policy. The amount of time one can consult . . . those came out of discussions in regents' sub-group meetings. They were all reviewed there and summarized [unclear].

CAC: This office was getting its agenda partly by self-generation and anticipation of problems . . . ?

LL; Oh, yes.

CAC: . . . in part from student protests . . . ?

LL: Yes.

CAC: . . . in part from questions from the regents . . . ?

LL: Yes.

CAC: . . . in part from faculty concerns . . . ?

LL: Yes, and sometimes from not very well thought out decisions that erupted into some little feud somewhere on campus. [laughter] I remember one person coming into the office one day and he was furious. I had an awful time not laughing because he had come ten minutes late to class one snowy wintery day. He went on and taught his class and the next time he got his paycheck, he found out that it was smaller. His chairman, it turned out—the two of them walked around campus a lot together and you'd think they were friends; but, they were feuding all the time—had become so angry with him that he wrote a short note to payroll requesting that Professor so and so's pay be docked so many dollars . . . \$175 or something—I don't know how he arrived at this—and payroll did it

CAC: [laughter]

LL: My experience with them is that when you try to move payroll, it's like moving a rock; but, they did it. What's to be done about it? I called up this chairman, and he came over, and I had the two of them in the office. It was really funny. I said, "Did you really think it was that serious? I don't and we're going to restore the pay." He said, "That is as serious as committing rape on the front of Northrop Auditorium." And he meant it. [laughter] I said, "I'm sorry you feel that way."

CAC: You're describing a workload and a set of pressures . . .

LL: There were all kinds.

CAC: . . . that would have been very hard on the family life of each of you.

LL: They were. Yes.

CAC: You, and Fred, and Gerry must have been working what kind of a work week?

LL: I don't know. Lillian [Mrs. Lloyd Lofquist] was getting sick of it, I know that. There would be times when I'd go over to the Union, the student part, and get a sandwich or go over to a hamburger joint over near the stadium, and get something, and go back to work, particularly in the retrenchment days. We had to take all these plans, and we had to reduce them all to a manageable document, and then we had to have hearings. Then, of course, there were always other kinds of hearings like with Jack Darley, who chaired the student uprising [committee] . . . I forget what the name of the committee was. It had community people and others on it to access what had happened during the student demonstration and how the police fitted in. We invited the mayor, [Charles] Stenvig and the police chief—they didn't come. We had people like Judge [Robert J.] Sheran, and some political types, and some university types, and I was always ex officio on those things . . . Fred or I, one or the other. There's a commentary behind this, too,

you would find a time when there was nobody to preside at a meeting. I remember one in Northrop where Lillian and I took the chairman of the board of Pillsbury and his wife, the president of the Bank of America and his wife, and the black mayor of Cleveland and his wife, to a served dinner at the Campus Club, then over to Northrop where an assistant vice-president represented the administration to present them, in front of all their friends—it went off very well, I must say; but, I was a little teed off about that—with outstanding alumni awards. I had their wives stand up [unclear] and it worked out very well.

CAC: The ceremonial duties, too?

LL: Yes. I couldn't help but think in that case, wouldn't they wonder where was the president? Why wasn't there a regent around or all the regents, the vice-presidents?

CAC: Sure.

LL: They've got Lofquist here. I never heard of him; but, he tells us he's an assistant vice-president. [laughter] I remember that well. It would be things like that or it would be the faculty retirement ceremony and Fred or I would go from our office. Gerry, bless him, was usually so damned busy, he couldn't be at all these places.

CAC: You speak of this experience with a kind of exhilaration, too. You were younger and you all had the energy to see it through.

LL: Oh, sure. We figured we could put it off, by god!

CAC: You had fun?

LL: We did for awhile, yes. That's getting back to that question on administration. You must get some reinforcement out of it or you wouldn't do it.

CAC: The reinforcement is the joy of engaging with good colleagues.

LL: I think so and seeing something happen in an institution that you like, having some hand in shaping some parts of it. Then, there are interesting things, too. It was interesting in that role—I'm sure this is still true . . . I've been here a long time; so, I know a lot of people when I go into the Campus Club, just as you do—that everybody said "Hello" . . . lots of people I didn't know. I wondered after we resigned how it would be. I've only identified two people, one of whom kind of turned away from me . . . Obviously, they were saying "Hello" to the position even though I was only an assistant. Then, there were people wanting to know things, too. Some of which you could share and some of which you can't. I suppose that was fun, too.

