

Interview with Clarke A. Chambers

Interviewed by Karen Strauss

Interviewed on March 15 and 18, 1996

Clarke A. Chambers - CAC
Karen Strauss - KS

KS: This is an interview with Professor Emeritus Clarke Chambers of the University of Minnesota. This is recorded as part of the oral history project at the University of Minnesota. The date is March 15, 1996.

One of the first questions I wanted to ask, Clarke, to start off . . . I know you're a native Minnesotan and I wondered if you would reflect on your childhood and your growing up? Were your parents also native Minnesotans?

CAC: My family was in Minnesota since the Civil War, or briefly thereafter. Both sides of the family fought in the Civil War. Both sides of the family came out to settle, I think probably, with land scrip from having served for the Republic, for Lincoln's great cause. They set up shop, my mother's side, in Faribault County, Blue Earth and my father's side in Owatonna, Steele County. So, I am a third generation Minnesotan because their parents came also. We've been around a long time. I might add to that—although, it's not of great moment—that my family, my sisters, and my cousins, and my aunts, and my grandfathers, and my great uncles were all Republican since the days of Lincoln. I'll have occasion to say that I defected from family loyalty in the 1930s . . . that is a bit later.

I want to say something just briefly, however, about my father who got his baccalaureate degree from the University of Minnesota in 1900. Then, after a year out, kind of feeling his way, he came back to Medical School and got his medical degree in 1904 or 1905. He practiced in various places in Minnesota and, then finally, ended up in Blue Earth where he found the person who came to be my mother, and courted her, and married her—so, the two Civil War sides of the family were united. My mother had one year at Carleton Academy in Northfield, Minnesota, back in the early 1890s. She always thought of herself as a Carleton alumna and, in a sense, she was. It was a two-year program at that time. I think she lasted only one year. That was her only exposure to formal education but like many professional wives in a small town, she

educated herself and was one of the founders of a Home Economics Club—what else?—and they had monthly meetings year around and talked about recipes, I guess, but much more than that, it's part of the national movement, they read books, and reviewed books, and they talked about politics, and they talked about policy, they talked about the schools in Blue Earth, and so forth. So, she was engaged in many, many ways from the very beginning.

I was born in 1921, when my mother, I think, was forty-two and my father was forty-five; so, I was a caboose in the family. They'd had an older daughter who was about five years older than I and my father by his first wife, who died, had a son who was fifteen, sixteen years older than I; so, by the time they got to me in their forties, they were pretty tired out of being parents.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: They went with a professional group, business men, and lawyers, and doctors, and the like, also were strangely childless so that I was probably the only person that young in any of that social set. When the bridge club met—that was another one—often I was taken along to have just dinner and listen to conversation. One of my father's closest friends, David Morse, who was an attorney at law, knew that I was very bright—I was precocious—and he started feeding me things to read far beyond my age. When he had a good law case, he'd say, if it was summer, "Come over to the courthouse and sit in." I was treated as kind of an adult by not only my parents but everyone else. I think it's a very rare thing to happen and, perhaps, only in a small town would that happen now.

KS: Yes.

CAC: I was far too old for my age. It was also the case that my mother's mother, by the time I was born in 1921, was living with us. Her husband had died earlier. He'd been a captain in the Civil War and had marched with [General William Tecumseh] Sherman to the sea. My mother had her mother live in our house. In those days, if you had cataracts, you went blind. There wasn't much they could do with them. From the time I was a very young child, my mother read to her mother all the time in the living room. In the winter, we'd start a fire in the fireplace and peel apples and I'd play on the floor; but, I heard all these things that were going on . . . Sir Walter Scott, for example. My grandmother was Scottish on that side and she loved the poetry of Bobby Burns and the novels of Sir Walter Scott; so, I heard all this stuff. I think somehow it soaked in. The other thing that I heard from her and from my grandmother were stories of the Civil War. Now, 1860 to 1930 is seventy years. That's quite awhile. But if we subtract seventy years from 1995, it's not that long ago; so that the Civil War, and Abraham Lincoln, and my grandfather—whom I never knew—his exploits in the war were all very real to me. At one point, there was a small pamphlet written about my grandfather who'd been a captain in the 123rd New York Volunteers and I had a copy given to me bound in blue velvet with crossed arms in gold on the outside. These were really important things. I think what it really did was to give to me, at that point, a sense of literature but also a sense of history, that the Civil War was a very real thing and Lincoln was a very real figure. Here is it 1925, 1930 and that's

kind of strange. Speaking to that point—I'm not going to talk about my childhood forever but I think it has a bearing on how one chooses or is chosen by a profession—I suppose it was 1926, when I was five or six years old in the mid 1920s . . . on the Fourth of July and Memorial Day there were always community celebrations . . .

KS: Right.

CAC: . . . and on this occasion, the American Legion, of course, marched and my father—he had been past commander . . . volunteered during the war in his forties to be a medical doctor—and all of his contemporaries, and persons younger came down Main Street. They had the flag and I guess they had a drum; but, they were all out of step. They were scraggly. Some had military caps. One fellow was all dressed in his army uniform and was carrying a gun. I don't know where he got the gun. But it was a motley crew. I'm saying this because it made such a sharp impact upon my imagination. We stood at the corner of Main Street and Fourth Street; and I saw these people wheel around, and they were out of step, and they couldn't make a wheel around right. They were old and I was laughing. I was holding my mother's hand. I look up and my mother is crying. I know there's something going on here and I don't know what it is. Again, I remember that. I could do a movie of that scene that I remember it so clearly. It must have had some awful impact on me and a curiosity, why am I laughing? Why is my mother crying? What is this war?

I'm talking a lot about war in my opening. When I was in seventh grade, we always had services in our school for Armistice Day in November. The seventh grade was chosen—we were just out of grade school and now we were mature young students—to put together a program. We'd have poetry, and a little patriotic reading and, maybe, someone would sing—I forget. Of course, being seventh graders, before the thing started, we got dissolved in laughter and giggles. It just wasn't right at all. I was to do "In Flanders fields the poppies grow," which I can still recite at length but I shan't. I was all ready for my part but four or five of us were just dissolved in giggling. I don't know why we were giggling. Our superintendent of schools Mr. Pemberton—I can see him now . . . that's another scene I could make a movie of—came down that center aisle and he said, "This service is at a conclusion but I have a few words to say." His words—this must be like 1932 or 1933—were about this community, and the war, and the men who went off, and the boys who died, and the Republic. Ohhh . . . I thought, here we are again and I felt so ashamed. I think it was a combination of things then—as I tell the story to my children and grandchildren if they want to listen to it—that I think I really was an historian from the time I was kid. I have this sense about, what is all this past and how did we get here? That's a strange thing for kids to have because they don't know anything about the past.

KS: Right.

CAC: As you can tell from the timber in voice, all of this was pretty traumatic as I try to recapture it. My mother saved, of course, dear little Clarke's school work. I still have the

scrapbook, which I think is the second or third grade, and we were asked to draw pictures of bears, and dogs, and cats, and what else, I don't know. There they are and mine are not very good. I was not very good at sketching; but, all of the animals had historical names. I remember one was Queen Elizabeth. One was Sir Walter Raleigh. One was Oliver Cromwell.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: How I ever heard of Oliver Cromwell in Blue Earth, I have no idea because I'm like eight years old. There's something going on here. I don't think it's genetic. There was one more event in high school and then we'll get on with something else. I was precocious and as a lot of precocious teenagers, my teachers didn't like me that well. I was really kind of bratty. I suspect I wouldn't tolerate it in a younger person if I were the teacher. We had a social studies teacher in the eleventh grade, a Miss Foss, who was terribly stern and really very disagreeable but she had my number. I was acting up. I have no idea what it was. She said, "Clarke Chambers, you think you're so smart. You just go out and you write an essay for this contest and then we'll see how smart you are!" It turned out it was a contest sponsored by the American Federation of Teachers. There were no unions in Blue Earth, let me tell you. I'd never heard of a union. Blue Earth had never heard of a union but it was 1937 or 1938. It was to write an essay about the importance of unionization to education. What else? Right? How was I supposed to find out about unions? We had a nice little Carnegie Library, and I went and did some research, and then I did some more research. I had the happy chance of this older sister, my sister Jean who was at Carleton, and she kept feeding me books to read. So, she took out of the Carleton Library books on unions and on education and sent them down to me in Blue Earth. I read these things and I wrote the essay. It was about twelve double spaced typed pages long and sent it off. When June came, the announcement came and I had won first prize in the whole nation. I don't think that's what Miss Foss had in mind.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: I think she wanted me to . . .

KS: Fail.

CAC: . . . be disciplined and lose out entirely. The first prize—I looked it up because I had imagined it was a higher prize—was \$125. I had a choice . . . I could go to Washington, D.C. and receive the prize from John L. Lewis and Eleanor Roosevelt—that's what the letter said—or I could take the cash. This is 1938, 1939 and that's worth at least \$1000 or \$1500 in current dollars and I was going to start college. When I went to Carleton the entire tuition and board and room was \$900 in all of 1939. That was a lot of money; so, I took the money and I helped invest it in my education. Is that a sign, too? It was a strange event and I thought, oh, hell! if somebody from Blue Earth can write this kind of thing, who knows . . . ?

I should add now at this point that because of my sister and the wide reading I did, somehow I got advertisements for books, pocket books. They didn't have paperbacks in those days. I saved my money and I read [Friedrich] Nietzsche for heavens sake . . . didn't have any idea what he was up to; but, I was far ahead. My sister, when she's at Carleton, was radicalized herself by professors of economics and politics at Carleton Christian College; so, she would have me read these books. I remember one Christmas, she gave me a copy of Palme Dutt's *World Politics*. It was a Leninist interpretation of imperialism in the world. I was eighteen years old; I didn't know who Lenin was but I found out. That led me to reading books of Edgar Snow on the Fourth and the Eighth Route Armies in China . . . Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. Here I am in Blue Earth and my real heroes are Lincoln but also Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. That's bizarre.

KS: Yes.

CAC: It should also be said in small town mid-America at that time, that our Presbyterian church—my mother is very devout—had a missionary that we supported in China, the Hamilton family. The Hamilton family were all red-headed. They were Scottish and they came back every three or four years. They would have magic lantern shows in the basement of the church. So, China was a reality to me even in the 1920s. I knew about China because these people came and they were our missionaries. Some of the kids would stay in our house for a week when they were on home stay. I think maybe when Chou En-lai and Mao Tse-tung became world renown in the 1930s, that was just natural, that was China, and I kind of picked up on that. I'm saying all this that at age fifteen, sixteen, eighteen, nineteen, twenty, I was introduced to a radical perception, and historical perceptions, and economic perceptions of the world and of history far in advance of my age or my circumstance in Blue Earth. As an historian, I often think of it . . . it's beyond explanation. It's just an operation of chance.

My wife, Florence, who was a year ahead of me at Carleton—although the same age . . . she was even brighter than I—found that Carleton was a liberating experience for her because suddenly the world opened up. For these strange reasons—I'm not boasting . . . it just is this chance thing, except I was bright and I can't take credit for that—my world view was not expanded by Carleton because I'd done it when I was a teenager. When I'm saying these things, I have in mind, in part, the other interviews I've done. I've done 110 or 120 interviews.

KS: Great.

CAC: I've found that so many of the faculty whom I have interviewed were the first and only members of their family to go beyond high school . . . in one case after another, including a good number of administrative officers at the university. We think of the professoriate being from lawyers, and doctors, and ministers of the gospel. In our department, we have persons like myself. My father was a doctor. John Howe's father was a minister. Paul Murphy's father was a minister and a professor of classics. That's kind of the picture we have; but, I found out that

at the University of Minnesota, people who came 1950 to 1980, were very often the first person ever to go to school and the only person to go to school. That was not my case; I don't match those two models. It's, of course, the second world war and the GI Bill of Rights that open up that second path. It has a bearing, as I know you know, on what happens to higher education at Minnesota but nationwide in the 1950s and 1960s when persons from different family backgrounds, immigrant, working-class, poor farm kids get into the academy, get into the professoriate. They bring a bundle of perceptions, and experience, and attitudes, and assumptions, and questions that the older elite professors did not have. We'll get to the University of Minnesota later but professors in the department I came into in 1951 were all old European and from patrician background. It wasn't until the 1960s when we add Hyman Berman, and Rudy Vecoli, and David Noble—the list could go on—that we plug into another background of persons who were attracted to the academy and never had a chance, never thought they could do it; but, it was the war and the GI Bill that made it possible. Well, that was not my experience.

Carleton was a good experience. I learned a lot. I was a History major. I was a Honors History major. I took summer school at Carleton, which they had added because of the war so we could get graduated and join the force. I graduate ahead of my class with about four of that group. I went into the service in January of 1943. After basic training, my records were sent through these funny machines they had then and if one had any capacity for mathematics or science in general, there were special technical schools one was sent to. I was sent to weather school and came to be a weather observer. Then, when I got overseas, that in a moment, because we were overseas, we had to encode our messages so the Japanese would not break them and, also, toward the end of the war before the Soviet Union came into the war in August of 1945, they were sending out encoded weather messages from Siberia. Of course, the weather in the northern hemisphere goes from northwest to southeast so that the weather in Siberia comes across Japan and part of the task that I and a group of us there had was to try to break that Russian code. They did give us kind of basic *stuff*, I mean code books, but even if they were, as we think of commissars, kind of dumb bureaucrats or they were lying to us, the code was not always very useful and that meant we had to use our imagination. It was a very challenging, intellectual task for doing that. I went overseas in the summer of 1944, and served in the Marianas and in Okinawa, and then the war ended when I was there in September of 1945.

This gets back on target, I think. I have letters to my mother and to my bride—I'd been married, just before I went overseas, in California to this Carleton classmate, Florence Wood—saying that when I get out of the service, what I want to do is to go to graduate school. I knew there was such a thing. It would be in history or history and economics combined. I thought what I wanted to do was study with Charles Beard. Well, Charles Beard was the only American historian I knew. Four years had passed between leaving Carleton and coming back after the war. Charles Beard, of course, if I'd known, hadn't taught history since he was fired from Columbia University during the first World War. [laughter]

KS: Oh. [laughter]

CAC: So, there was no way I could have studied with Charles Beard. There it is . . . it's kind of a naive statement . . . I want to study with Charles Beard. What do I know? Through my wife, I had made application toward the end of the war in various schools, Stanford, Berkeley, Chicago—I don't where else—and was accepted by all of them. I had a very good record at Carleton and I was a soldier boy; so, I think they were taking everybody. As it turned out, the only place we thought we were safe in finding an apartment we could live in when I got back was in Berkeley. I chose Berkeley, again, not with any thought. I knew it was a good school. I didn't know anybody on the faculty. I didn't know what their strengths were. I didn't know anything! Florence had stayed in the Bay Area in Marinship to build ships during the war and we knew people. We had an attic apartment. All right, then we'll go to Berkeley.

Now, chance is going to operate again and I say these things because I think history doesn't often enough take credit for chance. A second cousin once removed, Raymond Chambers, had studied history at Northwestern University, oh! 1908, a long time ago and John Hicks was one of his classmates. So, when he heard I was going to Berkeley—my mother, of course, wrote him, "Oh, there'll be another historian in the family"—he wrote me a letter of introduction to John Hicks. I had no idea who John Hicks was. I thought, what the hell? I haven't got anybody else to talk to. I made an appointment with John Hicks. He did remember distantly Raymond but with not much affection or regard. Old Raymond was not a very good historian but at least it was a name. I had my records in front of me and he said, "What is it you want to study?" I said, "I want to study history." He said, "That won't do." [laughter]

KS: [laughter]

CAC: I thought one studied history. He said, "Are you interested in anything?" "Oh! I'm interested in lots of things!" So, I started spinning off these things. It was that kind of a conversation. I can't repeat all of it. I don't remember all of it but I'm certain he became increasingly puzzled but he also recognized there was a bright and curious mind that was operating. He said, "I think you'd better study with me." I said, "That's fine." I had no idea what his field was. So, I became a John Hicks student. He was an agricultural historian. He wrote the best selling textbook, 1944 to 1960, *The Federal Union and the American Nation*. It was [published by] Houghton Mifflin. I think he had about 55 to 60 percent of the entire market. This is the GI market. Can you imagine the millions and millions of copies sold? He became a multi-millionaire, and also dean of the graduate school, and a few other things. I knew he'd written this book and I studied it very carefully, probably passed my pre-lims on the basis of it. It was a real scholarly work . . . the Populist Revolt. Then, he'd written some other agricultural history after that. At the first seminar, I had no idea how you define the research project, no idea at all. He said, "There's these Senate investigations of the migrant labor in California, and you're here, and all the documents are here, and we have Paul Taylor on our faculty." He was the great expert on migratory labor, married Dorothea Lange, second wife. I didn't know any of these things at that time. He said, "Why don't you just study that?" That was fine with me. I wanted to get into the business and out of it very fast. I was his chief teaching assistant. So, I had the experience at California and John Hicks was a very good mentor but primarily in this way of

setting a model of what a professional person was and how they operate in the academy. I wrote a masters thesis on this subject and, then, expanded it into a doctor's dissertation. When I wrote that, he said, "This is very good. I want to send it along to be published but, first, go home and rewrite it." That is another shock. I had no idea. He thought it was swell. He never made a single correction of structure, or style, or interpretation, or substance, or things I should look at and not look at. It was a good piece of work. He gave me no guidance at all. When he said, "Go home and rewrite it," I was just in shock. I had no idea what that meant. Fortunately, a fellow classmate of mine, a woman who was in Library Science—as women were and they weren't really expected to get Ph.D.s in those days—was his editorial assistant in rewriting the textbook. There had to be a new edition every two or three years. She knew his style and she was very smart. We were close friends and I went to see her and said, "I don't know what this means." She said, "I'll help you with one chapter as I help Mr. Hicks and then you're on your own." That's really what I needed. Here's a fellow student, she isn't even going to get a Ph.D., very bright, very able, and she is his assistant, and she knew how to write. She went over that chapter with a kind of detail that I tried subsequently to give my students because no one did it for me. I studied in Modern European History. I studied in Modern English History. No one ever criticized a piece of work I did. I'd get an A or an A- . . . another course done.

It's June 1950. I have two children. One was born nine and one half months after my return from overseas. Then, another baby came along in June of 1950 just as I was getting my doctor's degree. There were no jobs. The GI bulge was disappearing and the job market was really dreadfully bad. Again, I owe it to John Hicks who didn't read my dissertation carefully but did everything else. I found out later that he was going to be the Harnsworth professor in England at Oxford University in 1950, 1951 but he had refrained from telling his colleagues that in the department. So when in the summer of 1950, he said, "Oh, yes, it just happens, I'm going to England for the year," they said, "Going to England? Who's going to teach your courses?" "Oh," he said, "I've someone here who's all set. I'd recommend him. He can teach my courses." They had no search. They took John's word for it; so, in July or . . .

KS: Oh, my goodness!

CAC: . . . August 1950, I learn that I'm going to substitute in the courses of the great master John Hicks at Berkeley. At least, it was a salary.

KS: Yes.

CAC: I knew that it was a beginning. If you taught somewhere you had a better chance on the market. Then, he had persuaded the University of California Press to do my book [*California Farm Organization*] after I rewrote it. The book came out in 1952 . . . I'll tell you, that's luck. It's just sheer luck . . . a certain amount of talent . . . it was good but it just is staggering. So, 1950, 1951 is a wonderfully exciting year. The first class, Karen, I ever had was a class of 900 students in Wheeler Auditorium.

KS: [gasp] Gee!

CAC: And I'd never given a lecture. I had eight TAs [teaching assistants]. I had just been a TA. Now, I had eight TAs that I had to supervise. Wheeler Auditorium was larger than Nicholson. It held 900 to 1000 people. I remember one of the first days I was lecturing, somebody way in the back had a grapefruit and started it rolling down the center aisle. It's like watching a snake's eyes; I couldn't take my eyes off that grapefruit as it kept rolling.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: It was a good experience. I learned how to lecture and no one ever helped on that.

KS: Baptism by fire.

CAC: Baptism by fire. At least, I had a year of teaching, and I had income, and could pay the rent and the grocery bill. Then, came 1951 and there are no jobs. I had a very good record and good letters of recommendation. There was one job in Cortland State College in upstate New York. Cortland is in the heartland of the apple country; the Cortland apple comes from there. That was a half time job teaching and half time to do public relations for the college and I applied for that. Then, in August, the person who was teaching Twentieth Century history at the University of Minnesota got tired. He was a young person and he didn't want to do it anymore. He had another job . . . I think with a foundation. Minnesota was stuck in August with big enrollment classes. The Survey and the Twentieth Century both enroll very large. They had to find a replacement. A.C. Krey, a medievalist, was chairman of the department. He didn't know how to do a search for American History; so, he called up Ted Blegen who was dean of the Graduate School. Ted Blegen had taught at Hamline with John Hicks. Ted Blegen calls up John Hicks and says, "Is there anybody out there?" "Oh, yes, Clarke. He's from Minnesota. He'd be just fine." I was hired on the spot. No search. No letters. Talk about the old boys' network.

KS: Yes. It sounds so informal compared to now.

CAC: Oh! informal! It just is a chance that Krey knew Blegen knew Hicks and I was kind of the favored student. So, I came back to Minnesota in August of 1951 having no idea in two weeks what I was going to do. What alternative career would I take? I had no idea. That's frightening. It was part of the climate of 1950, 1951, 1952, 1953 when there was that slump. Again, the story is just luck that these things come along. I got here and, by the time I had transported a wife and two children all the way to Minnesota, had no money. Mrs. Chambers' family was here. They found us a small apartment and I think they must have paid the rent on it the first month. I went over to the school and said, "I'm broke. Can I get an advance on my salary?" We had one secretary—now we have seven or something like that in the History Department—Louise Olson, who ran the joint with a firm hand and great intelligence. She said, "Oh, sure, we'll get you an advance." We filled out the charts and about ten days later, she called up. It's August, early September and I have no money, and I'm out mowing the lawn for

my in -laws, and she says, "Your check is here." I was in shorts and T-shirt; so, I got in the car, and went over, and I went into the office in Ford Hall, and she looked at me, and she said, "Mr. Chambers, you go home and put on your trousers and a shirt." There was the check just two feet away. I went home. I put on my trousers and a clean shirt, and came back, and got the advance. I say this just to suggest that the university was a funny place in 1950, 1951 when I got here.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

CAC: Maybe I should say something about the department I came into in 1951.

KS: Yes.

CAC: It was composed of fourteen old men and two mature women. All they taught was European and American History. The two most distinguished, as I lasted through the 1950s . . . There were some very able . . . Herbert Heaton was in Economic History and A. L. Burt in Canadian. There were some persons who had real well-established national reputations; but, they were all in their late fifties and sixties. Alice Felt Tyler taught American History and Social History, I guess she would call it. She was the author of *Freedom's Ferment*, which is one of the greatest books that ever came out of this department. She was an assistant professor, age fifty-five, I suppose, and was active in American Studies, helped to found American Studies with Tremaine McDowell. The other was Faith Thompson who was an English constitutional historian. Before I got here, but when she was a mature scholar—she also was in her late fifties—Faith Thompson wrote a book on the Magna Carta and all she did was to treat the Magna Carta as a late feudal document instead of an early modern document. We have a Whiggish interpretation of English History in American History and she was just implicitly challenging that, that look at 1215 what was going on? It's a feudal document. It was one of the most important books written in Medieval English history in that generation and just because she asked a simple question.

KS: Yes.