CAC: How much in our conversation have you been unable to share now after ten years?

LL: Unable to share?

CAC: There are still things you think of as being secure and confidential because of the relationship with Gerry and Fred?

LL: Oh, yes, sure.

CAC: The historian is going to have no way of getting at that—not that we should.

LL: No, I suppose he or she won't.

CAC: By 1973, you've had an exciting time. You start in 1967 with the Arts College and then into the Morrill Hall in times of great tumult and great opportunity but with the shape of your long-range career, your commitment to research and to teaching . . . it must have been with some relief that you looked forward to coming home, so to speak.

LL: Yes. As a matter of fact, I had a leave for a year. I stayed here really to kind of tool myself up for some teaching, and then I taught for a year, and then I fell into this. I still do teach though . . . seminars, graduate ones. I've got three of those. Fred and I have always done that. I think Fred is still doing it, too. When he was in Morrill, I remember he was over at eight thirty in the morning teaching Geography. It is a relief to get back and do professorial things, too.

CAC: Towards the end of interviews sometimes we have to pick up lost threads and it becomes less coherent. This has been a pretty logical theme that we've followed here. Where were you during the Hubert Humphrey flap? Were you then associate dean or were you in the vice-president's . . . ?

LL: I was an associate dean when Hubert was brought in to teach here and at Mac[alester].

CAC: Your office must have been important there, too.

LL: Yes. Very quickly . . . the program that he was going to teach in was a Social Science program which Hy Berman was heading at the time. Hy's office was down the hall from me and we established an office down at the other end of the hall on the second floor of Social Sciences there for Hubert. I had met him earlier when he was the mayor and I was a VA representative on some committee for the handicapped; but, I didn't know him well. I found him to be absolutely fascinating. I wondered if he could possibly have much substance and what he would say when he would come and do a marathon day of three lectures on quite different topics to quite different groups, like political scientists, nurses, economists. So, I went to those lectures. I was not shepherding him around. Hy Berman was doing most of that and the secret service folks. I was very, very impressed. He had a lot of substance in all those areas. Some of the people who denigrated Hubert because he talked so much on every subject and felt he didn't

know anything were wrong. He's a fascinating guy for remembering names. I would say 100 people could go through a door, and he'll learn your name, and on the way out, he'll say "Goodbye, Lillian," to my wife, whom he didn't know. He knew me . . . just fascinating. The secret service were very worried—a small aside—because the halls are so narrow there.

CAC: Oh, my.

LL: They were afraid during these times that he might be in trouble; so, there was a rope ladder ordered—Hy Berman swears he still has it—that would enable Hubert to get from the second floor out the window of Social Science down in the direction of Wilson Library. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

LL: That was fun. I was not a part of the political things, and the Humphrey parties, and all that. Hy was since he's always been into politics.

CAC: Sure, he's on my list. Maybe before we come to the end of the conversation here, you could say something about Mr. Ziebarth who was a towering figure for so long in the university community and you worked with him very closely.

LL: I was always impressed by Dean Ziebarth and his warmth. At the same time, he could be rather deanly and formal and certainly always looked the part of a distinguished administrator. He was probably the best dressed man on campus in the history of the place.

CAC: And like Mr. Moos and like Gerry Shepherd, kept in touch with his faculty, I would guess.

LL: Yes, he did keep in touch with his faculty, and was concerned about them, and would write letters to them about their recent publications and books.

CAC: I received a couple.

LL: He was interested enough to meet with the student groups like the CLA Intermediary Board at his house every so often. The associate deans would come, too, and we'd discuss student problems. He was just an all around nice guy to work with and we still enjoy him. He has an office here in Elliott Hall still; but, we don't see that much of him anymore.

CAC: Having these interviews, I'm learning more about the strength of the University of Minnesota and it does rest in persons like you and all your good friends and colleagues who out of loyalty, and concern, and commitment to the enterprise make it work.

LL: And you, sir.

CAC: And it's some long commitment. Thank you very much, Lloyd.

LL: You're welcome.

[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