CAC: She was a good historian. She argued it out well. It was brilliant. Faith Thompson was not recognized. She was an assistant professor and I imagine at a very low salary. Sometimes, people would come from England and want to talk to her. I remember when I was in the office once when some such person came in that wanted to see Faith. Faith Thompson? You want to see Faith Thompson? Well of course, they wanted to see Faith Thompson, she'd done these wonderful monographs. I wasn't as sensitive to these affairs as later I would be in the 1960s when the women's movement breaks away; but even as a young person, it was clear that the women never spoke in class. Alice Felt Tyler, to make money because her salary was so low, had written a textbook on modern European history. A.L. Burt, who was a crusty old Britisher and taught Canadian History, was in charge of the committee to do European History and he

wouldn't let Alice Felt Tyler use her own textbook in her own class in European History! [sigh] I learned these things as I went along and kept my ears open and my eyes. The way those two women were treated made me aware, even before the 1960s, of the injustices and inequities in the academic world. They were very deep.

On the other hand, I was treated very well because I was very young and most of the senior men in History, save one—I'll come to him later—kind of thought of me as their nephew. They were my academic uncle and they wanted to introduce me. A.C. Krey, and Herbert Heaton, and Ernest Osgood took me to the Campus Club and introduced me to people. They saw that I was on one committee only but that would work me in. I was assigned, among other things, to help Ernest Osgood—who was then almost at the end of his career; he had two or three years to go—do the basic survey in American History. Ernest was really a Frontier historian and Western historian. In our first conversations, he said, "Now then, we're going to do this together. You're young and, therefore, we're going to divide up the lectures this first quarter and you take the ones that you feel most comfortable with but don't take Lewis and Clark!"

KS: [laughter]

CAC: He was an expert in Lewis and Clark. That was fine with me. I knew nothing about Lewis and Clark; so, I did choose. He came to every lecture that I gave when it was my turn and he said, "I expect you to be there for me," which, indeed, I was. We'd walk back and he'd say, "That was interesting. You certainly did well on . . ." such and so. Then about two weeks later, he'd say, "That lecture that you had there on Jacksonian democracy, I think if you'd read this and thought about it, you might have added a section. It went too long on . . ." something else and "You looked at the tariff too long. That's not that important." So, that what I had from him was very friendly, gentle but very astute criticism. Also, he'd say, "You have to build giving a lecture." I began to notice that whenever he started—there were 300 students I suppose in the class—he started with a very low voice but he'd look at everybody with a squint eye and pretty soon the place was quiet; and as it went along, he'd build with his voice but also with the story line. He had shaped and whittled those lectures. I would watch and listen to see how it was done because he was very good. Then, we'd talk about that. It was a wonderful apprenticeship that I had with him for two or three years. The third year, David Noble came. We're the only two junior members of the department all the way through the 1950s and into the early 1960s. So, we had a three-way. Ernest did the same thing for David Noble. It was a wonderful apprenticeship and I had that kind of support.

I was also doing the Twentieth Century on my own and I was into a seminar at once in that subject and didn't have quite so much support there. A.C. Krey, who was chairman of Medieval, was a German Milwaukee boy. He really wanted to move me along. He was very supportive in many ways. He had a bad heart, and he drank too much, and sometimes, at the end of the day, he say, "Maybe you'd walk home with me?" He lived over near the nursing . . . over on Walnut Street. Then he'd say, "Have a martini with me." It was not a regular thing but in one

trying to catch what those things were. Then, there was Faith Thompson and Alice Felt Tyler and they weren't part of it. So, what the department did, I don't know. Harold Deutch was the last of the old kind of chairman. He was a pretty good one. He was very open. He was a wonderful lecturer, fine scholar, traveled all around the world, a wonderful human being, very supportive of me also; but, he held things very close to his chest. By that time in American History, Philip Jordan, who was a Minnesota historian, was the only senior American historian. Ernest Osgood had retired. George Stevenson was gone. So, Harold took only the advice of Philip Jordan on the two junior persons, David Noble and myself.

Let me say something about publish and perish. My book on California agriculture came out in 1952 and I could ride on that for awhile. It was well received and well criticized so that was to my credit; but, I knew that I had to have a second book. I've told my graduate students so often that the second book is the hardest one—the third is okay—you've got to do it on your own, and you're raising a family, and you're establishing your career, and you're serving on committees. You're doing all these things. It's just very difficult. I had the notion that I couldn't travel. I didn't have enough money. I had too many children. I'd have to do some project that was local history. I have no idea why I said this, that maybe one thing that hadn't been done in Minnesota was welfare history. It was unknown. I didn't know anything about it. I guess I shared it with some of my senior colleagues. Philip Jordan got wind of this, and he called me into his office, and he said, "Mr. Chambers, there's one thing that you've got to understand. There is one regional Minnesota historian in this department. There's not room for two." And he said, "I don't want you touching Minnesota history nor none of your graduate students." I was in the academy . . . from 1946, I was a teaching assistant but all the way through to 1990 and no one ever treated me that way ever again and never before. That's the only time it ever happened. Therefore, it was just a terrible shocking thing. He didn't care about my problems and that's all right, I don't blame him for that. That's part of this old system also that you had a field and goddamn it, stick with it!

KS: That it was his personal province.

CAC: That it was his personal province and I wasn't to go in. He was the senior person. Harold Deutch would ask him whether I should be promoted. The year I came up for promotion, no one told me. There were no teacher evaluations by students and there were no visitations but I was lecturing in 155 Ford Hall, which is a miserable room, and sometimes I walked away from the lectern across the stage. Suddenly, I looked up, and there was Phil Jordan all scrunched down behind a pillar so I wouldn't see him, and he was observing to see whether I could give a lecture or not. It was like that grapefruit rolling down the aisle. [laughter]

KS: [laughter]

CAC: My heart was just in my throat.

KS: Yes.

CAC: He never said he was coming. No one ever said that there would be anybody coming. I thought, oh god! I'm cooked now.

KS: It's like he's spying on you.

CAC: Yes. All the others were supportive but it's that structure. It's hierarchical and it's patriarchal. The lines are pretty clear. You know what you have to do; but, that was very uncomfortable.

What I turned to was a simple minded project. Maybe I was inspired by Faith Thompson to ask a dumb question . . . it's a medieval document; it's not a modern document. I'd been teaching the Twentieth Century and I knew that when one got to the 1920s, one could relax because one could teach the 1920s as a funny era. It was: jazz; prohibition; Al Capone; [President Warren G.] Harding, for heaven's sakes; the "Lost Generation;" [F. Scott] Fitzgerald; flappers . . . all of that. It says something of my lack of sophistication as a Twentieth Century historian at that time that I could teach the 1920s in that fashion. I taught flappers but I didn't teach the first equal rights amendment . . . maybe, I knew about it but I didn't put any influence on it at all. It was always fun to get to the 1920s because the sophomores would wake up.

KS: Comic relief.

CAC: Yes, there was a lot of comic relief. You could say funny things. It was always good for a laugh. You could say that the high point of the wisdom of Mr. [President Calvin] Coolidge was when he said, "The business of America is business." The house would be brought down. You see, I could say the same thing in 1980—I did—and it's a very serious thing . . . Coolidge was dead right! The business of America is business. It's no longer a joke.

KS: Yes.

CAC: In the years of [President Ronald] Reagan, it's the real truth. One learns things as one goes along. This is kind of drifting; but, let me say one more thing about the teaching and study of history. The history I learned on my own as a kid in Blue Earth was Charles Beard, Vernon Parrington, and a lot of Marxists. I got the Marxists from my sister. I didn't know they were Marxists. I never studied Karl Marx; but, I knew about class before I should have. The fact that I thought Mao was a great hero—I changed my mind in the 1960s—is a reflection of that. Then, when I'm a graduate student, the academic history that's being taught to me, in every class and seminar I took, is really the oldest German idea of telling things as they really happened. It's [Leopold] von Ranke. I don't know that. I never heard of von Ranke. Nobody ever told me his name. You had to find out what happened and you went to the primary documents. As technicians, we were well-trained but I never had an introduction then. This is what, I learned later, was an era of consensus history, historical writing. No one ever said that to me. The word consensus was never used in my graduate career. I wouldn't have known what it was. We were supposed to find out what happened. It was consensus. I read Hofstadter and I read these others

and my sense of history was that the genius of American politics is compromise, and coalition, and consensus and that's pretty well the view I had of American history. We knew that there had been a Civil War, and that slavery had been divisive, and we knew there had been strikes in the 1890s. It's not ignorance but it's matter of how you perceive and what questions you ask about the past. My view of American history, when I came here and all through the 1950s, was really quite traditional. I should have been brighter. The only hint I had of historiography as a graduate student was Frederick Jackson Turner, for god's sake. He did that wonderful essay in 1893, "The Significance of the Frontier in American History." Then, there were different critics and John Hicks did have us read some of that. That's the only time I ever was introduced to the thought that people changed their minds about what the past was. I never knew there was such a thing as historiography and, yet, I had been self taught as a Beardean or a Marxist in the 1930s. The stuff I read in the 1950s was consensus and I had no idea . . . oh, very little idea, in any case. This is background for saying that I had the idea—simple-minded—that looking at American political reform, and that was my disposition, that something must have happened between the progressive era and the New Deal. I thought, what were old progressives doing in the 1920s and what were people who became New Dealers doing in the 1920s when they were young? There was one article by Arthur Link. Its theme was progressive in the 1920s but what he was looking at was agricultural protest and the [Robert Marion] La Follette campaign in 1924 and nothing else.

So, I got the idea, I've got to have a second book if I'm going to stay and get anywhere. Why don't I just look and see what old progressives who live past [President Woodrow] Wilson were doing and look at a number of people like Harry Hopkins, and Frances Perkins, and Adolph Berle, and Rex Tugwell. What were they doing in the 1920s before the New Deal came along? I had no idea beyond that—I put that on the record. It was just a dumb set of questions that something must have been happening. These people didn't die and go home. This is like 1958, 1959. I did get a small travel grant from the St. Paul Foundation and went to the Library of Congress. What do you do when you're an historian? You look for persons and then for groups they were associated with and movements. One thing leads to another, and I get up to New York and the New York Public Library, and I get into the settlement house papers, and I get into the child labor amendment movement in the 1920s. That leads me to child welfare and who was doing child welfare? Social workers were doing child welfare. There was a Child Welfare League, etcetera. I'm saying this for the record, because again, it's largely serendipitous that the way my career was going—I had no idea—but, by asking this question and going to the primary materials, I was led to two things. One was to persons in social work broadly defined, social reform, social service, social action, and particularly the settlements; but also, my *Seedtime of Reform* [: *American Social Service and Social Action, 1918-1933*] has a good chapter on the profession of social work, one of the first that was ever written. What I also discovered were women. I knew that there were women around, you know; but I'd never seen them as a focus of public history . . . never! When I was doing the Survey of Twentieth Century before 1960, I'm quite certain I never even talked about Jane Addams.

KS: Wow.

CAC: I talked about Women Suffrage but that's pretty straightforward. That's political. What that research did was just open up a new world to me and led to *Seedtime of Reform*, which was published in 1963 and well-received; but, it was received in a way in 1964, 1965 when women's history, feminism was just getting started. When there were early anthologies of women's history there wasn't any women's history; so, several chapters of my book on the women's movement in the 1920s and the relationship of the child welfare to women were anthologized in women's history anthologies. That was a surprise to me. I didn't invent the field of women's history, they happened to be there and that's why I wrote about them. [laughter] That's absurd that you're doing something that you don't know the real significance of what you're doing. So, I find social work as part of social reform and social action, I find the settlements, and I find *women*. The book establishes my career so that's a relief. Now, I know I can do it. I can do a second book that's recognized within the department and the college.

What I discovered going about the country was that the records that I had to use . . . some were in the Library of Congress, some were in the New York Public Library, but by and large, the papers now of organizations and movements I was interested in were in attics, and back rooms, and warehouses, and storage rooms of all these social service agencies in New York, Washington, D.C., Chicago, Boston, and so forth. Social history is beginning to break from different angles, immigration history, family, just beginning; so, you go to lots of conventions and some others are working on this. Bob Bremner's book, *From the Depths*, which was 1956 I think, was really the pioneer work in this field. Others are beginning to move that way; so, we have ten or fifteen people, and we have dinner together and some drinks, and talk about all these papers . . . what can be done? We say, "We'll form a committee." Ralph Pumphrey from the George Warren Brown School in Washington University, St. Louis, and others [unclear] begin to meet. I say, "These things should be preserved! We should all have a committee, and we should find where those papers are, and get them into a state archive or urban archive, or whatever it might be." That was a good idea except we go home and nobody did anything. I got kind of uneasy and I thought, oh, what the hell, my career is established now, I can do what I want to do.

In 1963, Timothy Smith had started the Immigration History Archives, later the Immigration History Research Center. It was to be the archives of new immigrants, 1880 to 1920. It started in Minnesota with a project that Tim Smith, Hy Berman, and I did on the Iron Range on the education, immigration, labor, welfare and religion on the Iron Range. [*Social Welfare Policies and Programs on the Iron Range - 1880-1930*] He had gotten money. Tim Smith was an entrepreneur. So, I talked with Gisela Konopka in the School of Social Work who is one person in the Social Work school who cared something about history. She had done some biography, which is close to history. And I talked to John Kidneigh who was then director of the school and said, "Why don't we set up a center and get this damned stuff?" Of course, it was Helen Hall, head resident director of the Henry Street Settlement in New York, who had married Paul Kellogg, who is editor of the *Survey* and I'd used the *Survey Papers* in *Seedtime*. Arthur Schlesinger had written a review of the *Seedtime* book and said, "What we need is a biography of Paul Kellogg." I didn't have that in mind at the time. Helen Hall, got in touch with me—the archives would have that correspondence—and said that these papers are at Columbia University

but they aren't well-cared for. They have to have a home. Would you consider doing that? I can raise a little money for you." She went to, I think it was, the Russell Sage Foundation and she got \$20,000. That was our seed money. It was her support and her prominence in the profession—this is 1963, 1964—that made it possible. So, we'd do it.

I've got to say this, in 1964, money is just beginning to pour into higher education. *Sputnik* was 1957. The National Defense Education Act is part of the great society of [President Lyndon B.] Johnson. We get the National Institute of Mental Health. In the meantime, the Ford Foundation has got lots of money, Rockefeller . . . everybody has. Everybody is getting in on the game. We think we can get some money for this now. That wouldn't haven't been true two or three years earlier. There wasn't any money. It all broke away 1963, 1964, 1965. Again, it's a lucky kind of coincidence. We had this Russell Sage grant that Helen Hall made possible to bring those materials and that was the heart of the archives, the first great collection and it was, as you know. You've worked on it . . . a great collection. John Kidneigh said, "We'll write to the National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH]." I said, "Mental health? That has nothing to do with what we're doing."

KS: [laughter]

CAC: He said, "That doesn't make any difference. They've got more money than they know what to do with." I learned from him that that was true. The NIMH had so much money that they didn't know how to spend it and they had to spend before the year was up or Congress wouldn't give them anymore. I wrote this grant with his help. John was really a big help because he knew the Washington scene and he knew the social work scene. We sent off a grant to underwrite it. I think it was for \$180,000, which again, is \$500,000 in current terms. I got a telephone call or maybe it was a memorandum. I had argued that mental health policy depended upon understanding history in a broad social sense and, therefore, it was justified. The message to me was, "We know that; but, what do archives have to do with history?" I wrote back and said, "That's what scholars work with is primary material. You've got to have archives." That was fine with them and that just slid right through.

KS: Wow.

CAC: Then, that let me go half time in History for four or five years. It put me on the road. It put me in contact with practitioners and social work leaders in social work everywhere in all kinds of fields. It was the most heady and most exhilarating work that one could ever think of.

So, it's 1964, and my god! how the money is rolling in. The college is supportive. The department is supportive. I'm able to travel. It's the 1960s and I'm in my forties. I don't know how many academic people, professional people, have career menopause; but, Karen, I sure as hell did. I was tired of doing that other . . . it came along just in time to save me. I remember thinking in the early 1960s, I'm on top of this. I could teach the Twentieth Century for the next twenty-five years; but, did I want to do that? Things are happening in my family. The kids are

adolescent and all of the tumult is beginning to break loose, the counter culture, and the women's movement, and civil rights. As a citizen, I'm engaged in those things. Oh, boy! sometime in the mid 1960s, Karen—I searched for documents and I can't find it . . . not even in my journal or diary—I realize that what I had taught in American History for fifteen years . . . I couldn't say that anymore. I couldn't make fun of the 1920s. I knew that I had to do something more than slavery with the African-American experience. Now, everybody is learning this. I'm just one of a thousand American historians. Because of my research on women that's particularly acute with me; but, my wife, in 1963, joins neighborhood group to read *The Feminine Mystique*. She disappears after supper to do that and I know something is going on there.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: I have friends in Continuing Education for Women [CEW] and I'm working for them. I'm doing a course starting in 1964, 1965 on American life, which is intellectual history from beginning to end. I'd get guests in and we do manifest destiny. We do transcendentalism. We do Jacksonian democracy. We do literature. We do geography. I don't do it all myself but I am the coordinator for the course. This is the CEW, and the women who are in that class are age forty to sixty, and they're well-educated. Most of them have baccalaureates, and they are experienced, and they are critical and they're—I won't say up in arms—ready to ask all kinds of questions. This is the mid 1960s. They've also read Betty Friedan. I'll tell you, I never had better students. It was just an exhilarating . . . all women. I had seminars with fifteen, eighteen women with different points of view. They were all pretty patrician and they're getting geared up so they can come back and pick up careers. They're getting divorced or they're want to do something with their lives. Oh! what a wonderful bunch of students! So, that happens in 1963, 1964, 1965. Then, by 1967, Edith Mucke, not yet director, is assistant director and in charge of curriculum and she's in on all of these things. I say to her, "Let's do a course on women in American history." "Wonderful!" They couldn't do it in the Arts College. So, she and I staged . . . again, there aren't many people around that know anything about women. I'm not kidding, Karen. There aren't women on the faculty.

KS: Gee.

CAC: There are some women in Art History; so, we do portrayals of women or women artists. Toni McNaron comes in the late 1960s; but, of course, she does Emily Dickinson. There's a cadre but a very small group. We do what I think is probably the first course in Women's Studies in the country.

KS: Wow.

CAC: But it's through Extension. When these women, who are all ready to go . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: We're talking about the 1960s. What an exciting period. Florence and I are both active in St. Paul with the Urban League, which was then beginning to become quite militant. We're still active, primarily because of the children in the Episcopal church, and I become junior warden of St. John the Evangelist Church. The church is concerned with civil rights and all of these issues as well. Florence is very active in Parents for Integrated Education, which was an attempt to integrate the schools in St. Paul. That's going on and our oldest daughter, Jenny, because of my connections with the Lower East Side, spends a summer in Lower East Side at Henry Street. Then, at the end of it, she says, "I want to go South." This is the southern summer. Helen Hall fixes it up so she can go through the South and have places to stay. She goes all by herself. She's an eighteen year old kid. She visited Martin Luther King Sr.'s church in Atlanta. All these things are happening. The environmental movement . . . for what reasons I don't know, that's of interest to the whole family right away. The kids are educating us to that. My students are. There's a certain nostalgia about the 1960s. Our kids are in their teens or a bit younger and Florence and I are in our forties and everything has broken loose. The academy has broken loose. The country has broken loose. The world is exciting. Then, of course, the Vietnam War comes along; and right away, we get involved in the McCarthy movement in 1968.

That's kind of background as an historian . . . In part, because of *Seedtime* when I learn things that no one had ever taught me but also because of all these other things that are happening in our common lives, and with our students, and with our family, I realized that the history I learned in the 1930s on my own and the history I learned as a graduate student is not all wrong; but, it's not where I am. I'm not alone. This is national, you know that. It's going on everywhere. It means that sometime in the mid 1960s, I can't teach the Survey or Twentieth Century anymore because I don't know enough of the things I have to know. Happily, I don't have to teach that much because I'm half time with the archives and doing a lot of field work. I'm doing seminars and that lets me read and talk and students bring in new things. I'm working for Continuing Education for Women, which opens up all of these things—and there's lots of money! Again, it's a matter of just dumb luck. These things all break just at the right time. The excitement of the 1960s intellectually and culturally and the excitement and the danger . . . Our two oldest daughters are involved in all kinds of . . . The middle child, particularly, is slightly on the drug scene but certainly counter culture and we have to deal with that. Things are happening that we don't know about.

Among other things, I meet ^GBerry Vizenor, American Indian, a reporter at that time for the *Minneapolis Star* or *Tribune*, I forget which . . . they weren't yet one paper. We become quickly very close friends. Then, you've got to know something . . . what is this Indian thing? I remember thinking . . . As an historian you know about pushing the Indians to the reservations and the injustices that were done; but, it really involves a change of perception. Either I was told or I thought it up—everybody was thinking about it at the same time—what would happen if you went out in Nebraska or Wyoming and made believe you were an Indian and looked at the heroic pioneers coming at you? Then, what do you know about the pioneers? So, you're not only

learning about Indians, you're learning about American Society and what manifest destiny really involved. It's a third phase. I have one set of historiographic ideas, not knowing it in the 1930s, then as a graduate student and early professional is another; and now, you've got to change your mind about everything. I don't think that younger historians know how hard it is to change.

KS: Yes, yes.

CAC: It's very traumatic. For one thing, you've got to throw away all your old outlines. The old outlines won't do. Jacksonian democracy is not what I taught in 1955. Jackson was an Indian fighter—among other things. Then, you learn more about Seneca Falls; that's part of Jacksonian democracy. Then, later, when I study welfare, you have all these charitable movements coming in; so, the field of American history just goes like that. I'm broadening my views. It changes just dramatically and one is part of that. I'll tell you, that's exciting.

Another thing Edith and I did with this course we had on Women in American Life—it went very well and became a central core for seven or eight years—we got the idea in 1968, 1969 that a lot of parents were worried about their children and they couldn't talk to their own children. The children wouldn't talk to them. The language is just gone. There were a lot of children, people seventeen, eighteen, twenty years old, who wanted to talk to an older generation when they couldn't to their parents; so, Edith and I set up a seminar for two years. It was called the Generation Gap and it was meant for parents. We hired kids and we paid them fifteen dollars a session to come in and join the dialog; so, they could talk to the old folks and the old folks could hear what the kids were saying. We just had to kind of monitor it. It was a non-credit course. It was such fun. We did it in 1968, 1969, 1970. Then, the course on Women in America . . . There was a demand in schools for teachers to know something about it and Edith Mucke and I, for seven years—I think it's 1969 to 1974—did a summer workshop for high school teachers on women. That was another opening up. The things that one could address, and the research one was doing, and the archives business, and the teaching with graduate students, and with Continuing Education for Women . . . all these things . . . oh! what a relief! It was no longer cut and dried. Everything was open . . . everything was open. I stress this because listening to many other professors, whether they're in Biology, or Engineering, or Anthropology, in different ways there are parallel stories and I didn't know those parallel stories. When I was being excited in 1963, 1964, microbiologists heard about DNA [Deoxyribonucleic Acid] and they had to go into molecular biology. [sound of a clap of hands] Bang! their field opened. The whole field of botany was exploded by environmental ecological studies. That's a new thing. Ken Keller is doing here in Chemical Engineering work with surgeons in organ transplant. As a chemical engineer, the ideas are there and the money is there; and chemical engineering is changing just overnight in the mid 1960s. So, there is one story after another. The Special Education opens up in the 1960s. [sound of a clap of hands] Suddenly, that's there! All of higher education is suddenly being switched around and it's at an uneven pace. Some people in Classics don't move as fast as other places; but, everywhere things are changing. It's the women's movement. It's environmentalism. It's new techniques. It's new questions. It's civil rights. It's "black is beautiful" . . . the whole thing and the money is there. It's the most remarkable thing

that when the money begins to decline in the mid 1970s, then, the questions are there but the opportunities aren't there in the same degree. As I think about the history of my own career but the history of the university, there are ten, twelve, fourteen years that are just bang up excitement.

That means, Karen, that there has to be changes in governance as well. I spoke earlier about hierarchical and patriarchal forms. Harold Deutch is the last of that. He's very benign. He's a lovely guy; but, it won't do. In History—I made a note so I'd get the date right . . . people can look this up if they're interested—in 1966, Stuart Hoyt, a medieval historian, gets the Young Turks on his side and they insist that the new chair be elected rather than named by the dean.

KS: Ah.

CAC: And Harold is really pissed off. I had real skepticism about Stuart Hoyt; but, I didn't have skepticism about the way things were going. I remember going in to see Harold about something, and he knew that I was kind of working for an elected chair, and he said, "Et tu, Brute!" and that's all he said.

KS: Ohhh.

CAC: He gave me a dirty look and, in a sense, he should have. He felt betrayed. How we engineer that, I can't remember; but, in 1966, we had instead of the dean talking with four senior professors, "Who would be the next good chairman?" we have a vote. I don't know how that happened but, of course, Stuart Hoyt, who had organized the rebellion, got it. It's not only history, it's also political science. It's sociology. They had to get rid of old Monachesi. He was just a damper by then. All through the Arts College, at least, and because of all this other ferment, it all goes together. See, the dates, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968 is when this is done. Then, if you're going to have an elected chairman, you should have new procedures for tenure and promotion. So, one of the first things the Hoyt Administration does—I was on the committee that helped write the new arrangements—is get an elected committee for tenure and promotion, representative proportional of the ranks by secret ballot. That would be advisory to the chair and we'd gather information on tenure and promotion. There's a move to get students on committees; so, students are added as non-voting. Then, they're added as voting but not on matters of personnel. That's appropriate; they shouldn't be privy to tenure and promotion. Students are added and first they're selected and within a very quick time, the graduate students elect their own representatives. We aren't going to name them. So, that happens. I remember this clearly because I was chairing the American wing. We had a European wing, Third World wing, Ancient wing, and so forth. The student said, "Why can't we have a vote?" Somebody said, "Yes, why not? Get student representatives, two undergraduate students. Give them a vote on most things." That was brought back to the full department. It wasn't all done easily and Otto Pflanze, who was a Bismarck scholar, introduced a resolution of censure of the American wing for having taken steps to give voting privileges to students without the authority of the department; and it carried. This wasn't done just smoothly; it was fighting all the way.

Stuart Hoyt—I say this not to fault him because I admire it in some people—was very ambitious. He wanted to be dean. He wanted to be whatever else there was ahead. He had the instincts and he had the quality. He was very intelligent, and he was a very good scholar, and he was a very good manipulator—he had that ahead of him—but, he also controlled the rebellion. This is my perception—maybe others would have others—that he played things very close to his chest. It opened up but there were limits. For example, when he died in January of 1971, I became chairman in May of 1971 after an interim of the assistant chairman being acting chair, and the first message I had as chair—by election of secret ballot—was a telephone call from Dean [E.W.] Ziebarth saying, “We have a retrenchment. Reduce your budget by 4 percent.” I had never seen a budget. I’d just been in office for three days but the budget had never been shared. I had no idea what our budget was, civil service, supplies, faculty salary . . . I had no idea so that the whole budget, Stuart had kept very tight. I’m not faulting him. I’m just saying that things go in steps in that fashion.

Then, of course, in 1969, 1970, 1971, down to 1974, there was Vietnam and there were strikes. Would the TAs be permitted to meet their sections off campus rather than in a classroom building? You wouldn’t think that would be a fight. Our department would be called into special session and we had to argue that out. Usually, the majority carried. Let me tell, you because I think it is again illustrative of generations and of fields, that in our department, the Ancient historians, the Medieval historians, the European historians, with one exception—the person, Mr. [J.K.] Munholland, who taught the French Empire and therefore taught Vietnam—all were hawks on the war . . . Harold Deutch, Otto Pflanze, all of these senior persons. It’s a division not unlike 1940, 1941. The same thing is happening. On the other side are all the American historians, save one who teaches ROTC [Reserve Officers Training Corps] history. He’s a nice person but he’s a hawk . . . plus the Third World. There’s a self selection that goes on in any department. I was chosen to be an historian and an American historian. There are predispositions. I could not have been a medieval historian and why? What is there in personality and character? It’s true of all these other people. You’re self selected and, then, once you get into Ancient history or medieval history, you’re socialized to the assumptions, and the principles, and the values of that guild and that’s where you are. The same would be true in Sociology or in Political Science. They’re divided also; so, people are chosen or they choose themselves to pursue a certain . . . Partly, it’s a mystery. We had these battles. The Third World and the Americanists usually could out-vote or we could out-sit them. I think that the conservatives on these issues were not as certain of their position as we were. We were very . . . no question in our minds at all about the war; so, these things carried very close but our meetings were raucous. They went on two, three, four hours. They involve not curriculum alone but now it’s a matter . . . how are you going to give credit for teach-ins? Our two Chinese historians, Romeyn Taylor and Ted Farmer, are leading the teach-ins in the college; and how can we support them and make this a going thing? The medievalists think that’s a worthless kind of enterprise. We’re here to learn history.

KS: Yes.

CAC: These are very trying days but it's all going on at once. Then, of course, it's Equal Opportunity. At first, that means Blacks but, then, it means women. Where are we going to get women? Where are we going to get Blacks? We decided sometime in 1970, 1971, to send one of our American historians because he happened to have access to Quaker connections to Black colleges in the South to try to recruit graduate students from Black colleges. That's departmental money. Are we going to spend that money? There are a whole series of questions like this and they're very divisive. If you destroy the old boys' system for promotion, the old boys don't like it—at least some of the old boys don't. These are exciting but they're also anxious, and there's a lot of running back and forth in the corridors, and there's a lot of politicking all the time throughout the college; but, I know the department best. It's complicated in this way, that the department I describe when I came to it in 1951, as Northern European and North American, were old men. They all retire; so, suddenly in the 1960s, there are all these vacancies and suddenly in the 1960s, the college has lots of money. If someone retires, they say, "Oh, well, hire two or three." And we don't know whom to hire. Things are very close and as these older men retire, we are able to hire Third World and Social History, new fields of history. John Modell comes in Family History. We'd never thought of Family History. What do we get? We get two Chinese, one Japanese, two South Asian Indian, two Latin Americanists, and two Africanists. These are added within eight years. For people that are interested, it's starting about 1965 and goes to 1975, and it's Social History and it's Third World with Mr. Kaba, an elegant African chief.

KS: Lansiné Kaba.

CAC: Ohhh, what a magnificent human being he was. In the meantime, there are students sitting-in in Morrill Hall; so, we get an Afro-American Studies Department and, then, we can have joint appointments. We get Kaba and we get [A.F.] Isaacman . . . East Africa with Isaacman and West Africa with Kaba. Once you get these people aboard who teach Chinese and Indian . . . we get Roger Buffalohead; so you get American Indian, and East Indian, the whole Pacific rim, and Latin America, and Africa. Very soon after I became chairman in 1971—not because I was chairman; although, I was sympathetic to it—we have to open Women's History. We don't have any money. So, we use soft money, that is leave money, and we hire Anne Boylan. She's with us three years. Then, we're able to set our first priority and hire a woman historian on a hard line. Anne Boylan is a candidate for this position; but, so are four or five others. Now, women are beginning to get their Ph.D.s all across the country. There's a wonderful pool. We hire Sara Evans. Anne Boylan was very good and she had lots of friends and it was very difficult. We had an open and honest search and we took somebody else. It was the first full-time woman's appointment . . . I think in the Arts College in 1974. There's this revolution that goes on. I spoke of the excitement of research and the archives; but now, there's this excitement also. Excitement always brings trouble.

I became chair in May of 1971. The first call I have, as I say, is retrench, retrench the budget and I'd never seen it. That fall, for the first time—I may be wrong; but, I remember it as being

my initiative—I brought in the budget and said, “We’re going to look at this.” Everybody’s salary, soft monies, civil servants, travel money which we took from supply . . . here it is, how are we going to spend it? One of the first things we do is create an elected committee on merit. That’s as important as tenure and promotion and, then, within a year, that’s silly to have two committees; so, we bind them together as tenure, promotion and merit. The merit committee makes recommendation on salaries and the whole department meets on salaries all day Saturday in May or whenever the budget comes up. There are recommendations from that committee sitting as a merit committee and it represents the non-tenured as well as the tenured ranks. Everyone is there to discuss. We don’t peel off. So, the assistant professors are they to say, “I don’t think Professor X, who is a full professor, made that big a contribution this year. Let’s look at something else.” I talked about hierarchy, now it’s breaking down entirely. When we came to promotion and tenure, the History Department was the most radical in the entire university. We had a vote of the faculty at large for promotion. Assistant professors were voting on the promotion of associate professors to full and fulls on the whole range but everybody was voting on everything; and then, the college said, “You can’t do that.” We had to have a second ballot which was those of superior rank and that was a secret ballot. Then, the chair had to look at these and see whether they matched; and if they didn’t match, he was ordered to return to the department and say, “It doesn’t match. We’ve got to talk some more.” It was like a Quaker meeting. Usually, they matched.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: Those who were skeptical about Blacks and women joining the professoriate aren’t racist and they aren’t sexist—oh, a little bit maybe—think you’ve got to have the best *man* for the job. They’re on the same side as those who want to teach history and not do sit-ins. They’re the same ones who think it’s no business of the students to be on committee. The lines are very clear. It’s just almost a perfect division on every issue. It means, in 1971, 1972, 1973, when I’m early chair, that our meetings start at 3:15 Monday afternoons, the first Monday of every month, and they go on to 7:00, 7:30 p.m.

KS: Oh, lord.

CAC: We don’t have supper. We see it through. Then, finally, there’s a resolution that if we haven’t done our business by 5:30, we have to recess and meet again next Monday and that’s better. It was wild. As chairman, I was trying to move this smoothly in what I assumed were the directions I wanted but also the majority of the department wanted; but, the psychic costs were really enormous. Let me cite one example. We had to have a replacement for Stuart Hoyt, who was a distinguished medievalist, when he died in the winter of 1971. So, there had to be a search and, of course, you have the only other medievalist chairing the search committee. They go through advertisements and they find the best men. They’re brought on campus and we think, the best one we want is really an associate professor; and then, we have to go back and get more money from the college. Then, we offer him the job—he didn’t want the job. So, then you go back and start it again. This went on for about two years. As it went along, the liberal side of

the department thought, the fault is we're looking for the best *man* and we just have to be open to Affirmative Action, not Equal Opportunity but Affirmative Action. God! that's a touch point! What do we mean by Affirmative Action? What do you mean by that? That's not easy. The lines are not clear at all, and the college is not clear, and neither is the university. There's not an official statement on Affirmative Action until after we'd done all of this. The department says to the committee that's chaired by Bernie Bachrach, who is a good medievalist but a very conservative person, "You have to open it for Affirmative Action." There are no Blacks in medieval history, that meant women. He said, "Are you trying to tell us who is best for the teaching of Medieval History? I resign. I will not chair this committee." No one in European History would fill in for Bernie Bachrach. That's understandable; I don't fault them. It was not politically feasible. They had to respect those who were close to field, know who was required for the field. We had this vacancy and we had the money. I had to chair that committee. As chairman of the department, I took over chair of the committee to search for a medieval historian on the principles of Affirmative Action. That's an awful thing.

KS: Yes.

CAC: I can't remember all . . . I think I've repressed the details of that; but finally, we find a woman who is very good, [Kathryn] Kay Reyerson. We make her an offer; thankfully, she accepts. That took three years and Kay Reyerson turned out to be the best *man* in the field. [laughter] She was very able and is now a full professor . . . and lots of publications, and a good teacher, and a good citizen. We had a position in Early Modern History and we didn't know what really it should be; so, we got to calling it the \$16,000 position. That's what Carla Phillips came into. Carla Phillips is one of our most distinguished historians now. Then, Sara Evans comes in Women's History. It's in the early to mid 1970s that we break somewhat into Black historians; but, there aren't enough of them. We can't enter that market. Women come into the department and once there are women in the department, then, that changes the complex of our meetings.

The women, it was—I'm making up a date now . . . 1974, 1975 when I'm still chairman—who don't want to have people smoke at the department meetings; so, a resolution is passed—it's a majority vote but it's pretty much along those lines—that there would be no smoking in the Ford room during department meetings. Really, as I look back, it was probably aimed at Otto Pflanze who was the Bismarckian. He smoked cigars which are really foul smelling.

KS: Of course, he did.

CAC: But he was also very patriarchal. He's one of the best historians we ever had. He just is brilliant, and very able, and very powerful. I remember meetings in which, at 5:00, he would take out this cigar, and he would roll it in his hands, and then he would take the cellophane off of it, and then, he would roll it some more, and then, he would put it in his mouth and begin to suck on it. The minute he put it in his mouth, even though there wasn't a match, one of the young women whom we'd hired would say, "Mr. Chairman, call the rule! Call the rule!" And

poor Pflanze would have to put his cigar back in his pocket. God! there are lots of silly things; but, it just went on like that all that time. [sound of clapping of hands] [sigh]

I'm using History as an example; but, these things are happening in other departments in different ways. Political Science does it smoother and better but they become very open. Sociology likewise. Anthropology likewise. All of these changes are taking place in the college. They open to students. They open to difference. The vice-president in 1974, 1975 had a workshop for chairpersons and I was asked to come and talk about procedures in History. Then, we had someone from Agronomy talk about chairing a department. There we had someone from the Institute of Technology [IT]. Of course, when I presented what we did in History, it was met with derisive laughter. I mean, these other people from other colleges thought it was just outrageous and so outrageous it was comic. They were right, it was kind of comic; but, I realized then, in 1975 or whenever it was, how diverse this sprawling university is in its modes of self-governance. What I'm describing is largely the Arts College. History, I'm certain, was at the radical left end of everything. Whatever the issue was, we were ahead of the curve and so far ahead of it sometimes that it was silly. It was a source of laughter and derisive laughter in many places, including the vice-president [VP] who thought we were just crazy.

KS: Who was the VP at that time?

CAC: He went on to be president of the University of Arizona. What was his name . . . 1970s? He succeeded Gerry Shepherd. Isn't that wonderful . . . I didn't like him and I can't remember his name. [laughter] [His name, of course, was Henry Koffler.]

KS: [laughter]

CAC: He was very able but very conservative. Also, I should add this, because it's part of the climate, that the first retrenchment is May 1971, and in 1973, it's worse, and in 1975, it's still worse, and somewhere along the line, it's retrenchment and reallocation. You take money away and then you give it back. The departmental and college units have to address this all the time. That comes to be part of the political climate. Grants are beginning to run out in the late 1970s and the state funds are beginning to run out; so, it's a real change. The excitement I've been talking about is from the late 1950s, the 1960s, in to the mid 1970s and, then, it changes.

Where should we take the conversation now? [laughter]

KS: Would you like to talk about some of . . . I've noticed that you were on a number of CLA-wide or university-wide committees. I was looking at things as diverse as the Senate Library Committee or going on the presidential task force of the University Archives.

CAC: Okay. Once I get established with my second book, as I explained this, I have elbow room, and I have time, and I have some standing; so, I'm asked to be chairman of the Senate Library Committee in 1962, 1963, something like that. This is when Met Wilson comes. I'm

also president of the AAUP [American Association of University Professors] at that time. I remember when Met Wilson came in the summer of 1960, as the new president following [James Lewis] Morrill, the AAUP had a barbecue in Ben Lippincott's backyard. We said, "We have got to stick to three things now. We want tightening up of tenure and academic freedom." I forget what the second one was. The third one was that there has to be a new library. We had it all staged so that after dinner, we would join. We'd all had a little whiskey except Mr. Wilson, who was a Mormon. So, then we talked about what the priorities should be and he just listened. I learned later, that of course, he was committed to a new library before he got here.

KS: Yes.

CAC: He had come and he had surveyed what the needs were. We had that west campus and he knew that what we had was a reading room, a reserved book room, on the West Bank. He said, "You can't do that to all of these departments. We need a major new library." He made a first commitment to that. I'll tell you another thing that we were concerned with was retirement because the retirement system was absolutely terrible and Met Wilson was ahead of us on that. He didn't say so that night; but, when he got here, the first thing he did was have a committee on retirement and by 1964, he had moved us from a scandalously bad retirement program into one of the best in the Big Ten. He was just the most remarkable president.

I was chairman of the Senate Library Committee. He gave the green light. He did the work at the legislature; so, we got the appropriation. Ned Stanford is director of libraries, and I'm on this committee, and there's a small committee representative of the faculty, and of the library, and of Central Administration; and we go on tours of libraries throughout the country. Oh! what fun! We visited all kinds of campuses and had a good time doing that and built Wilson Library, which carries his name as it should. Met Wilson deserves to have that named for him. That's kind of a beginning of citizenship beyond the college and into the university.

I can jump ahead on that, that I was asked to be chair of the Senate Library committee again in the late 1970s. That's when Eldred Smith was director. Of all the committees I've served on—there are a large number of them and, maybe, we should turn to that now as a focus—I've done well and I've done less well and chairing that Senate Committee the second time was, I count, the only utter failure I had. I just could not manage. We all knew that the library was in terrible trouble. Eldred Smith became a tyrant. He was brought in to bring order, and he brought order all right, and he moved people around, and he was mean to them. We had complaints and grievances all the time from library staff. Then, what was the Library Committee to do? We aren't to micromanage. What do you do with grievances? You know things aren't going well. What do you do? Finally, we had a small subcommittee and we went to the vice-president, Mr. Keller who was then vice-president for Academic Administration, and laid out one, two, three, four, five what was happening in the library and how it was not admissible. Keller wouldn't listen to us. We failed utterly. I've thought of it afterwards, what could we have done differently? I just don't know but Mr. Smith was too clever. He had too many power wings in Morrill Hall. Mr. Keller was not about to override a person he'd appointed. It just did not work.

It took a major revolution to get rid of . . . and I was not part of that. I remember the awful taste in my mouth. I wasn't up to it. I didn't do well at all.

I said that in May of 1971 I become chairman and then there is the first retrenchment. Mr. Ziebarth appoints a task force for the summer of 1971 to recommend how the college in the future can face these kinds of financial crises and I'm asked to chair it. Serving on the committee are a whole array of people who, subsequently, become deans or vice-presidents. Frank Sorauf is on the committee. Fred Lukermann is on the committee. It's a blue ribbon committee and I chaired it. We had hearings all summer long. None of us was on salary; we were all doing it pro bono and overload. I had to get witnesses to come in, and then, I had to have minutes, and then, we had to make a report by August. Oh! We recommended a series of things that were enacted right away. One was an advisory budget committee to the dean. Another was an advisory committee to the dean on tenure and promotion. Until, then, it was just like departments . . . the dean did, for the whole college, promotions and tenure. They came up to him from chairmen who maybe talked with two people. It was an awful process! We recommended very basic changes toward accountability. It was just—I won't say unanimous—strong consensus from all these strong people around the college. We gave it to Ziebarth and within one or two years, all these things were in place. But, I should share with posterity on this tape that it was the only committee I ever served on that the dean, Mr. Ziebarth who is a gentleman and so punctilious in all matters . . . I never had a word of thanks for this, not even a thank you for the report.

KS: Really?

CAC: He's part of this older generation who were used to the hierarchical. I think he was just shocked that . . . See, we were doing for the college what the departments had done for themselves. We opened this damned thing up to participation. I think he thought it as infringing upon the dean's prerogative—and it did; without question, that's what it did. He's such a gentleman and he's such a dear friend. He's still living. I live with him in the condominium. That was one time that . . . I should add to it that it was such awful work and I was so put out by it. I was so new at it and so inexperienced that by the end of the summer, I had trench mouth. How on earth does anyone get trench mouth? They do from stress . . .

KS: Yes.

CAC: . . . and no sleep. That damned committee made me sick!

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

CAC: There were happier committees. Another thing that happened in the college and the university in the early 1970s was Experimental College. The students wanted their own college,

to make up their own courses. I'll tell you, why not? Right? What I'm talking about that we fought in History was fought in the college. So, they had Experimental College. They had University Without Walls. They had Living Learning Center. All these things, suddenly, there they were and what were we to do with them? They had to be coordinated; so, I was asked to chair a committee. Fine. We got university college students [unclear] all these programs and, then, we got an elected board to manage University College. Then, we had to get a dean for University College. I chaired the search committee. [sigh] We had a search and we advertised. It had to be inside the faculty. We came up with three persons all of whom would have been very good. One was George Shapiro who, probably as I reflect upon it, was the best. George Shapiro was in Speech Communications, a wonderful person and very open to students, very open to new methods but also had very high standards. Barbara Knudson, who was kind of in Sociology, and kind of at loose ends, and a very competent person, was one of the candidates. There were twelve or fifteen others. Then, there was Earl Craig. Earl Craig had an academic appointment but he only had a master's degree. I'd worked with Earl Craig. In the earlier 1960s, I ran a summer orientation program for international students who came here. It was a two-week introduction to the University of Minnesota and to American culture. It was a wonderful experience and he was my assistant and a very good one. Earl Craig was one of the candidates. The committee finally put those three names forward to the vice-president, Mr. Shepherd. I went back and looked at my letter to see if I remembered right. We said there were three candidates. Anyone of them would do superb work and, then, we had a little sheet on each one; but, that the committee felt that Earl Craig would, at this time, be the most appropriate. Earl Craig didn't have tenure. Earl Craig didn't have a doctor's degree. Mr. Craig, if he were to become dean of University College, would have to act on the careers of persons who had Ph.D.s and did have tenure . . . just wouldn't do. Gerry Shepherd called me in and just bloody hell reamed me out, as probably he should have. They appointed, finally, Barbara Knudson. It wasn't until I was doing these oral interviews that I learned that the report our committee made had somehow slipped from the vice-president's office to the president's office—it was Malcolm Moos—and Malcolm Moos, not telling Shepherd, shared the committee report with the Board of Regents, namely Josie Johnson . . .

KS: Oh, oh.

CAC: . . . who was then the only Black woman on the Board. Josie said, "Why are you doing Barbara Knudson? Why aren't you doing a Black man?" So, Moos went down to Shepherd and shared that and Shepherd said, "Why did that ever get to the Board?" I mean, it was a very delicate thing. I've learned, subsequently doing these oral histories, that it was one factor—there were others—that led Sheperd and his whole staff to resign as vice-president and associate vice-presidents because Malcolm Moos had not followed procedures, as they saw it, that were appropriate. Mac Moos did not say that Earl Craig was not an appropriate . . . he leaked that thing to Josie Johnson. He should never have done that. By doing this thing, our committee may have brought down Malcolm Moos because when Gerry Shepherd resigned, that was the trigger and, then, Elmer Andersen had to come in and ask, "What's going on here." He was

president of the Board of Regents. Then, the faculty got into this and that was the beginning of the end. Now, talk about unintended consequences . . .

KS: Yes.

CAC: At the time, I didn't know any of this. I should share also, because I've picked up other things from Neal Amundson, for example, who was a Regents' professor of Chemical Engineering—I interviewed him. He had the story of Elmer Andersen calling a meeting. He had rented an office over near the university on University Avenue, some scroungy little office so he could be near the university because things were hopping. Everyday there was a crisis and Elmer is president of the regents. The Regents' professors, under Neal Amundson's initiative, decided they would meet, all the Regents' professors, and have a vote of no confidence in Mac Moos. So, they did. According to Neal Amundson—I only have his story—they begin to get a little bit uneasy. Al Nier thought it was okay and Walter Heller thought it was all right. But, of course, "Mr. Moos is a friend . . ." "Mr. Moos has done . . ." "This is not an appropriate thing for Regents . . ." Maybe, it wasn't. By the time they met the next day—this is on Neal Amundson's tape—there were only three Regents' professors who would do this and there were fourteen or fifteen of them. What Neal Amundson did was call in other people and he called in me. I was chairman of History, and I'd been chairman of AAUP, and all these things. I was lugged over . . . he said, "You know all about this. You were there." You know how one represses things or forgets them? I said, "Oh, my god! that's what that meeting was about." I'd forgotten. Amundson and Heller were there, and Elmer Andersen, and Neil Sherburne who was on the Board and a friend of Elmer's, and a new regent by the name of John Ingve. I didn't know anything about him. We sat in that dingy office and talked about the university; but, you know at the time—maybe, I'm presenting myself as naive—my memory of it was that I didn't know what we were doing. Now, I should have; and maybe I did and maybe I've repressed it. This is the danger of oral history. It wasn't until I interviewed Neal Amundson that I remembered, oh my god! there was that meeting. It was a meeting because the Regents' professors, according to Neal Amundson, wouldn't do this and Elmer Andersen wanted to talk to more people and see whether there really was this . . . Ohhh. You see what one gets into. Isn't that a frightening story? It is to me. It's kind of scary because you do these things and sometimes you don't know . . . or you deliberately repress them. I don't know what is the case. I think I'm telling the story rather accurately now.

There were lots of other committees. There was Interdisciplinary Studies in the Arts College and I'll tell you that was one of the best things we ever did. It was Roger Page's idea. The Arts College was behind it and the students were behind it. We would have small groups of students and they'd take parallel courses in Ecology, or American Ways of Life, or whatever. We had symposia Friday afternoons that the students could come to. My son, Robert, happened to be in it.

KS: Oh.

CAC: He never had a better learning experience. He picked up forestry. He picked up nature writers in the English Department. He picked up other courses that bore on environment and he ends up as an ecologist. That lasted about four years. It ran out of money. It took a lot of faculty time and the rewards, Karen, were going to publication and to professional and not to teaching and not to these kinds of things. It fell apart. They just said, "No, we won't do that anymore." It was one of the most successful by my measurement and I think others would agree with me. Roger Page would, and Dick Skaggs would, and Marcia Eaton would. It was one of the best things we ever did. It just went out.

This is the mid to late 1970s now and the vice-president, [Henry Koffler] who went on to Arizona . . . and the monies are beginning to decrease. It's clear that if there are limited funds for merit, they will go for scholarship, teaching, and citizenship. Every department knows what that means. We knew. We advanced those who were productive in a publication sense—so did everyone else. If you spent a lot of time on Interdisciplinary Studies, well, that's nice . . . that's a good thing but not much merit. If you had a lot of committee work or were active in outreach, for example, as Rudolph Vecoli and Hyman Berman were in our department . . . very understated. My work in the archives, and Rudy Vecoli's in his archives, and Theofanis Stavrou's work with the Modern Greek Studies Center . . . never, never recognized as carrying much weight. Why weren't we writing books? That came to be the climate in the 1970s and the 1980s. Look, it matches Reaganism.

KS: Yes.

CAC: It's a competitive world. Among other things—I've come to realize it more clearly from these interviews—it stretched out these salaries. If merit monies were to go only for real merit and not even for cost of living, then those who were on the market nationally could get their salary bid up. The distance between the lowest paid full professor—just to take that rank—and the highest paid full professor used to be significant but within reasonably narrow bounds. It just grew. That started in the 1970s and 1980s and it's part of that whole change of climate, that we're going to be a first-rate institution and we're going to be the Harvard on the Mississippi. What it did, I think, in many departments was demoralize the department. We had opened up our department in the mid 1960s, late 1960s, early 1970s with Hoyt and Chambers. For our meetings, we had 90 percent of the faculty there. We were doing important things but once that impulse had gone and merit criteria was widening the salary structure, people dropped out. They weren't going to come to the meetings. Why participate if it's not going to amount to much? Our meetings—this again is a college phenomenon—in History, I know that fewer and fewer people came. It was those who were disaffected that didn't come. So, all of these things have consequences.

The committee that probably was the most rewarding was when Fred Lukermann asked me to chair a committee to revise the group requirements for baccalaureate in the Arts College in 1979. Fred was a neighbor and a friend. I was very close to Frank Sorauf also; but, Fred was more

open on these things. What he wanted to move the college toward was kind of the way I did. For example, History had opened up Social History and the Third World; and lo and behold! our committee opens up a requirement that every student to get a baccalaureate in the Arts College had to have two courses at least in civilizations other than North American or European.

KS: Right.

CAC: We called it "The World Requirement" but really it was a Third World requirement. He wanted other things done. He said, "Who would you like on your committee?" We agreed. We got a blue ribbon committee. Nils Hasselmo was on it and Corky [W.H.] Johnson from Physics because IT always was represented on our curricular . . . Roger Page was our chief of staff. Marcia Eaton was there from Philosophy. It was a small committee and the best committee I have ever worked with and we worked very hard. We worked for six or seven months. We issued an interim report of ideas that we were thinking about. We sent the report to all faculty and all departments and asked for responses. *To whomever is writing the history of the university*—I can italicize that—you know, I have a whole box on that.

KS: Right

CAC: It includes responses from most of the departments. They don't like that or they think we should try something else instead. If you wanted to look at the state of higher education in the Arts College at that time, it just is a wealth of primary stuff. We reread through those and, then, we went and visited departments. Then, we did our final report in 1980 and saw it through the College Assembly. People who are listening to this can go look at the report. I'm really very proud of it. I think it was a swell report. It wasn't revolutionary; but, it did make some very significant changes. We said that introductory courses should pay equal attention to the subject matter in a discipline and its methods. Most people had never thought about methods. That's for the Graduate School. We said, "How do historians think? How do literary critics go about their business? How do geographers ask their questions? Let's introduce that. You couldn't do it by fiat but by saying that's a criterion, we opened up the Third World, right? We opened up sections. One could take a quarter of Freshman Composition and then if they did good work, you could satisfy the rest in the context of a major; so, you did a Composition course when you were in the major . . . There were other things. It was a swell report. One of the minor things we suggested was that at least two courses, if the student wanted, could be used to satisfy group requirements if they were in practice applied fields, that is the Dance, or Studio Art, or Theatre. Well! the conservatives everywhere in the college thought that was a softening. What does one learn by giving a recital? One learns a lot by working on a recital or being in a performance if it's in an academic setting. Even the dance, I imagine, has its intellectual components. At our last assembly meeting, a lot of the conservatives, particularly from the Humanities . . . I never could figure that out . . . Art History—of course they didn't like Studio Art—and English got together and proposed a resolution to knock that out.

KS: Really?

CAC: That was vulgarized liberal education. They were going to carry the day; but, we had voting members from the sciences and it was the theoretical physicists and the mathematicians, many of whom were musicians . . . [laughter] They got up and they were angry . . . by playing the oboe you could learn a good deal!

KS: Interesting.

CAC: They were so persuasive that when it came to a vote, we won.

KS: That's great.

CAC: It's a funny alliance as things happen like that. That's an interesting report and people can go look at it. That was 1979 and 1980. That was very successful. It was just about at the same time, however, that I was having no success with the Senate Library Committee. These are mixed affairs.

Let me say that the creation of the archives, and the elbow room I had, and, then I became chairman, and that meant that I was less engaged in teaching . . . that it's in the mid 1970s that I introduced my History of Social Welfare course and did that until after my retirement. I retired in 1990 and taught this by contract for three years after retirement. That really came to be—I won't say it's the best course . . . others will make that judgment—for me, it was the best thing I ever did and I think, in major part, because it brought together the citizenship concerns I had and, also, it was aimed for students working for the master's of Social Work or, in some cases, Public Health. I had some lawyers in the course. I had some people working for administrative degrees in the College of Education; but, most of them were in Social Work and Human Services. They were the core group and they were age thirty to fifty. They were disproportionately female and minority. It's the only place I ever picked up American Indians, Chicanos, and toward the end Hmong . . . a lot of Asians but Hmong students, and disabled students. I had deaf and blind students. I'd never had them until I did this course. As a career end, it was a wonderful thing to deal with mature minds who didn't want to take down notes and regurgitate. They really wanted to learn something but they wanted to learn what they wanted to learn. If they didn't really respond to some section, that was all right with them. They didn't really care. They were there to learn what they wanted to learn. That was just a wonderful experience.

I said there were disabled people. Let me tell one anecdote. I had a large number of blind students because blind students go into social work because then they want to work with blind people. Wonderful. I had one blind student who had a machine he brought to class to take his notes in Braille. I'd never seen a machine like that. It's about a foot by a foot and it's got little . . . you punch things in and you listen as you do it. I think his must have been an older one. It wasn't a computer. It was not silent. When he took notes, it was like a threshing machine. It went clickety clack, click, click, click! [spoken loudly] He sat in the front of the room. There were 80 to 100 students there. You lecture, and things go better or less well, and ohhh, you get

tired—I'm not talking about myself, I'm doing the best I can to put it out but the students don't always respond. For some reason, he would sit there and not take a note for twenty minutes or twenty-five minutes. Suddenly—what would turn him on, I don't know—he'd turn on the threshing machine and it would go clickety clack, click, click, click! [spoken loudly] The whole student body would wake up and they'd all start taking notes as though it were important.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: Of course, it would throw me off my pace. I'd say, "What did I say that was so important?" He was a lovely, lovely person. I had another student, a female and legally blind. She could see but she couldn't read. She also had trouble with her legs. Sometimes, she walked with a cane and sometimes, she came in a wheel chair. She had a Seeing Eye dog. This Seeing Eye dog was a mutt. I'd never seen a mutt . . . they're normally these German shepherds, right? I got to know her rather well. She'd come to the office and say, "I can't read. What kind of work can I do?" So, we'd work out special assignments. She'd interview people, etcetera, and we'd talk. I said, "Gosh! that's a wonderful dog. He's so good with you but he doesn't look like a Seeing Eye dog to me." "Oh! he isn't," she said. He was a mutt and he was kind of bowlegged. He couldn't go very fast. He kind of flopped along. She said, "They had to get me slow dog because I'm not only blind, I have trouble walking. If he goes fast like a German shepherd, it would pull me over. So, they got me a slow dog." He was a swell dog. It also was challenging that one had to find different kinds of assignments. Indians always wanted to write about welfare on the reservations. That's fine. I didn't know anything about it. These blind and deaf students had other interests and the minorities did. It was just a wonderfully challenging course and really came to be my bread and butter. I was up for it by then because of the work I'd done in the archives. I knew social workers, which very few people do, and had anecdotes of practice. That was a great part of my career in my sixties.

[break in the interview]

KS: This is the continuation of the oral history interview with Clarke Chambers. The date is March 18, 1996. Clarke, I wanted to start by mentioning a [unclear]. Last Friday, you mentioned several times the importance of luck in your career. I agree that you had some good strokes of fortune . . . [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

KS: . . . but what occurred to me over the weekend is that along with intellect, and hard work, and good fortune, and all of that . . . what about the role of being ready to take a chance when it comes, of being adaptable, open to change?

CAC: Oh, I'm glad you asked that question. We haven't talked on the interview about Tim Smith who was the person who encouraged Hy Berman and myself to join him in 1963, 1964, in doing a special seminar on the history of the Iron Range. He was the History of Education

and Religion; and he realized that the Range had a marvelous story and, indeed, it does. He saw the opportunity. He got President Wilson to underwrite this project. It wasn't anyone else's money; it was the university's money. We went up on the Range. We had a seminar we did together jointly with about eight or ten students and we all took different aspects; and then, I was to write up welfare and surrounding institutions. He would do education and Hy would do immigrants and labor. It never came off. I learned a lot, and I got publications out of it, and I still draw on my experience on the Iron Range; but, the others did not. I say this in way of introduction because Timothy Smith was an entrepreneur, and he was an opportunist, and he was always creating these opportunities for himself. One time, when I wasn't feeling very forgiving or compassionate, it occurred to me that there's the old saying, "Opportunity knocks but once" and I thought with Tim Smith that there would be a knock, and he would go to the door, and he would say, "Why here's my old friend Opportunity." [laughter]

KS: [laughter]

CAC: He was the best at finding opportunity and it always came around again. His story is a very, very sad one; but, it does reflect on higher education in the 1960s. I'm going to come back to your question. He was an ordained minister in the Nazarene church. He was a professor of the History of Education and Religion. He'd written a smashingly good book on the nature of revivalism and evangelism, 1830 to 1860 [*Revivalism and Social Reform: American Protestantism on the Eve of the Civil War*]. It still is a classic. He was an extraordinarily imaginative person; but, he was also very devout—no I won't say that—he was pious. This is the mid 1960s and the counter culture is on and he takes to opening class, whatever the lecture was, with a minute of silence. Everybody knew that he was praying. He didn't say that. He didn't say, "Let us pray," and he didn't say, "In the name of the Lord Jesus," or anything like that; but, it was clear that there was this kind of infusion of religiosity. If he'd done that in 1955 or 1995, it wouldn't have been such a big deal but in 1965, it was not a very good time. He aroused the secret hostility of a number of students. Three of them—two of whom were really mentally ill, as it turns out—conspired against Timothy and they started a campaign of harassment with phone calls to his home, sending out pizzas at midnight, sending the fire wagon out at two o'clock in the morning. He had a daughter, then I think age twelve, thirteen, fourteen. Sometimes, these kids would get the daughter and they would say, "Did you know that Professor Smith has been seriously injured on campus?" something like that. It was awful. Timothy could not get the university to persuade the police to put a tracer on his phone; so, this continued for six or eight months and it was a terrible event. In the meantime, with many of his colleagues who are more intensely secular than I and didn't like Tim because he was an opportunist—not that they were not—he didn't have their sympathy. When a chance came along for him to go to Johns Hopkins, that was the opportunity and he knew that his career had closed down at Minnesota; and he left and left that project stranded. I don't really fault him unduly for that. It was an awful event; but, it's part of that climate of the 1960s that was so stimulating, and so exciting, and so challenging; but, it had its downside. They finally did find out who these three were and the ringleader was taken to court for his part. Some of it spilled off on Hyman and me just because they knew that

we were part of this project. My son, Robert, was home once all alone, age eight and they said some of these awful things to him. Robert has turned out to be—now he's forty-two—a pretty skeptical and tough guy. He knew it was something that wasn't true and he kind of passed it off; but, it was not a pleasant thing. So, there are opportunities and you are right.

So, let me address your question without appearing self-serving. [laughter] I hope. There's a gross kind of good luck in having had an academic career, 1945 to 1990. Nationally, as we know, it was an era of growth. From 1945 to 1974, the real standard of living, the real gross national product, the real mean family income doubled. Now, there is no precedent for that in all history . . . 1945 to 1974 a doubling of real money. This society was able . . . it made the decisions to put the capital gain, if you wish the surplus which came with that, not only into higher standards but also into public programs of health, education, and welfare. It's during this period that the Social Security, right in through [President Richard] Nixon—Nixon is the last person who can do this—expanded the Social Security program. With the pouring in of monies—of course, it was defense, too . . . a lot of money into defense—a lot of money went into higher education and it was there. When I spoke last time we met on Friday, the money that was available from private foundations and from federal and state government in the 1960s and 1970s . . . there's been no precedent before or since. I remember interviewing once John Borchert—this was ten years ago—I noticed that when we got to the 1960s, John got on the edge of his chair, and sat up straight, and began to talk with enthusiasm. Then, I notice that other people were doing the same thing. I thought maybe they were excited by the Women's movement, and the environment, and the anti-war movement . . . the things that excited me. It turns out, they were excited by lots of money. It was money to do what they wanted to do. John Borchert made more contributions to the economic social well-being of this state than any other professor. I say that . . . that's an extravagant thing to say; but, he made, as a geographer, all kinds of contributions and without that money, he never would have done it. That was exciting. He could hire graduate students. When we got into the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs [CURA], there was money there and he was the first director of CURA. He could reach out into depressed ghetto neighborhoods and establish effective programs, and housing, and transportation. I'll tell you, it was exciting. So, there's a chance there that none of us had anything to do with.

KS: Yes.

CAC: I find that persons my age, looking back, will say, "Gosh! Clarke, weren't we lucky?" I think that's true. That was luck. But, it was true of society generally. That was a lucky era and a lot of problems could be resolved just because there was money there to work with. That's not to say that the money was always invested; but, I think by and large, it's remarkable in health particularly, and in education that those investments were made and it was lucky.

Beyond that, Karen—I've often thought of this as a professional historian and trying to write history—think of that mixture of determinism, and chance, and will . . . that the opportunity is there. Franklin Roosevelt had the opportunity in the 1930s and he moved with it. Being in a

Depression, he was lucky in a political and governmental sense. Even in our personal biographies, it's luck who touches our lives. Now, you are right, that if we weren't open to those persons, then they wouldn't touch us. You [unclear] a reflection here . . . just let me continue it for a moment. Thinking of myself as a human being but also as a professional historian, I was lucky to have had the mother I did. She knew how to tell stories. I still believe that storytelling is at the heart of the historical profession, that anecdote stories are the engine that drives analysis, as one of my colleague once said. I think that's true. What made me uneasy in the 1970s and 1980s when we got cliometrics and quantifiable history, they were answering questions that traditional methods could not; but, you couldn't read it, and there weren't any people, and nothing ever happened. The stuff just kind of sat there on the page and some of it was brilliant . . . demographic studies, and voting studies, and econometric studies that are very important. It's like a southern tradition. Blue Earth was southern in that sense that I heard stories. Everybody told stories and particularly my mother. As I think I said in the introduction, her father had really been a hero. He'd marched on foot with his 123rd New York Volunteers Company from Tennessee to Georgia with Sherman and that was a hard go. She told those stories. In 1937 was it . . . *Gone with the Wind*? She belonged to this home economics club and she was going to give a report on it. She was just knocked out by that book . . . ohhh, very romantic, very exciting. She either invented or it was really true . . . Like a good historian sometimes she embellished stories. She did a certain amount of invention. I hate to confess that on tape; but, some historians to make a good story do the same thing. She had a story of my grandfather, her father, who, in the march through Georgia, had come upon a great mansion, a great plantation, and over the fireplace was a lovely portrait of this young southern belle. He, by this account, took his sword and cut the canvas, and rolled up the picture, and mailed it back to his affianced—they were married just after the war—the woman he was going to marry. He put on the back of it the address so that when this awful war was over, he would mail it back and sure enough he did. Well, my mother worked that into her review of *Gone with the Wind*. [laughter]

KS: [laughter]

CAC: At the proper moment, she reached behind her chair and brought out the sword . . .

KS: Oh! Oh, my.

CAC: . . . not the picture but the sword. Then, she would weep and then, everybody there would weep.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: It was such an effective presentation that she gave it all through . . . She went to Mankato, and Worthington, and to Albert Lea and gave this wonderful story of the Civil War. You might guess also that I had to fight this pretty hard . . . god! she was a strong woman. My father was a very lovely, prudent, modest man and a country physician and worked fifteen twenty hours a day and didn't have much . . . and he was older and his presence there was always

supportive and always respectful; but, it didn't have the same psychological punch that my mother did. That was luck. I think that if I had any dramatic flare as a teacher, I learned it very early on.

I'm still continuing your theme. I had nothing to do with the second world war being a good war. If wars are ever good, the second world war was a good war. Everybody was engaged. We had a sense of common mission. We were united as a community, as a people. The objective of the war, to bring down Nazism, and Japanese imperialism, and the cruelty of those regimes was widely shared. There were 400,000 Americans killed and 20 million Russian citizens . . . I'm not saying that it was a pleasant war. But, I think for most of my generation, it was a way to get up and get out and really get started. It was exciting. I had a good time in the war and I've talked with many of my contemporaries—some of them on tape for this project—and they all had the same. They were learning things. They were seeing the world. They were doing important things. They were given responsibility far sooner. There were captains commissioned in North Africa on the spot . . . friends of mine. That's pretty heady stuff. When it came to my own service, I served in a non-combatant—I wasn't a CO [conscientious objector or that sort—unit that didn't fight. I was shot at with bombs and machine guns when the Japanese were still at Iwo Jima; and when we landed at Saipan, there was still fighting going on. So, I was in danger now and again; but, I wasn't a combat soldier and I never had to fight. I'm sure I would have been a very bad soldier, combat soldier. I just don't think that my disposition was such . . . I would have had a hard time killing somebody, even in defense, even under the emotion of war. So, even in that sense, it was lucky. We had a good war, and we won it, and it was an unambiguous ending.

KS: Right. When you came back you weren't . . . ?

CAC: Yes. You talk about luck. I had nothing to do with that. Then, you come back and Congress in its wisdom had passed, in 1944, the GI Bill. That was the education. I think my father would have helped pay for my graduate school. But, when I think of my generation—to extend it beyond biography—the number of persons in my generation who were able to do what they'd always wanted to do because they had that GI Bill . . . Certainly, in the liberal arts, which I know best, any number of my generation who were working class families, poor hard scrabble farming families, immigrant families second generation would never have gone to school without the GI Bill. When they come into the profession in the 1950s, it takes awhile to get established. But, by the 1960s, they're all in place and they change the nature, at least in social science and the humanities, the whole range of things. Then, the women come another ten years later and that opens up again. It's a remarkably lucky and exciting kind of break through that takes place. Rudy Vecoli who was a bit younger than I but he was GI Bill and he was trained at Madison with Merle Curti . . . Merle Curti just died last week.

KS: Oh, I didn't know that.

CAC: I think he was ninety-four years old. Of course, Merle Curti was a wonderful historian and the most gentle and beautiful of human beings. Gosh! he was sweet and intelligent. He was really good. He had students work on old topics and he had Rudy working on his degree on progressive reform, a lot of Anglo Saxons. Rudy has told me that it wasn't until he finally got tenure and he looked around that he said, "Hell! that's not for me." Then, he started writing about Italians and did it very well. His research was . . . got it back to Italy and, then, he becomes, of course, director of the Immigration History Research Center. The GI Bill empowered him. When the time came, he took that opportunity and went with it.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[Tape 3, Side 1]

CAC: So, we were lucky with the GI Bill. Let me say a bit more about this luck and, then, I'm going to come back and say how you can be open to it—of course, you have to be open to go to school. It was pure luck that took me to John Hicks and I said earlier that I learned a great deal from him but not how to write and he was a superb writer. I've always kind of felt down about that but he was so busy, and overwhelmed by GI students, and being dean of the graduate school, and so on; so, I don't really blame him personally. What he did was set a model of how one was a professional person in a large institution and assuming responsibility for citizenship. He was an old populist. He was a Methodist's minister's son and he had an enormous sense of obligation for citizenship. When the [loyalty] oath came at California, he was selected not by the administration but by his fellow professors as being the point man to negotiate with the Board of Regents to get that damned thing off. He didn't get it off; but, he was the person they trusted to do that, and he took on that responsibility, and it was something that he got no credit for. It wasn't so much mentoring as being a model of how you behave. I think that soaks in. It's like a father figure. My own father taught me just by his example how to behave with respect toward other people. He was very respectful to his patients. John was the same way. He had a high level of respect and a great respect for the institution. He was a social Democrat, a kind of modest one. He was a Truman Democrat but to the left of that. So, that was lucky. I could have drawn anybody. I could have gone anywhere else.

When I get to Minnesota, I'm lucky to draw Ernest Osgood. I might have drawn Philip Jordan. Ernest really introduced me and taught me a number of things that were important to know and that was chance. The other thing that was luck—when I was asked I had to do it—is that I was the youngest member of the department by far and, so things that came along, they asked me to do. I had to fulfill the department's obligation to American Studies for one or two quarters a year. I didn't know anything about . . . I knew something, I'd read novels; but, what I had to do was learn the literature, and art, and music, and folk music, and [Ralph Waldo] Emerson, and so forth. I wasn't trained in those things. Again, it's lucky that Mary Turpie was there. Do you know Mary Turpie by reputation?

KS: By reputation, yes.

CAC: It's a well-earned reputation. She was a demanding and supportive lady—and she was a lady. I was doing one of these sections and she said she expected that I would come once a week and they would talk about the curriculum that was coming up for that week, the readings and how she handled them in different places. I learned from Mary Turpie. Now, I was open to that and I learned eagerly because she had a lot to teach; but, it was lucky that it was a good teacher who was there.

Before that at Carleton, I was lucky and had Lucile Deen, later Lucile Deen Pinkham, as my history adviser. It was from her really that I learned that history was a discipline, that it was not only a defined field. You had to work at it, and you had to be honest with it, and you had to commit yourself to it. It was a discipline and Lucile Deen taught me that. These people come into your lives. I could have worked with someone else at Carleton and I chose Lucile Deen. The implication of your question, of course, is accurate.

Then, came the 1960s—I talked about this earlier—and the possibility of working with adult women in the Continuing Education for Women program. Edith Mucke at that time was not the director; but, she was in charge of what I was doing. I couldn't have had a better partner. Unlike Louise Roth, who was her superior, who was a little more protective, and a little more rigid, and a little more bureaucratic, that things had to be done right, Edith was willing to . . . let's give it a try. When I suggested or maybe she suggested—I don't know, it was a team effort—that we do this Women in American Life, oh, boy! we went to it. She was a good partner and that's lucky.

In 1964, I mentioned this in our earlier conversation, it was lucky the money was there for the archives. If I'd been three years earlier or four years later, it never would have happened. The money was there. The other lucky thing was that I had in an Honors undergraduate seminar Andrea Hinding. When I got this money and this grant, I said—we didn't have to have open searches in those days—"Andrea, do you want to come . . . ? I don't know anything. You don't know anything. We'll teach ourselves." So, in 1964, we sat down in an empty warehouse with how many boxes of stuff from New York . . . let's say eighty boxes of things. Then, we had to find Maxine Clapp to teach us. Now, Andrea was bright. She was feisty. She was prickly. She was a quick study. She fought people. She fought me. But, you couldn't have had a better person to learn that and establish those guidelines because we had nothing to go on. We had to start it from scratch. Andrea, at age twenty-two—you know her well—had those characteristics, not quite in as abundant supply as later she would; but, she's an assertive person. If things weren't going right, boy! she let me know and she let Maxine know; and, not always, but often she was right. If things weren't going well, we worked them out. To have Andrea as a partner . . . Then in the early 1970s, we began to see that the materials we're gathering at the archives have a disproportionate number of women and women's history is coming in then. She said, "There must be hidden women"—I'm sure it was her inspiration; although, lots of people were getting it around the country at the same time—"in archival collections in state historical societies and everywhere . . . let's just find out." That was the origin of the *Women's History Sources*

Survey. That's 1974, 1975, 1976. She's now the senior partner. I'm just a consultant. Because this is the mid 1970s, I'm just overwhelmed by History Department stuff. I make a very minor contribution to that project; and, yet, the authority of my presence made it possible to do things that otherwise would not have happened. It was luck to have Andrea as a partner in that project.

Then, I think of the luck of some graduate students. We always say rhetorically and sometimes we mean it, "Oh, we learn from our students." I didn't learn from all of them; but, I learned from a lot of them. Let me just cite one. She still is a friend . . . Marjorie Bingham, who got her doctor's degree in American Studies sometime in the mid 1960s. She wrote on environmental authors, [Henry David] Thoreau, and on through John Muir, and other nature writers. It was literary and it was American Studies. It was a good study. Now, it's 1964, 1965, 1966, and in a tutorial relationship, we see each other a great deal. She had a better sense than most people I could ever have known of the turmoil that I was facing in my personal life because of all of these things that are happening—I took them unduly. She said, "Have you ever read [Albert] Camus?" I said, "No, who's Camus?" Here, a graduate student is bringing me books, the novels of Camus to read. Then, she said, "How about [Nikos] Kazantzakis?" I read Kazantzakis, right? She was there as a young woman, oh, boy! just a head-on, rock solid feminist but she's also an existentialist. I'm suffering this career crisis and personal crisis in my life—I won't say she's a counselor, or a priest, or anything like that—and there was a kind of strength from that relationship and it was an existential kind of strength that really made it possible for me to steady myself during the 1960s when everything was breaking all over the place. That's part of the problem of those of us who were parents in the 1960s . . . our kids are getting politically active, they're getting sexually active, they're getting—at least one of my children lightly—into the drug scene. That's pretty threatening and how does one relate to that? That is upsetting in one's own personal life. So, one is lucky that an occasional graduate student is like that. It's always rewarding to have a good student but this was a relationship quite different, quite beyond that. She went on to be a master teacher at St. Louis Park High School, just recently retired. We have lunch every three or four months just to touch base and see how things are. That was pretty lucky to have someone like that.

Let me say one more thing now to come back to the university. Once I had established myself as scholar and teacher, and then with the archives, and then as chairman, this university—I've talked with people other places and I don't think it happens in the same way everywhere—and this college and my colleagues gave me an enormous elbow room, that I could do what I wanted to do. I had to perform by standards of quality what I was doing; but, if I wanted to write on something, they didn't say, "You're a Twentieth Century political reform historian." It wasn't that. I was looking the other day at my CV, and I guess I wasn't surprised because after all it's my life; but, I was amused to note the variety of things I wrote on . . . agricultural history, the history of ideas, and I did that piece on *The Belief in Progress* that was republished in Japanese, of all things. I did immigration. I did historiography. I did biography. I did family. I did all kinds of different things and I think that this university, particularly at its best in the 1960s and 1970s, really gave me that kind of elbow room. It meant also, this elbow room, that when I

wanted to develop a course in the history of social welfare and social work, there wasn't any such course in the country. There were courses in social policy, usually given in schools of public affairs or in policy sequences in schools of social work, but never by an historian—there might have been somewhere but I didn't know about them. The School of Social Work, as people listening to this may appreciate, was not a prestigious school. There are very few places where the school of social work amounts to anything anyhow. I was asked four or five years ago to give an annual endowed address at the University of Chicago for the School of Social Service Administration. It was their centennial year, 1993, and the university was established in 1893. It was kind of a special affair; so, I did some research on the history. They had centennial histories written at Chicago in 1993. There wasn't a one of them that said anything about the School of Social Service Administration . . . [Sophonisba] Breckinridge, Edith Abbott, Grace Abbott, all these wonderful . . . That school was the premier school along with Columbia for thirty-five years and there wasn't any notice of it taken. There was one reference in one of those books to an Abbott and they got the wrong one. They used Grace's name and they were really talking about Edith.

KS: Oh! gee.

CAC: Even in great schools of social work, because they deal with poor people and convicts and deviant peoples of all sort and poor people are deviant of course, it isn't well thought of. When I wanted to do this course and the School of Social Work saw that it would fit into their master's program very well—I can't quote any of my colleagues directly—the general sense was, If Clarke wants to waste his time with those ninnies that's all right, let him do it. By that time, who cared? So, I did. It came to be a major pedagogical commitment that I made. So, that connection is a chancy one.

Reflecting further, Karen, except for John Hicks and my father, all these other persons I've talked about are women. I'm not discovering that suddenly. [laughter] That I have found a friendship, and a respect, and a challenge from women . . . why do you suppose that is?. My closest friends, with one exception, Theofanis Stavrou, have always been with women.

KS: And it started with mother?

CAC: Yes. These women are all more self-knowing than my mother but they're all assertive. They're non-ideological. This isn't a fancy-dancy kind of feminism. They're autonomous. I used the word feisty; every last one of them is feisty.

KS: Bev Stadum?

CAC: Bev Stadum would be another one, yes in Social Work . . . probably in that sense, the most rewarding student that I had. Learned . . . god! She was a practicing social worker and when she did her Ph.D. on the history of charity organizations and associated charities in Minneapolis, boy! did I learn a lot from her and still do. I see her occasionally as well. Now,

isn't that remarkable? I have often reflected on this . . . to say nothing of having an autonomous, assertive, feisty wife who played a very traditional role. She was mother. She stayed at home. She did teach in Rhetoric in St. Paul for seven or eight years and that meant a great deal to her; but, basically, her career was as mother and wife and a damned good one. She earned a good deal of regard and affection from her children and from her husband. Although, she was playing a traditional role, she wasn't a traditional woman—nor was my mother. That's right. I have this feeling of being surrounded. I think, Karen—I've thought about this so it isn't, again, original this afternoon; although, I didn't think I was going to talk about it, you pulled the trigger—that in a professional community which is patriarchal and male run—still is, a lot of it's been broken but it still is—the nature of men is to compete with one another. If the basic mode is one of competition . . . It's not a direct competition but I think it is a competitive model. I feel myself far more competitive with my male friends even though I'm not trying to get one more article than they; it's a funny subtle kind of thing that's operating. If it is that kind of a relationship, however warm and friendly and you share many things intellectual and social and you go to the movies, and you go to the Minnesota Orchestra together, and do all those things together and it's with wonderful, wonderful friends; but, there is a real line, Karen—at least in my case . . . I don't want to generalize beyond that—that you don't share things that are really important . . . I mean things that are of ultimate significance. I wouldn't talk about death. I wouldn't talk about sex. I talk about welfare policy and talk about the Vietnam War with any number of people; but, things that are really personally very sensitive and very private, I wouldn't share with a man. Now, maybe that's a shortcoming on my part and maybe there are men out there that I should . . . With all these women I've talked about, I would have no reservation, nor did they. There's a kind of openness and an easiness of communication. Maybe they don't perceive it that way; but, I think it's there. That doesn't say much about the history of the University of Minnesota; but, it says something about the culture. It is a culture of competition.

How does one know about one's own motives? I was not politically ambitious within the university; but, I was glad to be chair. I was glad to do all of these other things where I had authority and position so I could get leverage. Once, I did let myself—I say, "let myself," maybe I wanted it . . . I don't know—stand for the deanship of the college in 1973. I remember the committee came by and said, "You just have to make yourself . . ." That's pretty complimentary, pretty flattering . . . you've got to let yourself stand. I was a good chairman and I'd had all these other . . . been the AAUP president, and I knew the college very well, and I chaired that task force in 1971, and I knew what they needed. I told this fellow, "I think that if I were to become dean that I would be divorced. I just think that it won't work." But, I didn't withdraw. [laughter] I'm told—these days, they are more open than they were then—that Frank Sorauf and I were the final two candidates and, happily, they chose Frank. This was the summer of 1973. I say "happily" because I learned soon—I guess I always knew but boy! do I know now—that I would have been a very poor dean, that I really have a hard time saying, "No." I worry decisions and I don't like to hurt people. Frank was a Jesuit and Jesuit trained. He was a swell dean. He was. Deans have to have another level of disposition that certainly is not mine.

Again, let me say, "Maybe I was lucky." They chose wisely. They chose the right person in 1973; but, maybe it was luck that I didn't get it.

I'm meandering now. I'd won a prize for the biography of Paul Kellogg [*Paul Kellogg and the Survey: Voices for Social Welfare and Social Justice*] and it brought a stipend of \$1500 or something. That was not a lot of money but I said, "That's out of the blue." You don't have to pay income tax on a prize; so, it was all there. I went home and I said, "Gee! I've always wanted to go to Greece, and Theofanis is going to be in Greece, and he wants to take me to Cyprus. Maybe, I'll just go." Florence said, "You spoiled it. I was just going to suggest when you came home, 'Why don't you take that money and go to Greece?'" [laughter]

KS: [laughter]

CAC: So, I did spoil it. I took the initiative and I should have . . . she was waiting to encourage me and she did encourage me. That was spectacular. I spent five weeks in Greece and, then, we went to Cyprus. It was just exactly a year before the Turks came in. His village was in the northern coast of Kyrenia in Cyprus. I had a little stone, white-washed bedroom right on the sea, and got to know his family, and got to know something of that culture. Ohhh! I just look on those days . . . that was such a beautiful thing. A lot of these chances come along and, of course, your intuition is a good one . . . that one needs to be open to them. At least by the time I was forty-five, I was free enough to be open to lots of things.

You were going to ask, also, about graduate students.

KS: Yes, about the personal attention or the nurturing that you give individual students.

CAC: Most of that came after these events I've talked about. That came in the mid 1960s when I changed the propositions on which my professional career was based and how I perceived the American past. I changed my own lifestyle . . . all kinds of changes taking place. I think that in my career and in my person—my person, perhaps, more importantly—by the mid 1960s, I was really more free to play that kind of a role. I don't think it was a decision. You just slip into what may be an appropriate mode of relationship for yourself; although, I think that family, and the children, and the graduate student I mentioned all kind of set me free. This was part of it. Marjorie said, "I've never had a woman teach me in history." Now, she's a graduate student, and she's almost to her Ph.D., and she said, "You've been my adviser for three years and you've never given me a compliment." I said, "Never given you a compliment! Marjorie, we've had all these wonderful conversations and you know that you're doing this wonderful work." "I know it," she said, "and you know it; but, you've never told me." I thought, oh, boy! oh, boy! I shan't say that that's a vision on the road to Damascus; but, I remember that single event. What happened, Karen, I took a certain amount of implied criticism from my colleagues. Some of these students that you're talking about, no one else would have.

KS: Why is that?

CAC: They weren't going to make the reputation of the University of Minnesota or they weren't going to be great scholars. There was an old Black man. His name [Arthur Hill] is there on the . . . He was sixty-three and I was fifty-seven, I'm guessing. He taught at the community college in Minneapolis downtown. He'd taught geography, and history, and social science, and all these things. He'd worked on the railroad. He'd picked cotton. He was a raconteur and a good teacher. He wanted to get his doctor's degree before he retired. There were persons closer to the field that he could have worked with; but, they wouldn't take him on. He was not a good student in a classical intellectual sense. He was damned good but he wasn't a great scholar. Would he be able to write a dissertation? Ohhh, I didn't know. Every logical person wouldn't take him. He came in to see me and he said, "I've never had a course with you. If you want me to take a course, I'll take a course with you. But I've taken all these courses. I've got to take those exams and I have to write a dissertation. I want my degree before I retire." We had a long talk and I said, "What the hell?" He laughed. He was a wonderfully funny fellow. So, I became his adviser. He passed his writtens, barely. He passed his orals with a great margin because he was so articulate with the spoken word. He just ran circles around us. We'd ask him a question and he'd tell stories about Tennessee. [laughter]

KS: [laughter]

CAC: We couldn't stop him. He was well-informed. It was clear that he knew Black culture. He knew white culture. He knew everything but not in a scholarly fashion; so, he got through the orals just fine. Then, he wrote the history of his own county in Tennessee. I didn't know anything about Tennessee. I knew nothing about that county. I knew very little about Black family or Black religion. That's what he wrote. He got his degree. I went to the awarding of the degree in Northrop Auditorium and, afterwards, as we had drinks and doughnuts or whatever, his whole extended family was there, all these Black cousins, and nieces, and nephews. It was a great moment for him and within a year he was dead. He never did anything to make the reputation of the Department of History; but, I feel as rewarded by working with him as with any.

There was a monk, Brother Raphael, a Christian brother, I think he was. He was a very independent sort because he was a brother and he didn't share all the values of the academy or all the values of the . . . He wasn't very devout either for that matter. He was an interesting fellow and nobody would have him in American Studies. He'd never had a course with me and he came around and said, "I have passed all these things now. I don't know what I want to write." I said, "Let's talk about it." We talked about it and at that time, I was interested in the determinism implicit in what was called the new social history. It comes again in the 1960s but this was in the 1920s with Harry Elmer Barnes. I said, "I've read a lot about Harry Elmer Barnes. Go read some of that." That turned him on; so, he wrote a dissertation on Harry Elmer Barnes. There never was an article out of it. There was never a book. He went back to St. Mary's College in Winona and taught and was a good teacher. So, that was a rewarding kind of thing.

There are others on that list. If you'll look at . . . not only my latest but my last Ph.D., who is also a Jamaican Black, is going to complete his oral. He's done his dissertation now. He's number forty-four. If you look at the titles of those dissertations, they roam all over the place. There never was a party line. That was rewarding to me because I learned all these funny things. Within the academy, I was one of the few persons who was willing to take a risk with someone who is not that a big deal, and wanted to do something, and was going to make good use of his or her degree.

I'll tell you of another case, Elsa Greene. This is the late mid 1960s. There's great hostility. She's a closet lesbian. I didn't know that at the time; but, I kind of suspected it. She wants to write on Emily Dickinson as a lesbian, that everybody looked for Emily Dickinson's lover and they thought it was that editor from Boston.

KS: Right.

CAC: It turned out to be the wife of her brother who lived next door and I think it's now become clear that that woman and Emily Dickinson—whether they had a sexual affair, I don't know—had a very affectionate, what we would call, implicit lesbian affair. Here, was Elsa Greene. I didn't have that idea. A lot of Emily Dickinson's poetry I can't understand. People in the English Department would not share that because it was not an admissible dissertation. Emily Dickinson as a lesbian . . . or the feminist implications of Emily Dickinson? She'd been my teaching assistant in this course I had in Women and Ideas in America. Another case . . . I never had her in class but she came by and said, "I think you could do this." She wasn't getting from me any understanding of Emily Dickinson. All she got from me was a green light. I said, "If you can persuade me, you can persuade almost any damned fool." So, she wrote these chapters and we'd talk about them and wonderful. She together with Andrea were the initiators of the Women's Studies program at the University of Minnesota.

KS: Really?

CAC: There was one other. There were three of them. I can't remember the name of the third but these two women got together. They didn't consult me; this was on their own initiative. They wrote a seventy page . . . like [Martin] Luther's *Ninety-Five Theses* that he pounded to the wall . . . that there had to be a program in Women's Studies, and this is why it had to be done, and they carried it to various people. They carried it to Toni McNaron—she tells the story—and to others. They said, "My god! nobody is going to read seventy pages. [laughter] So, they got it down to eight or ten; but, it was Elsa Greene and Andrea Hinding, as students—they were both graduate students—who really pulled the trigger in getting that program. So, there's Elsa Greene who's another example of a lot of tutorial time spent . . . and with students who weren't going to make my reputation and they weren't going to make the reputation of anybody including themselves. That was funny that you would ask that question. I'm kind of making this up now and I hope it doesn't sound self-serving but it was really an enormously rewarding thing for me

and I think rewarding for these people who would never have gotten their degrees. Now, they might have found *A*, *B*, or *C*. There are others. When it came to merit time, my colleagues knew that these were students that . . . if he wants to do that, that's all right.

KS: It occurs to me that you said that you liked the stories in history. I think I can see a link between liking stories in history and liking to look at individual people.

CAC: [laughter] Yes. The academy is a lucky place, if one is open—again, you're right—to these people who come by. It's fun! . . . and therefore, rewarding in many strange ways.

KS: It's that old saying—is it Pascal, I can't remember who?—" . . . chance favors [only] the prepared mind." [It was, in fact, Louis Pasteur]

CAC: Ahhh! Ohhh, Karen, that's a good one. I think sometimes when you have your children and they're going to kindergarten, and they're going to first grade, they have tests to see if they are reading-ready. That's the concept that I've often used, that people have to be emotionally ready. It's not only learning how to read but to do anything.

KS: Yes.

CAC: This readiness, in my case, I think really developed in the 1960s when I had quite another existential [unclear] about what was important. What were the values and what did I want to do? It's existential in this sense. It doesn't make any difference whether you do it or not as far as the world is concerned or the reputation and so on. It just appears to be the right thing to do at that time, to have that kind of a supporting relationship, which means that it also is mutually supporting so that when Art Hill got his doctor's degree and had that whole family with him . . . that's a real sense of having done, once in awhile, the right thing.

KS: Yes. [whispered]

CAC: Ooof! Getting back to the university—this is the university's tape after all—once the 1960s happened to me and everybody else, I was free. I had a kind of security and a self-confidence and that really let me do lots of these things. Elsewhere, for example at Rutgers or at Madison, the 1960s for many of many friends is very destructive. I think if there had been murders on our campus, assassinations, whatever, if there had been real violence . . . it's different. I think Minnesota so far from either coast had a kind of safety or security.

The other thing, of course Karen—others have talked so I'm not saying anything that people won't know if they listen to these [tapes] or wouldn't know from their own sense—that the University of Minnesota, Twin Cities campus, is the only major public university in the metropolitan center of the state. The University of Illinois is downstate. Michigan is at Ann Arbor. Indiana is at Bloomington which is a nice city; but, it's not the center of the state by any means. Iowa's

university is at Iowa City and it's not at Des Moines. The University of Minnesota is where half the population lives there and the what's going on is right there. Some of the people who were with the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs talked about having that laboratory right there and being able to work; whereas, you could never have done this at Michigan State at East Lansing, for god's sake. So, to be at Minnesota, which was my native home—I felt at home at Minnesota—there was also that kind of challenge with that kind of security. I think that, at its best, the university was a wonderful place to be when I know of the careers of my peers and my friends elsewhere. The Minnesota was a good place. Some many of my friends would say it and I would say it, too . . . I'm not so sure now. I hope we're wrong. It was certainly lucky to be here during those years.

Well, have we left things unsaid?

KS: Do you want to talk about fellowships?

CAC: I would hope everybody in the academy has this experience. I had four sabbaticals and each one was what it should be. The penultimate one I had made possible working up a course in social welfare history. With another one, I wrote the Kellogg book and with another one I wrote the *Seedtime* book. Sabbaticals are just absolutely essential and I'll tell you they're hard to get when you're young and I think they're getting harder to get now. With two of the sabbaticals, Florence encouraged me to go away. I said, "I can write better if I just don't hang around here." During one of them, I went to above Marine-on-Croix to a little cottage right on the river, right on the river and I wrote ten chapters of the Paul Kellogg book in ten weeks.

KS: Wow!

CAC: That's because I had it all up here. I'd get up in the morning and I'd work, and I'd work through the night, and if I wanted to go out and walk in the woods, I'd walk in the woods. I just had my whole calendar to myself. I cooked and I ate when I wanted to. God! that was a beautiful experience! Suddenly, this creation just came out! It had to be edited. I had to work on it a lot after that but the first statement is the hardest and the most exciting. Then, I had a similar sabbatical. Again, I said, "Florence, I had good luck the last time." [laughter] A friend, who had been a sometimes student said, "I've got this house up in Grantsburg. We don't use it except on the weekends. If you want to be there Monday through Friday, be my guest." So, I went up there in the fall and, again, in the spring. What a wonderful, wonderful relief that was. No children, no colleagues, no telephone . . . I had nothing. All I had to do was read and study and walk out to Crex Meadow twelve miles away, and I could go out and watch the birds and the wildlife. Oh, my. Those fellowships were, oh, gosh! a restorative time not only for the career but for the person. I perhaps should say this. Like everyone else, if you have a certain visibility . . . I was on the selection committee for the Harry Truman Fellowships and on the editorial board of the *Journal of American History*. This is all, again, the 1960s and 1970s. This is when these things are really taking off and I have a national reputation of sorts.

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[Tape 3, Side 2]

CAC: The one that, perhaps, speaks better to where I was and what I was doing . . . that I was the only man on the Organization of American Historians' Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession. I was on that with Gerda Lerner and Ann Firor Scott. I didn't have much to contribute. I was the token man. That, professionally, meant a great deal to me. On that, let me just say something else. I had a student named Ruth Porisch. She never finished her work. She was a Lutheran and worked as a Lutheran educator, a director of youth work or something like that. In the early feminist thing . . . this would have been the early 1970s, she came around and said, "I work with lots of Lutheran churches. They don't know about this woman thing. They won't listen to a woman. Would you just try once and see what would happen? Would you go to a vestry, and say that women are okay, and that women who are in the church are okay . . . talk about it historically?" I'm doing a flippant shorthand. I thought, what the hell? [laughter] So, I went. Here was a man saying that women have a series of authentic and legitimate—I won't say grievances and not demands—concerns and the church can address them. The university is trying to address them. We have to address this together. Ruth saw me afterwards and laughed. She said, "You would say what anybody else would say; but, you came as a man and they were all men and it was all right." I don't know how many times I did this; but, three or four times I went to various vestries at that time to say that it was okay to address the issues that women are bringing forward. Now, that's just crazy! Again, it was a student who had confidence enough in me. By confidence, I mean, we had been candid with each other. We shared at this level so that she felt secure and asked me to do this. Isn't that crazy?

When I think of the profession and the profession nationally, it probably was the archives that made a contribution to scholarship quite beyond anything else that was done. That's why I'm praying so that we get this new building with the archives together with the YMCA [Young Men's Christian Association]. The YMCA was Andrea's idea, too.

KS: Right.

CAC: She [unclear] that up and I was a junior partner and helped because, again, the YMCA wanted a man to come around and say it was okay. Of course now, they just love Andrea. Ohhh, boy! she can do no wrong . . . they think she can't do any wrong. I think that whole archive breakaway, if one looks purely at scholarship or a professional career, was probably the chief thing. It was very rewarding; but, I think what you had me talk about was more rewarding . . . knowing people and working with them and empowering, insofar as that's possible. Sometimes, all people want, Karen, is a green light.

KS: Yes.

CAC: I ride on the inter-campus bus and I'd been reading about . . . This was when women's intercollegiate athletics was breaking through and this young woman—girl, I would even say—got on and she was carrying this big thing like athletes carry. What she's got in it, I don't know. It's not a tuba, I know that. I say, "You're an athlete?" "Oh, yes." It's got "U of M Gophers" on it and so forth. I said, "Gosh, what do you do?" She said, "I'm a high jumper." I said, "Are you that woman who broke that record of jumping higher than any female gopher had ever jumped before?" "Yes," she said, "I did pretty well the other day." I said, "How on earth did you ever get into high jumping?" She thought for awhile and she said, "When I was a sophomore in high school, we had a gym coach who said it was all right to jump." All that was required was a green light. All she had to have was someone who said, "It's okay. If you want to jump, go jump!" I think that that's true of a lot of what we've been talking about. Now, some people can't jump very high.

KS: Yes.

CAC: I think that people have to be given a green light to *jump*.

KS: Especially when they're young, eighteen, nineteen, twenty.

CAC: Ohhh, boy! Or I'll tell you if you're a woman and forty-five in that Rusty Ladies' program . . . you say, "That's okay. You go to it." It's still true in our culture that men often can give these green lights where no one else can—and that's a terrible irony.

KS: So . . . what is it like to be a retired historian?

CAC: Florence sometimes says—I've been retired six years—"If you're retired, why do you go over there? Why do you go to work everyday?"

KS: [laughter]

CAC: Karen, is teasing me a bit because she knows that I taught, by contract, the Social Welfare course for three years after I retired and, then, Nils Hasselmo wanted me to write a history of the university, I can't do that for a variety of personal and professional reasons and one bad eye; so, I said, "I'll do some oral interviews." Here we are, I'm almost at the end. Ten more days and this project kind of comes to a conclusion. There again, it was an opportunity that comes along and it was so rewarding; and I think for whoever does write the history—they'll have to look at all kinds of primary materials—there are insights in many of the interviews. I'm going to highlight some for whoever that scholar is who comes along and try to help. Some people's accounts are far more . . . on things of central importance to the history of the university . . . Roger Page, who was associate dean of the Arts College, boy! I'll tell you, he's got a lovely

interview. Keith McFarland from the St. Paul campus, all the way through, he just knows . . . A fellow by the name of David Berg in Morrill Hall, a middle management person, a professional, he knows policy and where it came from the last thirty years. Some of these interviews are just, just remarkable. That's been fun. So, I haven't retired. I gave a seminar the other night for the College of Education on the community importance of public education, commenting on the vouchers. I went over to Macalester the other day and talked on the New Deal and so forth.

Another thing that future persons may be interested in . . . Last August, thanks to Steve Benson, who was with the university radio station, KUOM . . . when it closed, he had to find something to keep him busy. He started what we have come to call an Elderlearning Institute. It's kind of like it's a first cousin to Elderhostels. What we do is give courses in place rather than traveling somewhere and you can go home, and sleep in your bed, and eat your own food. There were a small group of us, eight or ten, who got together . . . Steve Benson is really the moving force. Roger Page and I—did things in the Arts College together . . . oh, my heavens! for thirty years; we were co-chair of the Curriculum Committee—go off and try to piece together a program of courses for elders to come and take. There are always things to do. What also happens is that, of course, at different ages for different persons, the energy levels begin to adjust rather dramatically; and I just know from my experience this year that there's a lower ceiling on what I can do at any given time. That class I gave the other day at Macalester . . . when I was through with it, I was dizzy. I didn't think I was going to be able to walk out of that room. That was a clear sign. I'm not going to do that much anymore.

But, I do have in mind, if I can, writing some informal stuff, perhaps, on what I've learned from these interviews. It won't be formal history but maybe an essay . . . I think particularly an essay on what strikes me as the fragmentation of the academy by intense overspecialization of field and, therefore, the loss of community and the loss of collegiality. Looking back upon it, clearly it sets in in the 1960s and accelerates in the 1970s; and then, when the money gives out, there are all these free-standing folks left. I just think that the academy has been fragmented and I'd like to write an essay on that.

I always hate to end things on a down note. I guess that's not a down note, is it? We're near the end, right?

KS: Do you want to talk about any predictions for the next forty years?

CAC: No!

KS: [laughter] I didn't think so.

CAC: Historians always look backwards. I didn't see clearly—although, people have been writing about it for some time—the impact of specialization. I'll tell you, it's just in every field. You can't go to a GP; there's no general practitioner to take care of you. You have to go five

different specialists. The same thing is true in history. I talked to Dave Berg, I think it was, and he said, "There are no more generalists left in the university." I interviewed a lawyer who is a philanthropist. He gave lots of money through the Minnesota Foundation to the university. He's a very distinguished lawyer, senior partner of a very large firm . . . penthouse up here. He tells me there is no more law. He said, "When I got into the profession in the 1950s, you'd go to lunch with your colleagues and you'd talk about the law." And he said, "Now, all my colleagues are so specialized, we don't have anything to say to each other. We have to talk about other things." That's just all through our society. I don't know what we're going to do with it.

Let's make this my final comment . . . I think. I got lucky in one other way and that is, I completed my career before computers came along.

KS: [laughter]

CAC: I'm too dumb ever to have understood or known how to use them. When they came along, I said, "I'm too old, and I'm too dumb, and I'm not going to learn." So, that was lucky. I got out just in time.

KS: Computers can give you the illusion that you're doing an awful lot real fast . . .

CAC: Ohhh, yes.

KS: . . . whether you really are or not.

CAC: That's the truth. I've kind of run out, unless you have other things?

KS: I had a few questions that you answered. I was going to ask you about balancing the public output with re-energizing privately; but, you kind of touched on that with the cabin.

CAC: That's right, how do you get re-energized?

KS: Well, goodbye. [laughter] That's the end. Thank you.

Transcribed by:

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

Commentary by Clarke A. Chambers
on the University of Minnesota Oral History Project
Commentary Expressed on April 20 and 21, 1998
in Falcon Heights, Minnesota

This is Clarke Chambers. I'm doing an unusual thing. I had thought of interviewing myself at the end of this whole oral history project, which has been going for several years now; but, I thought if I asked myself questions and, then, answered them, it might seem rather precious. What I am going to try to do over the next couple of days, from a rough outline, is to talk about the project, how it originated, how it proceeded, how I organized it, how it went forward, how it changed as it went along, and, then perhaps, comment on some of the over all, general observations I have from conversing with almost 130 persons who had spent their lives here at the University of Minnesota. It's going to be a very informal little account. I hope it will assist persons when they come to interpret the transcripts of the many interviews I've had with others.

My first comment is historical, which is appropriate for an historian. In the summer and fall of 1984, Fred Lukermann, who was then dean of the College of Liberal Arts, suggested that I should interview some folks in the Arts College and in Central Administration so that that record could be on hand for historians or for anyone else interested in higher education in the latter part of the Twentieth Century. That was my first go at it. I began in the summer with a graduate research assistant, a young woman in Political Science who was working on her master's degree. I had thought that she might do research in the archives on persons whom I was going to interview on what their careers had been and what their contributions to the university had been. As a matter of fact, that didn't work out very well. Perhaps, it was, in some large part, my own fault. Perhaps, I didn't train her well enough. I found that when I went to doing research myself, with the help of staff at the University Archives, that I knew what I was looking for. I was far more efficient and I could get what I wanted quickly and to the point.

I think I did approximately sixteen or eighteen interviews in the summer and fall, including one that was really very important. By chance, I was visiting my brother on the West Coast in Oregon and Met Wilson, who was president from 1960 to 1967, was

living in retirement in Eugene, and I thought Mrs. Chambers and I would just stop off and see if I could get an interview with him. Of course, he was delighted and I had a very civil, interesting conversation with him in the late summer of 1984. The interviews added up to sixteen or eighteen in all, primarily out of the Arts College because it was the Arts College that was financing this project; although, I did interview Gerry Shepherd, who was vice-president for Academic Administration—himself an electrical engineer—and others as well in administrative circles. Fred Lukermann had been an assistant vice-president working with Gerry Shepherd for a number of years; so, that was a logical extension. Then, the project pretty well lapsed. What I had were the tapes but no transcripts. I came to realize from 1984 to 1990, 1992, from further inquiries and further work of my own, that scholars were not about to listen to tapes. It's terribly inefficient. They go on and on and one gets easily distracted, so it doesn't work very well. We had to have transcriptions.

When I retired in the fall of 1990, Nils Hasselmo, by then president of the university and an old colleague in the Arts College, spoke to me several times about the possibility that I would as an historian take on the task, not only of doing interviews but of doing research from other primary materials and my own experience at the university, and write a sequel to James Gray's centennial history of the university, *University of Minnesota: 1851-1951*, which was published in 1951, with the expectation in mind that in the year 2001, the sesquicentennial, wouldn't it be nice to have a sequel to James Gray telling about the University of Minnesota in the last half of the Twentieth Century? That was tempting to some degree; but, I retired at age seventy, and in 1990, I realized that when the writing would have to be done in the later decade of the 1990s, 1998-1999, with the year 2000 in mind, it might just be that I wouldn't have the wit or the energy to sustain a major book. It's hard work to write a book and I was skeptical of my own capacity in the late chronological years of my own seventies. So, I held back. We had many conversations and, then, when I was spending the winter in southern New Mexico in the little town of Mesilla to get out of the Siberian winters here in Minnesota, we had correspondence about the possibility of my doing at least a series of interviews with persons whose lives had been central to the history of the University of Minnesota in the last half of the Twentieth Century. That struck me as a much more feasible project and one that I would enjoy taking on.

We had to worry about budget. Sara Evans, who was then chair of History, helped me work it out and experts at the Minnesota Historical Society, including Jim Fogerty, cued me in on procedures and what the best recording machines were for doing this work. So, when I came back in the summer of 1994, I began the second phase—the first one having been the summer/fall of 1986. In 1994, I picked it up again and just this winter, in March of 1998, I completed what I think is probably my last two interviews, one with

President Hasselmo, who was retired last summer, and now living in his home in Tucson. I interviewed Mr. Hasselmo for a number of hours and, then, I interviewed his wife. Pat. I think those are probably the last ones I will do.

Let me say right off the top that Mr. Hasselmo's perception of the project—one that we shared from the beginning—was that the history should not be a typical institutional history. There are a lot of them and they're all very limited. I did research, when first I started in 1984 and again when I picked it up in 1994, on the writing of institutional history. They tend to be bureaucratic, really from the top down, looking at presidents and organizing chapters by who was president and what buildings were created and what a great place and what winning teams there were. There weren't very many good models for me to go on. The University of Wisconsin has had a continuing program for many years—they are now, I think, on volume four—but they chopped up their history into twenty, twenty-five year periods. They started back in the origins of the mid Nineteenth Century and, then, came forward from there. Merle Curti and Vernon Carstensen started the project. More recently, other historians have picked it up. In that case, it was difficult to see the forest for the trees. The stories were largely anecdotal, not without relevance and significance but it was another kind of exercise. It was still institutional history.

Both President Nils Hasselmo and I really wanted to avoid that as much as we could. Of course, you have to focus on the institution. Presidents are not unimportant. Vice-presidents for Academic Affairs are not unimportant and so it goes. But, we really wanted to get a sense of what the two of us agreed was a study of the culture of higher education—culture, of course, in the anthropological sense—that would include modes of governance and self-governance as an important part of culture. Politics and government are not unimportant; but, the chief focus was intended to be on the intellectual, academic autobiographies with persons who saw the university through its chief missions of teaching, learning, research, publication, citizenship within the university, and outreach to various communities within the state and the region. As it turned out, the region is the world. One of the interesting things—I knew it but I didn't appreciate its full extent—was the outreach of the University of Minnesota to have global influence in the later part of the Twentieth Century. Chiefly, then, I intended to gather on tape intellectual, academic autobiographies. Where did persons get their origin of interest? What turned them on? What paths of education had they taken through the Ph.D.? Who were their mentors? What support came from the family? Why had they chosen to be a geographer or a chemical engineer? For me, at least, those parts of my interviews, which often took twenty, twenty-five, thirty minutes . . . when you start asking somebody what they did when they were a kid and how they got excited about something in the intellectual world, it's a very engaging enterprise indeed. A primary way into

understanding the culture was, then, through combined autobiographies of individuals who had played important roles at this university.

I didn't have a set skeleton or outline, but there were things that I wanted in every interview to cover in one way or another. One certainly was a description of the department, the college, the university when the individual being interviewed arrived here, whenever that was. One person, at least, was here in the 1940s as a student, but others came in the 1950s, and 1960s, and 1970s. I wanted to know what cultures did they perceive in the department, in the discipline, in the college when they got here, systems of incentives, systems of reward, systems of governance within the department. I was interested also, once they came to the University of Minnesota, on the course of their research agendas. How did they move from one area to another? One research physician, Ivan Frantz, Jr., whom I interviewed, had moved from cancer to heart. That's a strange leap and he explains it. How do they change? How do teaching strategies and structures change over the years? What relative emphasis on undergraduate, graduate, and professional education came about? Did they engage in interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary research? How did they perceive the changing quality or motives and dynamics of the student body whom they worked with? Then, always, I tried to move the person being interviewed into commenting on varied forms of outreach. As it turns out, they were very diverse. This university is entangled in the region, the state, and the world, and the nation in diverse and very exciting ways. I was interested also in what citizenship role individuals had played within the republic of the academy at every level. What did they do within the department, in the college, on university-wide committees?

Much of that clutter of autobiographical detail was not always directly relevant to the proposed university history; but, I was gathering these interviews not alone for the history, which will be written by the year 2000, but interested also in casting as wide a net as I could for persons interested in different disciplines. How did ecology grow out of biology? How did molecular biology rise out of microbiology? There are all kinds of questions that aren't always directly relevant to institutional history. But, again, I was trying to get at the cultural heart of higher education thinking that the University of Minnesota is not all that peculiar—although, as I discovered, it certainly is in some ways—so that one could understand and appreciate better the trends of higher education in these last fifty years. Perhaps, what I had in mind was the notion of Clifford Geertz, the great cultural anthropologist, that with a weight of concrete detail and thick self-description from telling one's own life, perhaps, one could get an angle at least on these central concerns that I had and Mr. Hasselmo had shared.

In advance of every interview I did, I more than causal background research but it wasn't definitive and it wasn't exhaustive. I went to the University Archives and dug out what

was available there on a given individual. Frequently, there was a great deal of interesting information that I could draw on; but, I learned as I went along that it was important also two or three weeks in advance of an interview to ask the person to be interviewed to provide an annotated curriculum vitae of his career and education and, then, to jot down an agenda of things that she or he felt had been important in their career here at Minnesota. Often I was surprised. Individuals, after all, know their own careers better than I possibly could from research in primary materials. Now, maybe others wouldn't agree that what they did was important; but certainly, it was the case that they knew their own lives. I discovered very quickly that by asking them to do the homework before we sat down to have a conversation that the two of us were able not to have an outline or a skeleton but have broad areas that we wanted to talk about. If I had them before me, I could note . . . you said that so and so was important and let's turn to that now. I think it worked rather well. I should say also that in the University Archives, I had the expert assistance of Penny Krosch, who is director of the University Archives, and of Lois Hendrickson, who is A+. She was very quick in knowing where I might go to discover what I needed.

As I went along, I learned that what the manuals of oral interviewing set forth as appropriate procedures were not fully valid for the kind of project I was engaged in. I was not a neutral outside observer doing lots of study and then asking a uniform menu of set questions. Such kinds of interviews tend to be really quite mechanical. After all, almost without exception, the persons whom I interviewed were known to me. We had worked on committees together. We knew each other socially. We knew each other in informal ways at the Campus Club. There was, I think, in almost every instance, a kind of ease and I like to think—maybe it's not always true in every case—a kind of mutual respect. I was known to them by my reputation and work that we'd done together and I knew them in the same way. Even if we had never met, we knew each other by reputation. I think that provided an environment for conversation rather than questioning. I'd been warned by the manuals, "One must not set up a conversation and suggest counter points of view or draw on your own experience;" but, with the men and women I talked with, to share an experience turned out to be far more effective in provoking them to push their own perceptions to deeper and wider points.

I also learned very quickly that the real key to the success of any oral history project—I had not appreciated it when I went into it—was to have a partner, a transcriber. A woman who is a professional transcriber and herself an oral historian was recommended to me by the Minnesota Historical Society: Beverly Hermes, whose name appears on every interview that she transcribed. We met and right away hit it off. She was helpful not only in providing accurate, grammatical transcriptions—if people used bad language, she put it in—but she knew also when to paragraph, when to put in semicolons and she knew

what the subject matter was. She was a constant source of support throughout it all. We came to be really very close professional associates and friends in the course of our work together and her encouragement was of central importance to me. It was she who suggested that I debrief myself at the end as a way to help others understand the transcripts that are there for study. They are all typed and in the University Archives.

It was also important early on to craft a release form, a short form and a long form so that if one wanted to add restrictions that could be done. I haven't made a close count but I think it's no more than four of the interviews that I did out of the 130 that the person being interviewed said, "I would like to have this closed and used only with my permission," which is perfectly respectable. Sometimes, it was with a very good point. They were saying things that they didn't want the whole world to know. If a qualified scholar asks for permission, of course, permission would be given. Almost everyone selected the short release form.

Of the persons I interviewed—although, my focus was deliberately on teaching, learning, research, publication, citizenship, and outreach—many faculty became administrative officers. When they did so, I interviewed deans and assistant vice-presidents and directors of international programs and so on. I also interviewed a number of persons whom we know at the University of Minnesota as P&A, that is Professional and Administrative. Librarians, for example, I interviewed a number of them and a number of persons who are professional managers within Morrill Hall or within the Arts College . . . persons of that sort because their contributions were central in importance also. I should add quickly that I interviewed only one civil servant and I think that was a mistake. If I could start again and had lots of time and lots of money, I would probably try to spread myself out there. I did a lot of sounding out of other civil servants as to who would really do a good job and I got a young woman who was just superb, Gladys McKenzie. She knew the university from a point of view that few others could manage, a highly intelligent, very articulate woman of deep commitment to the university and very skeptical and very critical of the university, of course, as perceived by a civil servant. I should have had more but I didn't. I also made efforts, I think more successfully here, to interview community leaders outside the university: businessmen, engineers, philanthropists, and persons who had known or served the university on the Minnesota Foundation raising money for various projects at the university. I interviewed persons in the Minnesota Orchestra, also in museums and scholarly societies outside the academy itself. I interviewed a couple of reporters and journalists and lobbyists to get a sense of the political environment in the state of Minnesota in these last fifty years. I haven't counted them but fifteen or so, maybe twenty, of the persons I interviewed were not within the university but outside the university and deeply committed to the university. I think that helped provide a certain balance.

Looking back, however, at the 130 persons—it may be 129; I'm not going to count them—that I interviewed, shortcomings become clear. There's an over representation of persons from the College of Liberal Arts. I apologize for that and to explain it in some part, the Arts College has been historically the largest and most central college for the basic disciplines of any intellectual enterprise. Because it was the college I knew best also had something to do with it, of course. I had interviews with engineers and with some people in the Medical School but there are two major neglects that I should point out at once. One is that I don't have enough interviews from the Health Sciences, the Medical School, the School of Nursing, and so forth. That is explained, in some part, by the fact that I held back from doing those interviews until I knew more about the university. By the time, let us say 1996, 1997, that I was reasonably well-informed, the Medical School, particularly, and the Health Sciences generally, were in utter turmoil. I had interviews set up with several people and they seemed willing enough to talk; but, then, they would call up and say, "Oh! something has come up. I can't do it. Maybe we could try it next week." We would try it next week and that wouldn't work then either. From conversing with people around the university, it became clear to me that the furor around reorganization, around the loss of patients in the University Hospital and clinics, around the Dr. John Najarian episode, made it unlikely that any person in the Health Sciences could really give me what it was I was looking for. I knew that if they were unwilling interviewees, it was unlikely to be profitable. So, with the Medical School, I wish I'd started interviews earlier but I did not. I have three or four people from the Medical School but that's not enough; I should have had more.

There's no one from Intercollegiate Athletics. I must confess that that was just a personal shortcoming, a neglect that has no source of meaning except my own lack of understanding and enthusiasm for Intercollegiate Athletics. I wish I had or I wish someone who knew that field better would have done it in partnership with me.; but, we did not and I regret that that's the case.

There are no interviews with students; although, some of the people I interviewed had been students at the University of Minnesota and had come onto faculty so that would be an exception. By and large, I don't have any. I think that is explained by the fact that we have a student body of 50,000 at any given time. How does one select students? The process of selection would have biased the conversation at once. I could have interviewed students of my own but that would have served no purpose. I just didn't have the facilities or the means to try to get a random sample. How would I find out where they were? It was just too complicated with the limited time and resources I had. So, there are no students except those who happened to have been faculty who had been students at the University of Minnesota in one fashion or another.

There was also—people reading these interviews should be sensitive to it—a conscious, if sometimes perhaps misguided, concentration on persons of long career at Minnesota; so, there is built in a kind of generational bias. There is a disproportionate selection of persons to be interviewed who came early on, some in the 1950s, many in the 1960s, and some in the 1970s. I did not think that what I was interested in doing, to see the trend and the development of higher education over fifty years, could be done by talking with someone who had been here four, or five, or six years—maybe I should have. If I had more time, perhaps, I would have; but, I did not. Readers of these transcripts should have that in mind. There is a generational bias, in some case conscious and in some case arising out of my own subjective perception of what the project was designed to do.

For persons interested in the selection on other grounds, gender for example . . . I think that approximately twenty-five percent, perhaps a bit more of the persons I interviewed, were women. That means a disproportionate number. In the 1950s and 1960s, women did not constitute twenty-five percent of the faculty or administrative staff at the University of Minnesota; but, I knew that the coming of women into the academy in the 1970s in great number and in the 1980s in greater number was something that should be attended to. So many of the younger persons I interviewed were, in fact, women. Maybe I should have had more of the younger generation; but, I did want to catch the impact of feminism upon the development of the university in these decades.

While I'm in the confessing mood, I might say also that I underestimated the time I would need to spend on editing transcripts. That came to be a tedious assignment: the misspelling of names had to be corrected; identification of organizations with their proper, accurate, full title had to be made; and dates were frequently wrong. In these instances, I followed the lead of my transcriber, Beverly Hermes. If a person made a mistake in date, we left that in and, then, in brackets, we would say, "The date really was 1971, not 1965," or what have you; so, the transcript itself reflects the true spoken words. We did not edit or change or delete or add anything except to correct spelling and correct dates and identification of professional societies and matters of that sort. I also spent a certain amount of time doing logs on all of the transcriptions in the expectation that if there were a log, people could go quickly to the right page and see what subject was under discussion. I'm not sure that that was very useful. It took a lot of my energy and I finally wearied of it and I may not have, at the end, done a very good job on it. My primary contribution was conversing with persons about shared values, shared experiences in this attempt to understand the culture of higher education in the last half of the Twentieth Century.

I say all these things not in regret or in complaint but in some part to put the record straight and to advise future oral interviewers of the burdens they may not at first

recognize or appreciate. I had no idea the editing would take so much time. I knew I had to do research ahead of time. I didn't realize I'd run out of budget so quickly. I kept budget back for the transcription because that was vital. A lot of the work, the last several years, was done pro bono because there just wasn't the budget to cover salary. I say that without any sense of disappointment. I was having a good time.

At this point, let me quickly add what a joy it was to me personally. The interviewing was stimulating and exciting. It deepened my intellectual and professional relationships with a number of persons whose careers I thought I knew rather well. But sometimes, when the two or three hours, the hour and a half, were up, I'd think, oh! I should have known this person better. We could have been good friends and we were just colleagues who shared a place and a time. It was a joy also to most persons who were interviewed. They prepared conscientiously. Everybody likes to tell their own story. There's no story better than the narrative that one constructs of one's past. Of course, we're always skeptical of our capacity to be self-serving. As I think back upon it though, many of these interviews were self-critical. Many of them were not self-serving in any explicit way. Very few people had agendas to run. They just relaxed into this conversation and told their life, and their joys, and their frustrations, and what the 1960s were like for them.

Let me give an illustration. I had been active myself in various social movements of the 1960s. I wasn't a leader but I was excited by civil rights, and by the ecology movement, and by feminism. I really moved into research involving women in the past, in part because of the 1960s. I was opposed to the Vietnam War by 1967 and 1968. I had thought those were the excitements of the 1960s—indeed they were. But, as I interviewed a number of people, they would begin to sit on the edge of their chair, and their eyes would brighten, and they would lean forward, and they would begin to tell what the 1960s meant to them. Pretty soon I began to recognize that although many shared my social concerns, they were also excited about access to money to do what they wanted to do. That's part of the story I want to comment on a bit later. Beginning in the late 1950s and, then, in a rush in the 1960s and early 1970s, persons who never had access to major research funding could get money to do what they wanted to do, to travel, to hire research assistants, and that was exciting. It was that intellectual, career excitement that so often came through. It made me realize how complex the 1960s were, that we did as an institution, as other institutions of higher learning did, respond to societal needs and pressures in the 1960s; but, my god! how the money rolled in and that was a part of the story that I knew but I didn't realize its full dimension.

Many persons, once the machine was turned off and we shook hands and thanked each other and talked about current affairs, would say with a certain wistfulness, "I didn't know

anybody really cared." That struck me poignantly. I don't have it on tape. They always said it after the tape was turned off. Certainly, it must have been an uplift to many persons to be able to tell their stories and have it recorded for posterity. The excitement and the pleasure of any number of persons was so very clear to me. One who had asked me for a transcript copy for his own use—eight or ten people did—reported later that his wife had read it with delight and *surprise* at all her husband had accomplished over his years at the university. I got the sense from the way he was telling the story that there was, at least, a momentary boost in demonstrative affection from the spouse on reading his story.

I want to turn now to certain major themes that emerged—some I had anticipated. Conversations provided details, concrete anecdotes, for instances. Some I had at the outset barely divined and some observations came as a surprise.

I'll begin with a few conclusions that are difficult to weigh but I think they are valid. For example, as a beneficiary of the G.I. Bill of Rights myself—I did my Ph.D. work at Berkeley from 1946 to 1950—I knew from my experience and that of many of my friends that the revolution in post secondary education that flowed from that public investment was perfectly enormous. As my interviews went along, that hunch was profoundly confirmed. I began to see more clearly that the G.I. Bill brought a new set of persons into the professoriate—different in class, different in ethnic heritage, different in religion—quite substantially different from the Anglo-Northern European, patrician and, yes, male and white faculty who had dominated the academy from the beginning of the century or back into the Nineteenth Century, down to around 1940. The Second World War was a real cutting point. The G.I. bill permitted persons of my generation, persons of working-class parentage, persons whose parents came from southern and eastern Europe, not from Scotland or England but from Italy and Poland and Yugoslavia, Catholics and eastern European Jews. The academy had always had a number of very distinguished Jewish professors but most of them, until the 1940s and 1950s, had been German Jews, mostly of reformed Judaism. The sons and, then, later the daughters who came into the academy because of the original impulse of the G.I. Bill were quite a different sort. The G. I. Bill just burst open, undergraduate and graduate alike, the student body and, in time, the faculty. I knew this from my own experience in history; but, it repeated itself in so many areas, in the humanities and social sciences particularly but in the exact sciences as well. This new generation coming into the academy in the 1950s asked different questions, sought out different bodies of evidence, devised new theoretical insights, and proposed new hypotheses. In history it was history from the bottom up, the so-called new social history, that I played a modest part in at the University of Minnesota. It was this generation coming into the academy in the 1950s and 1960s that very quickly became impatient with hierarchal and patriarchal management

of departments and colleges. They wanted a piece of the action. I don't think it was a matter of being *politically correct*. It was a matter that so many of these young persons—young in the 1950s—came from a different class, a different ethnic background, a different religious backgrounds and they just had to come with new perceptions and new agendas for research and teaching. Once that was opened up, then of course, African-Americans began to come into the academy to study as graduate students in the 1960s and 1970s. Of course, the big impulse was the coming of women, an increase not so much in undergraduate enrollment but in professional and graduate school enrollment in the late 1960s and at an accelerated pace in the 1970s. It started in 1945. The university would never be the same again and, certainly, the University of Minnesota was not.

A related comment . . . I wish that I could go back and re-interview some of the respondents because it wasn't until I was half way into the project in 1994 and 1995 that I began to realize how many of the persons I was interviewing were the first of their family ever to go beyond high school, and in many cases, the only person in their family ever to go beyond high school. That raised questions. I couldn't go back and ask all these people over again one question: what members of your family had gone on to higher education? It just had to fall out. Near the end of my project, I did go back and look at a lot of them and I discovered about a third, maybe thirty-five or forty percent, never talked about this at all because I hadn't been sensitive to it early enough. But, of those who did mention—volunteer—that information, about sixty percent of the persons I interviewed, of all sorts and disciplines, were the first ever in their family to go beyond high school and, often, they remained the only member of their family to do so. Now, here is a circumstance that certainly changed the nature of higher education, and teaching, and research. Here was social mobility with a vengeance. One can only speculate at sources of ambition, at factors of personality and circumstances that led them on, and what the consequences were for their teaching and research. Did it make a difference that John Brandl in the Humphrey Institute and Public Administration was the first and only person of his family, a large Polish family on a hard scrabble farm in Stearns County, Minnesota, to go St. John's University? What difference did it make to his career that he was from that background? He was a sport. Why him? Why not somebody else? I don't know. It is, to me, impressive, the very large number of persons who broke out of family tradition. I think it was the encouragement of the expectation of going on that came in 1945, 1950, and 1960; but, certainly more than that. Some people broke out; many people did not. If I were reading these transcripts de novo, which some will be doing, I would certainly keep my eye on that.

Certainly, there were different styles of research and teaching. I think the trend toward democratization in department and university governance beginning in the 1960s relates not only to the different class, and ethnic, and religious backgrounds but also to the fact

that these persons are rebels. They're breaking out. They're doing something different. They weren't going to sit around and let the management of the university proceed as it had for so many decades. They were in a take-over mode from the traditional faculty, which was conservative, patrician, patriarchal, hierarchical. They would have none of it. Now, it's also true that social trends, generally, in the American counter culture of the 1960s provided a hospitable environment for a revolution in academic style and structures. These factors were generational. They were class, ethnic, and soon gender. These forces were at work. The fathers and grandfathers were pushed aside by the youngsters—the youngsters who were more diverse, more radical, more spontaneous, more innovative, more populist, and certainly less deferential. One sees in the mid 1960s a very sudden change, partly it's counter culture, partly it's the fact that another generation is coming into influence. There was a quick change.

I think it took place in two or three years in dress codes. When I think of 1950 and 1951 at the University of Minnesota and many other places, a faculty person had a costume and was dressed in a tweed jacket, and slacks, and shirt, and tie. Very soon, it was slacks and sweaters and no tie at all. The informality in dress met informality in teacher/student relations, as well, and in the relations among faculty. Again, I know from my own experience—I've heard other people say it—that in 1951 when I came, junior faculty addressed their senior colleagues as "Professor" so and so or at least "Mister" so and so—rarely, "Miss" or "Mrs." because there weren't many women in the faculty, at that time; but, by 1965, almost everyone was on a first name basis of familiarity. Students called their instructors by first names, frequently not invariably. It depended upon discipline frequently. Systems of traditional deference surely were subverted. There are lot of little signs in the interviews that that was, indeed, the case.

Another subjective observation . . . Persisting throughout the last half of the Twentieth Century and longer than that—I really am talking about higher education at a large public research university—was the centrality of the discipline intellectually and the department politically in the life of the university. Often it took really extravagant forms of near autonomy of the department in policy matters. Oh, it's true that one needed new staff. The enlargement of the staff in the 1960s and the early 1970s was really spectacular. The money had to come from the dean and he might have an advisory committee or he might just be responding to departmental chairs; but, the definition of new positions, the search for persons to fill them remained largely, I would even say overwhelmingly, a departmental affair. In many of the interviews that notion will be manifest. Part of the democratization of departments in the late 1960s, especially in CLA, was insistence on the process of *election* to positions as chairs rather than *selection* by the dean after consultation with select senior faculty. Once the chairs owed their position to secret ballot, they had a kind of base of power or influence not dependant upon the dean's

pleasure. I think that the democratization, then, of the late 1960s and 1970s contributed to an acceleration in the tendency toward the autonomy of the department in deciding matters of curriculum, personnel, budget, criteria for promotion, and so on. Of course, there were college standards and university standards; but, in one case after another in these interviews, the authority of the department is something and the chairs, unlike the former heads who were appointed by the deans, were responsive to their whole faculty and that made a difference in the governance and in the intellectual environment.

Countering this tendency—very unevenly across the university—were efforts in the 1960s and particularly in the early 1970s to create interdisciplinary or cross-disciplinary curricula. Minnesota had pioneered in Humanities and General Studies in the late 1930s and 1940s. American Studies, a premier department program at the University of Minnesota, was founded in 1944 as a general education program. Liberal education, general education was there. In the 1960s, I think, in large part in response to student demands and needs and expressions, there was a great deal of pedagogical transformation that brought about various kinds of experimentation, Cross-Disciplinary Studies in CLA, perhaps, most notably but in University College, University Without Walls, individually designed majors, Experimental College . . . one can go on and you'll catch them in the interviews. There was that experimentation across departmental lines in the 1960s at an accelerated pace. It had been there at Minnesota since the 1940s at least and, perhaps, with General College back into the 1930s; but, many of these programs fell victim to fiscal retrenchment in the 1970s—I'll come to that later—and to the fatigue of professors who had been in the forefront of innovation. It took very heroic dedication to participate in these cross-disciplinary programs. For the most part—again, the interviews will talk about this—colleagues, chairs, deans rarely rewarded these contributions with merit pay. It was after school was out that those energies had to be invested and, in time, participants tended to drop out. They returned to their own disciplinary projects for research and for teaching. After all, it is true the departments had courses they felt they had to cover. Individual faculty could be released for extra department programs only at a sacrifice to core programs which were considered because of the departmental and disciplinary focus of higher education to be of first, major, importance. Furthermore, cross-disciplinary work tended to run against the powerful force of disciplinary specialization and subspecialization. I'm going to return to that theme—at least I have it on my outline for later—which I think led to a fragmentation. Let me postpone that for a moment.

Still on the issue of departmental autonomy . . . I should mention the extremes to which that ran in the Health Sciences. One can trace this down in primary materials. Somewhere around the figure of thirty departments in the Medical School, maybe it was thirty-four, separate departments within the Medical School, each department with a

head—they were never democratized—a head whose power arose primarily from control over government grants, especially from the National Institutes of Health. These departments were fiefdoms. The heads were often very distinguished surgeons and specialists of national and international reputation—properly so. They were innovators of organ transplant, for example. The Medical School in the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s was innovative in so many ways. The level of medical technology certainly increased to the benefit of patients and to society and community generally. But, with the university, these heads enjoyed really unchallenged and unsupervised control over hiring, firing, salary, access to lab space, access to office space, access to research assistants, and on and on and on. To me, it is clear hearing, less from the Medical School—as I say, I only have several interviews there—from persons who saw this working on the Judicial Committee, for example, in the university that procedures and personnel in the Medical School were not subject to due processes commonly in place in most other nooks of this sprawling university. Procedures were often arbitrary and, from the point of view of those who suffered, unfair, of course. Deans of the Medical School, vice-presidents for Health Sciences were largely powerless to oversee personnel and dedication of research grants. Dean Robert Howard, in the mid 1960s, 1963, 1964, in the Medical School, sought to persuade Central Administration and the university president, Met Wilson, to empower executive officers above the departmental level; but, Met Wilson wouldn't touch it, if my perceptions are even approximately accurate. After all, the Health Sciences had enormous political and community support. The surgeons were the heroes in the community and had sources of support in the legislature, sources of support throughout the state—which is understandable; this is not a matter to fault them—which made it extraordinarily difficult for Central Administration to get a handle. Subsequent presidents—if my reading is correct; sometimes one has to read between the lines or between the spoken words—kept hands off as well from Malcolm Moos, C. Peter Magrath, right on through until the legal crisis came in the mid 1990s out of the Najarian affair. Persons interested in this subject can, of course, investigate in many places, not so much with the oral interviews but in primary materials that are widely available for anyone seriously interested. I have no heart and not enough detailed information to untangle that complex set of events. My comments are intended rather and merely to illustrate the persisting centrality of departments or disciplines in all affairs: personnel, budget, outreach, teaching, research, the whole mission of the University of Minnesota.

As a footnote to that but still to the same point, and quickly, there are comments scattered throughout the interviews by persons who had served at various times on the university's Judicial Committee, which is a grievance committee of sorts to oversee that procedures in personnel follow regular procedures. One will find there comments on the disproportionate number of due process cases arising from arbitrary procedures in the Medical School—procedures perceived to be arbitrary, in any case—over a long period of

time. It measures, in some part what others can see when they read some of these interviews, the enormous—I'll say more than chasm—grand canyon stretching along Washington Avenue with the Medical School, the Health Sciences, to the south of Washington Avenue and the rest of us, to the north. It was a major division and the Medical School and the Health Sciences, generally, were more autonomous because they had outside financial sources of influence. They didn't have to depend upon some dean, or vice-president, or president. Well, I'm not writing the history. Someone else, happily, is doing that. These commentaries are just general reflections on my experience as I listened to the 130 persons I interviewed.

Let me switch for awhile to what I have come to see as a breaking of the story, 1950 to 1998, into logical, chronological eras. After all, historians have but one logic and that is chrono-logic. Things happen in sequence. Historians, forever, have to be engaged in defining eras, defining segments of time in which there was a certain style, a certain set of values, a certain tendency, a certain direction in teaching and research. It may be that scholars, other than myself, five or ten or twenty years from now who, I hope, will be reading these transcripts, will see things differently. After all, we don't know how things will turn out. I'm talking from the perspective of 1998. We don't know what's going to happen in 2005 or 2010. It seems to me, from my perspective here in 1998, that the story falls logically into three large parts, with lags and overlaps, of course. Chronologies are never precise. One can say that Met Wilson came as president of the university in 1960 and resigned in 1967. That's the Wilson Era; but, history isn't defined alone by presidencies. So, I want to suggest what these three eras were to me as I reflect on the interviews and on my own experience.

One can start with James Morrill's Administration which ran from 1945 to 1960. The early years, 1945, 1950, 1951 were dominated by heroic efforts and patchwork strategies to accommodate the flood of new students that came with the G.I. Bill. James Gray ends his centennial history in 1951, just at that moment. I see the years 1950, 1951, up to 1956 or 1956, still the Morrill years, as years of relative stability and consolidation; although, McCarthyism was de-stabilizing even in Minnesota. We had our Oppenheimer Case and we had our Wiggins Case in philosophy, the first involving security issues in nuclear physics and the second, the denial of tenure to a black member of the Department of Philosophy. There were issues that the AAUP, American Association of University Professors, had to take up. But, for the most part, if one looks at it, the university was on top of things in 1945, 1950, 1955. I think it makes a pretty clear era. The G.I. Bill had created an expectation that increasing proportions and numbers of high school graduates would enroll in institutions of higher education. Those figures can be checked out easily.

Then, I think relatively suddenly—although, at the time, you never see things quite as clearly—there was a major shift in financial resources following the 1957 launching of *Sputnik*. That was a dramatic event. In the midst of the Cold War, it stirred up enormous anxiety in society and, therefore, in the community and, therefore, in the university about the security of the nation, and science, and America's role as a global power. Following *Sputnik* in 1957, we didn't have to wait for President John F. Kennedy; although, things were accelerated with the creation of the National Aeronautic and Space Administration, NASA. Even before then, grants from the federal government began to rise—the National Defense Education Act, NDEA; the Department of Defense itself; the National Institutes of Health; and, then, in the 1960s, the National Institute of Mental Health; the National Endowment for the Humanities; the National Endowment for the Arts; Fulbright fellowships in the social science fields and health; and international programs from Rockefeller and Ford—and the money really began to roll in and 1957 is a point of change. We didn't see it at once; but, in the late 1950s and early 1960s and then at an accelerated pace in the 1960s and early 1970s, access of the academy to outside support, the proportion of financial support coming from legislative appropriations decreased. They might increase in absolute numbers but as a proportion of the total costs of doing business at the university, they began to decrease exactly at that point. The Languages get a big boost from the National Defense Education Act. It goes on and on. I'm not going to recite all the materials.

It introduces what I think is the second major era which stretches from the late 1950s into the mid 1970s, twenty years, let us say. I should add to that observation that this was within the growth of the national economy, which doubled the standard of living of the American citizen, measured in real terms, from 1945 to 1975. Real income, real per citizen income, real standards of living doubled between 1945 and 1975. Real economic growth created an enormous social surplus. Although, there was competition for that surplus, higher education was certainly high on the priority lists, often because education was seen as a way to advance the American cause in the Cold War and as a global power. So, the money comes in and the money transforms almost every discipline in the university. Persons can engage now in research that they didn't have the money to engage in in earlier decades. That, it seems to me, is the second major era, roughly from 1957—retrenchments begin in 1971—up until 1975, 1976. Monies continue. I'm talking about trends. The trends, to me, are rather clear. The gold begins to fade in the 1970s. I became chairman in May 1971. The first call I had from the dean was to retrench the department's budget, I forget, by three percent or something like that.

There are other things that happened in the early to mid 1970s. One was political. The state legislature in the early 1970s, for the first time in decades, came under control of the Democratic Farmer Labor Party. The legislature itself was reapportioned and made

itself professional. I mean by that that state legislators got higher salaries, membership became almost a full time career, and legislators were assigned full time regular staff. This meant that legislators had the means now to analyze, on their own, very complex budgets proposed by the university. For decades, the university had depended on the goodwill of powerful senior outstate Republican senators to carry the university's budget. That advantage was lost. It's also true in the 1970s that there was an increased demand of health, welfare, corrections, prisons, all of which competed with higher education for state funds. It is also in the 1970s—there's no precise date but it comes in the early 1970s—that state government set a goal of an institution of post secondary education within thirty or thirty-five miles of every high school in the state. Now, that was an ambitious project. The community colleges, vocational/technical colleges, state university campuses all competed for funds and each one of those institutions enjoyed the support of local legislators and state senators. The University of Minnesota-Duluth did well; but, Twin Cities legislators proved not to be protectors of the Twin Cities' campus in the same degree. Bemidji, Winona, Mankato, St. Cloud—run down the list—and all those junior colleges, community colleges, vo-tech colleges, and the state university campuses all had loyal supporters and the University of Minnesota Twin Cities' campus came not to be the only game in the state.

It was also in the early 1970s, 1973, 1974, that inflation began to set in—no fault of the university but just national and international trends. The embargo on oil that came, I think in 1974, sent a shiver of inflation through the entire country. That meant that salaries lagged in 1975, 1980, 1981; whereas, the relative economic position of the faculty had been a favorable one, increasingly favorable, from the late 1950s to the early to mid 1970s when the reverse was the case. When retrenchments came for all of these reasons, then, the bidding became different and the mood of the university became different. The money just did not go as far and money was being cut back, relatively speaking. Again, if you look at absolute funds, of course, the National Institutes of Health continued to be a major source of income for the Health Sciences. Relatively speaking, retrenchment sets in. We didn't know it right away; but, it's certainly there.

It's also true—let this be a defining part of the middle period as I see it, 1957 to 1975, plus or minus—the emergence in the 1960s of all kinds of societal issues: environment, civil rights, feminism, urban problems, housing, poverty, youth counter culture, anti-war movement, and so on. It is in the late 1960s and early 1970s that the university responds with Experimental College, with Living Learning Center, with Afro-American Studies, with Chicano Studies, with American Indian Studies, and, in time, with Women's Studies. They all come in the late 1960s and early 1970s and in response to societal pressures, at that time—but also the money is there still. That's still part of the second phase.

Then, you see, in the mid 1970s, there comes retrenchment, there comes a cut back, there comes a competition for funds, there comes a legislature reapportioned and far more sensitive to local institutions than to the University of Minnesota. It seems to me that all of these things add up so that a third era, as I see it, begins in the mid 1970s and extends still to the present time. This is an era characterized by retrenchment and reallocation of funds, by the necessity to plan, and by what President Kenneth Keller came to call in the mid 1980s a Commitment to Focus and Mr. Hasselmo's University 2000. They are all responding to the changed conditions in the third era from 1975 to 1995, let us say. I'm speculating here. With the passage of time, when we know how things come out, it may be that that periodization won't work; but, from the point of view of this one person, and from many interviews, and from the research I had to do as background for these interviews, it seems to me that that makes reasonable sense. This is a rather elaborate chronological scheme and maybe others will see it differently.

It is now Tuesday, April 21, 1998. I'm recording this in my apartment in a faculty retirement condominium in Falcon Heights.

My last comments were in regard to the problem of establishing chronological eras for any history, including the history of higher education at the University of Minnesota in this instance. I was suggesting, as I see it from the perspective of 1998, that 1945 to 1957 was an era of consolidation, of vast expansion with the G.I. Bill. Enrollments held back a bit in the early 1950's but, then, begin to regain momentum as the national community, the state community came to see that post secondary education was the new level of entry into significant careers and lives in the United States.

Then, I suggested that a dramatic breaking point—things change slowly in any large institution, a sprawling institution such as a university—began in 1957. There was an era of eighteen to twenty years of rapid expansion, expansion of faculty, expansion of student body, expansion of graduate students particularly, enlargement of the availability of research funds from private and public foundations, particularly those related to defense. This was an outgrowth, at least in some major part, of the psychology of the Cold War, which became so acute in the 1950s and 1960s, and the competition for technological advance between the Soviet Union and the United States. It was what quite a few of my interviewees referred to as a "golden age" or a "golden era." It was a color selected for the color of money, which is green, I grant you. Growth of faculty, growth of support staff, and the growth of specialization is a consequence. Now, specialization didn't come from money. Money was the facilitator. Funds for research, funds for outreach, and funds for travel certainly made possible specialization; but, the trend toward specialization in all intellectual disciplines—not only at Minnesota; this is a national and international phenomenon—had internal dynamics, of course: the advances in the sciences, in rocketry,

in computer science. Everybody had to start getting into the game beginning in the 1960s but at an accelerated pace later. The computer opened up all kinds of facilitating possibilities. Everybody was in on the game. I may have reported in my earlier interview regarding my own career within the Department of History that I think we went from a faculty of around eighteen or nineteen, in 1951 when I came here, to a faculty of forty-five or forty-six, depending upon how joint appointments are counted, by the mid 1970s. That's a two and a half times rate of growth in faculty. When we added faculty, it was in new specializations—to the health of the department and to the health of both graduate and undergraduate education. We added, for example, persons in Third World History: the subcontinent of India, China, Japan, Africa, Latin America. These were very high priorities. Persons also with new kinds of methodological specialities, the new social history, women's history, came to be up front. These were the areas that we trained in. It's more difficult to sustain collegiality with a department of forty-five persons of diverse methods, interests, eras, parts of the nation, parts of the world in which history is being written and taught than it is when the faculty is more coherent and more focused on traditional areas, which we understand in history, at least, was northern Europe and American expansion. We used to give a course called "The Expansion of Europe Overseas," beginning with Columbus and going down through the new empires of the late Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries. In the 1960s, we renamed that course "The World and the West." It was a small undergraduate course team taught always by someone from American or European History on the one hand and someone from the so-called third world, an Africanist, an Asian expert, or Latin Americanist. Specialization was facilitated. There were dynamics internal to every discipline really pushing the envelope on all of these.

Then, for a variety of factors that I touched upon, in the mid 1970s, that begins to shift, slowly at first. The first retrenchments are very slow; but, there is a changed climate in absolute numbers. I want to make this clear. Scholars, of course, will go to primary documents. Don't depend upon the spoken work and the memory. I know that the primary documents would show that in absolute numbers the medical sciences, for example, continued to do very well for a long time; but, relatively speaking, retrenchment set in at every point. The competition for funds in the 1970s became very acute. Inflation cut into the real worth of salaries for the professoriate and for supporting staff in every department. It was quite a changed environment. Retrenchment then, in the early to mid 1970s, required—although, it wasn't said so forcefully and explicitly, at first—long-range planning. I get a sense—I have been unable to interview President Magrath who was here from 1973 to 1984; he was here ten years—that he was really reluctant to set it forth, one, two, three, that long-range was essential. But, at the college level, at departmental levels, at the level of Morrill Hall, certainly when Mr. Keller became vice-president for Academic Administration, the necessity for long-range

planning, for retrenchment and reassignment and reallocation of funds was there. When Mr. Keller moved from the vice-presidency to the presidency and was asked by Governor Rudy Perpich and others, "For god's sake, do something about focusing the university," he had Commitment to Focus ready to write. All the groundwork, all the preliminary memoranda were there. Now, he had to pull it together and he did it in six weeks, something like that. It could be done quickly because the groundwork had been done and Mr. Keller was part of that process in the graduate office and the vice-president's office. He had the support and backup staff from different colleges and from Central Administration to move very, very quickly. Long-range planning just had to evolve out of these conditions. Retrenchment and reallocation and long-range planning are certainly marks of what I see as the third major era since the Second World War, dating from the mid 1970s down to the present. Now, that doesn't mean that things didn't change within the era—of course they did. I think we can see, with the passage of time, that it was rather a clearly new era.

The latter years of what I see as the third era were also characterized by what I and others who have been interviewed would refer to as the corporatization of the university, a trend that was evident nationally. Again, Minnesota was not entirely peculiar. One sees it in the acceleration of technology transfer, for example, in engineering, in the medical sciences, the health sciences, in management, and in computer science. There were spin-offs from research being done in these colleges, these units, and a growing partnership with business or the corporate community and specific research agendas internal to the university. There is some debate and a careful reading of the transcripts of the interviews will show that it's not a simple matter at all. Some people feared that this growing partnership between the university and the community was a logical outgrowth of the Land-Grant mission going way back to the origins of the university in 1851, where the Land-Grant mission was to do research and teaching that would promote the social and economic well-being of the state and, certainly, there was a pay off in these closer relationships. Others saw that some agendas, at least, were modified. Where the money was, one went. That is not shocking. It's not corruption; but, it is part of a subtle process. The capital drive in the mid 1980s, raised \$350 million to \$360 million, the largest sum ever gathered—it is claimed and I suspect it's true—in a capital fund drive by any public university in the history of higher education in the United States of America. Most of it was invested in endowed chairs and most of those endowed chairs were in areas likely to have a direct pay-off: Health Sciences, Engineering, Law, Management, Biological Genetics, Agronomy, and the like. The university came to be defended and seen as the engine that drove the economy of the state and in a substantial degree, that was true. There were real spin-offs of technology and innovation in management and in related areas that did, indeed, contribute to the prosperity of the state and of the region of the Upper Midwest. Relatively few of the endowed chairs were in the humanities,

social science, or liberal arts, generally. Of course, there are some exceptions and Mr. Keller and Mr. Hasselmo later tried to set aside undesignated grants for the liberal arts and for general education; but, it's clear that funds were invested where there would be seem to be pay off and people on the outside who were putting up the monies, a million dollars at a shot, plus or minus, were, indeed, enthusiastic about having a research chair, a person who would also do a lot of teaching, particularly at the graduate level but undergraduate as well, in areas that were of concern to the donor. There's no bribery or corruption involved in this; but, certainly there's a subtle subversion, as I see it—again, you will find arguments in the interviews from both sides—of basic disciplines in the liberal arts, including the non-applied basic sciences. It seems to me that the initiation of a plan of Incentives for Managed Growth reflects this tendency to use marketplace systems in the academy where they will not be fully appropriate. I would warn the reader of my own apparent and obvious commitment precisely to the areas that I see neglected and passed by. But, it's not only my perception; many of the persons I interviewed saw it from their own point of view, roughly in that way. I remember as a teacher of Twentieth Century American Political and Social History, in the early days, I had large classes of sophomores and juniors, really large classes. When we got to the 1920s, one could always draw a laugh from sophomores by quoting Calvin Coolidge's great aphorism, "The business of America is business." In the 1950s and 1960s, that was seen as obvious and comic if told in the right way. It was a truism; but, sometimes, truisms partake of objective truth. I think that what Mr. Coolidge said was right at the heart of a long-run American value system, that the business of American has, indeed, been business—for better or worse. I'm saying it as an objective fact.

That being the case, the success the university derived from the expansion of the late 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, encouraged academic entrepreneurship; that is, promotion and high salaries tended to go to those who were successful, successful in gathering research funds, in creating new fields, new centers, implementing them. I did it myself with the Social Welfare History Archives. Some fields were expanding and hot. Others were stable, declining, or cool. I see a certain paradox, a certain tension. I find it ironic and, perhaps, even comic that in the Arts College, at least, but generally the professoriate as I know it and you will hear it on many of the interviews, is kind of left liberal. It's not to say that it's politically correct. It just means that many of us, particularly in the social sciences and the humanities, have been traditionally, for many years, for many generations, basically critical of a business society, of competition, of endeavor, of the costs of a cut-throat competitive kind of society, the free-booting, classical market forces of supply and demand. Many of those you will read were critical of the larger environment of American values, American principles, American ideals. But, the joke comes that increasingly, merit for promotion or for salary increase was defined, not alone but in some major part, by criteria chiefly of the marketplace: articles and books published,

numbers of enrolled students in graduate seminars and undergraduate courses, numbers of graduate candidates advancing through the Ph.D. under the guidance of a given individual, the placement of such Ph.D.s in prestigious colleges and universities throughout the country, the number of citations that other scholars made to one's own work. These were measurable kinds of criteria and they matched the marketplace. Other factors in many departments came into consideration; but, I think such kinds of statistics were really easier to judge as meritorious than the inherent quality of a person's work: teaching, published research, outreach, citizenship, and the like. At salary time, in May and June, when every department has to, by its own procedures, say what kind of raises will be given and what promotions are to be recommended, certainly, the first and heaviest weight went to published research, reputation. The second—it was difficult to evaluate; we got student evaluations and the insistence upon it in the 1960s and 1970s but that's pretty slippery data—went to teaching. How was one really to measure the success of teaching? By enrollments? Maybe the person was an easy grader. That always came up. He has lots of students because the grades are easy. A third and far lesser weight was on citizenship within the academic republic and outreach to the community. These varied, of course, from discipline to discipline; but, by and large, we disdained—many of us—the competitiveness of free-booting economic structures. I think one would find that, generally, a close analysis of salary schedules would exhibit a widening distance between the least paid and, therefore, least honored and the best paid and, therefore, most honored persons in a given discipline. That bore on what I had mentioned earlier as one of my subjective observations of these interviews, a problem associated with a loss of collegiality within a department, a discipline, or from college to college. In some places a star system emerged. When the star was marketable, he—many of them were he, still—could take research funding and graduate students and a reputation to another university at a better price. The competition existed then, particularly in times of expansion in the 1960s and 1970s, in that fashion. I think this had consequences for faculty morale, especially when inflation ate so deeply into real income, beginning in the mid 1970s and extending for seven, eight, nine years. Monies for salary increase fell far below the rate of inflation and it created in many different nooks and crannies of the university a kind of internal tension.

In many other interviews, there was also a clear affirmation of the positive consequences. Of course, people want a better, higher quality university. The stars, presumably, would add to that. One is interested in maintaining and advancing the quality and national reputation of academic programs and, of course, we were eager to do that. We all wanted to be ranked higher. I don't know of a department that didn't pray for a better reputational position in the recurring, every five years or so, national surveys of graduate programs. Quite understandably, Chemical Engineering, for example, one of the most distinguished departments, maintained its quality over all those years. Professor Neal

Amundson and Professor Keller were able to maintain the quality of that program and it was seen to be on the positive side. That was a department that was bringing honor to the University of Minnesota. I don't think that should be denigrated. I'm suggesting it was dicey. There was tension within this. There was also spectacular advances in all different kinds of fields, in genetics, in engineering, and within the Arts College in economics, geography, and psychology, for example. It worked. They were great departments and they attracted good graduate students. It's always fun working with better graduate students. If I were to write it, which happily I am not, my history would have to address the tension—I shant say contradiction because we both wanted quality and saw what some of the negative consequences were of this intensely competitive kind of academic environment. Each discipline, each department did it differently; but, I have no doubt at all, as I listened to so many colleagues, that specialization had its pluses and minuses—from a societal point of view, perhaps more pluses than minuses.

For example, rather early on I was made aware of this when I interviewed Maynard Reynolds of the College of Education. He was brought here in the early 1950s and introduced a specialization of Special Education. Now, that reached out into the public school system, K-12, throughout the state and throughout the region and, eventually, throughout the nation as well. The College of Education added more staff with more money, more graduate students, more assistants. Special Education, which had been one at the most, perhaps one and a half persons in 1950, became a large parish within the province of the College of Education; so, the College of Education expanded. Its mission with retrenchment came less to be the training of teachers for K-12 and more for specialized training for the management of school systems and for such things as Special Education. I think when one looked at Maynard Reynolds' interview, one sees that increasingly he—the same thing is parellely true in other disciplines—began to associate his own work primarily with other persons interested in special education in the region and in the nation and less with many of his colleagues who were not of his own interest in special education. I picked that up with a lot of persons who made their chief identification with the discipline within the University of Minnesota but more importantly in the professional associations and in international groups. That's where one got intellectual sustenance and one got excitement and one got recognition. It was a heady enterprise that was advancing and, as always in history, there are minuses and pluses. The golden years accelerated that tendency and in the 1980s and 1990s, the deepening of the partnership with the business and corporate world built upon that situation.

I don't want to end on that note. I want to say something about a clutter of little things, of major importance, but I'm not going to comment upon them at such length. One observation that began to jump out at me—I hadn't planned it at first and I wish I had anticipated it sooner—is that these intellectual academic autobiographies often included

accounts of persons, teachers, parents, neighbors, uncles and aunts, whatever, who played crucial roles in encouraging young men and young women to continue their education. I'm talking about the mentoring process, persons who open up the challenge and excitement of intellectual inquiry in a given field, on the one hand, and care about the young person and their progress and their success, on the other. I think of the interview with Warren Ibele, dean of the Graduate School, member of the faculty of Mechanical Engineering. He was from a working-class family in New Orleans. I think it's in the seventh or eighth grade that he had a teacher in mechanical drawing who saw drawing as both a way of precision and making mechanics function more efficiently but also the aesthetic beauty of the process. That teacher spotted this kid in eighth grade as a real comer and supported him all the way through his education—I don't mean with money—and was there to mentor in a very important way on to Tulane, in this instance. There are lots of those stories and I began to wonder and speculate about the degree to which faculty persons—men and women who had had successful mentoring in their youth or in college or in graduate school or from family or from neighbors—carried that experience of mentoring over into their own career. Did they mentor others? Did they consciously realize how important that is? I don't know. If I were going to write the history, I would try to figure it out. Older persons who stayed in touch, wrote letters, made contacts, sometimes lent money, sometimes a room in a house. Comments of this sort, I did not solicit at first. Once in awhile I would say, "Was there someone in your early history that turned you on?" Usually there were. I'm not sure—I don't know how one would find out—whether that experience of having been well-mentored oneself contributed to making one's own career to include a conscious effort to mentor the work of undergraduate and graduate students—or junior faculty, for that matter.

Another item . . . Many of the respondents—if pressed, all of them, I'm sure—pointed to the University of Minnesota's location, situation, and mission as not being unique perhaps in the country, but certainly very different from prevailing models throughout the country. The University of Minnesota, the Twin Cities campus—that's what I'm talking about chiefly now—was the only Big Ten university with a full range of collegiate and professional schools in one location. That site, in the metro center of the state, with two cities and lots of suburbs and seven counties, has direct and immediate access to state government, to the capitol in St. Paul just a bus ride away, to all kinds of cultural institutions, orchestras, choruses, theaters, museums, art institutes, historical societies, scientific museums, to business and technological communities within the state and metro area. When one thinks of other places in the Big Ten and, then, extended to state universities generally . . . Illinois, Champaign-Urbana was in a cornfield far from Springfield, the state capitol, and far from Chicago, where the money and the prestige and the cultured institutions were. Michigan and Michigan State were divided. Iowa and

Iowa State were divided. Indiana University was remote from centers of commerce and culture. Minnesota's advantage must be considered almost unique in the nation in that regard. Many people spoke of this, not necessarily in the general terms that I'm suggesting now. When one thinks of the creation of the Center of Urban and Regional Affairs in the late 1960s to outreach to different constituencies within the metropolitan area with the concern of poverty, and housing, and race relations, and crime, etcetera, we had our laboratory right at the back door. The same thing was true of engineers. Look at the success of Medtronics, a corporation in medical technology. They were a close partnership with research scholars at the University of Minnesota Health Sciences. Again, I want to italicize that the University of Minnesota had the whole range in one Twin Cities campus: the Law School, the Medical School, the School of Engineering, the School of Agriculture, Forestry, and Home Economics, etcetera, etcetera. Everywhere the whole range of offerings, undergraduate, graduate and professional, were here in one location. This is not to comment in any way negatively on the liberal arts program at Morris, which is extraordinarily successful, or the branch of the university in Duluth, which has been and still is an enormously important part of the university system, or the work done at Crookston in the experimental farms and agricultural education generally; but, it is to say that Ann Arbor, and Champaign-Urbana, and Madison, and Iowa City, and Purdue, and Ohio State . . . none had the location, the connections, the networking that the University of Minnesota did and none had a cluster or professional and basic disciplined programs as the university did. It made an enormous difference in the history the last fifty years.

Another item, different in degree, perhaps, if not in kind, is the force that many have commented on in the interviews of the active participation in university affairs, of philanthropic families, agencies, and institutions. Community leaders cared about the health of the university. They were willing and eager to help out. The Dayton Company and the Dayton Foundation, for example, had inaugurated, the Five-Percent Club, half of a tithe, in which five-percent of a corporation's profits for the year would be invested in philanthropic affairs. That spread throughout the Twin Cities and throughout the state of Minnesota—it spread nationally, as well. I get from many who were close to this the enthusiasm, the depth of commitment of community leaders. They wanted the university to succeed and they could be called upon not only for funds through the University Minnesota Foundation but they could be called upon for advice and counsel. The chief executive officer of Medtronics played a major role in the reorganization of the Health Sciences in the Hasselmo Administration, pro bono. These people just came in and worked and worked and worked to achieve these ends.

Item . . . the outreach of the university in the world. I knew it was the case; but, the extent of it, I must confess, I had not fully appreciated. The attraction of the University

of Minnesota . . . Again, many other universities were doing this; it was not unique to Minnesota. The expansion of graduate and professional training for students from the Pacific Rim, for example, from the Peoples Republic of China, from Taiwan, from Japan, from India, all around the world meant an enormous number of students getting their degrees, their professional certification here at the University of Minnesota in increasing numbers as we advance through the years. Student exchanges, at another level, chiefly undergraduate . . . The Student Project for Amity Among Nations, SPAN—which started I think in 1947 with a very distinguished and imaginative person in the School of Journalism, Mitchell Charnley, and, then, picked up by Professor Theofanis Stavrou of the Department of History—sent groups of fifteen or twenty undergraduate students to do research projects in the summer all around the world: Africa, Europe, Asia, Latin America, Mexico. That program under its directors demanded at least a basic facility with the language where the work was being done. Now, that's not true of the overseas programs of many colleges and universities. One goes to France and maybe picks up a little French language when there for six weeks in the summer; but, if one were going to study in Greece, or in Nigeria, or in the Philippines, or whatever the case might be, it was required that a fundamental working knowledge of the language was essential before the student could go. That's a remarkable program of outreach. It's a dramatic story of global connections of a land-locked university. It has both sides: students coming here from everywhere in the world and the university going to the world with research projects in Morocco, in the Philippines, in India, in South Korea. It is a fantastic story. There are many parts of that are told in these interviews.

A parallel story is the outreach of the university to the metropolitan area and the state, by Agricultural Extension, of course, but in music, theater, the arts, in Afro-American Studies, in Chicano Studies, American Indian Studies, and Women's Studies. The outreach to the immediate community was vigorous and important. That is another part of the impact of the Land-Grant mission, the impact of the university. When the Guthrie Theatre came here, the fellowships were set up in the Studio Theater Program here at the University of Minnesota and out of that fellowship program came, in time, over fifteen or twenty years, the expansion of small theaters throughout the Twin Cities area. I can't recite all of them; but, if I were reading these interviews and doing research in other kinds of primary materials, I would certainly want to focus on those developments, as well.

I didn't intend to put on tape a comprehensive, in-depth set of observations and comments. I wished, merely, to describe a bit of the history of the project, what its objectives were, how I went about it, what mistakes I made, where the strengths were. I hope readers of the transcript will know what a real rewarding experience it was for me. It is also the case that I was asked by President Hasselmo to chair a university committee

to find someone who could do the sesquicentennial history for 2000, 2001. That was a difficult assignment. It wasn't easy to find persons who were qualified, available, eager to commit themselves to this kind of a project; but, a year or so ago, the committee interviewed and was able to accept the partnership of Stanford Lehmborg, a Tudor Stuart historian in the Department of History, and Ann Pflaum, associate dean of the University College here at the university and herself a Ph.D. in History from the University of Minnesota. They have been working and are working furiously and intelligently now on research and writing, which will result in, in the year 2000 probably, a sequel volume to James Gray's centennial account. Other scholars have already begun to use segments of the transcribed interviews for their own special studies. People from other colleges and universities who come here to study the origins of Women's Studies, for example, have used the eight or ten interviews I have dealing with that. So, things are underway. It is my hope and my expectation that the body of transcribed interviews will provide an important research base for anyone interested in higher education at the University of Minnesota the last half of century and for this project, this contracted-for history of the University of Minnesota.

My expectation and my hope and prayer is also that these interviews will provide a reservoir of commentary on the lives and careers of persons who committed themselves to the University of Minnesota the last half century in many, many different ways and that scholars from many places, from many disciplines, with many interests, with many different points of view and questions to be answered will find these interviews, in some way, useful as beginning points. Now, as an historian, I know and scholars in every field certainly must understand the relative unreliability of objective fact in the spoken word. We remain skeptical of all sources of primary material in writing history; but, I think particularly does that apply to oral history. There is a bias not only of the person being interviewed but it is my bias, as well. I hope that these comments have alerted readers of the transcripts to the ways, not often intended, that my own subjective impressions entered into the creation of this reservoir of spoken words.

My closing note is that it was a joyful and rewarding experience for me and for many persons whom I interviewed—no question about that—but, in approaching any kind of primary material, readers have to begin with an initial kind of skepticism, not cynicism but a skepticism. It won't do to listen or read these transcripts alone. There's an enormous body, a flow of paper, tons of paper created by a bureaucratic institution such as the University of Minnesota and that material has to be consulted. The oral histories have another purpose and I think a very good one. Let that be my final note that it was a rewarding experience for me and I'm sure for the university and those persons whom I interviewed; but, that body of material has to be approached with a certain kind of healthy skepticism in understanding very, very complex careers, very complex

developments within each discipline and within the university at large. There are also comments on the management and administration, the political side of the university, and that, as it should be, was not the chief focus, the intended focus, of the interviews; but, invariably, inevitably, one had to be concerned with governance of the department, of the college, of the university. Persons wished to comment on their participation in department, college, and university affairs. Many went on to administrative positions and those were not unimportant. They were very important. My interviews were not designed to tell stories of presidents and deans—although, those issues entered into the conversations—but to try to capture the broad culture of higher education at the University of Minnesota the last half century. If that goal is even approximately reached, I will be delighted. Other people will have to make that judgment—on which note, I sign off.

[End of the Commentary]

Transcribed by:

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