



MACALESTER COLLEGE
Macalester College Archives, DeWitt Wallace Library
Oral History Project

Interview with: **David Ranheim**
Class of 1964; Trustee, 1975-2005; Board of Trustees Chair, 1985-1989

Date: **Thursday, January 11th, 2007, 2:00p.m.**

Place: Macalester College DeWitt Wallace Library, Harmon Room
Interviewer: Sara Nelson, Class of 2007

Edited interview run time: 1:46:55 minutes Disk 1: 1:19:57
Disk 2: 26:58

Accession: 2007-12-21-02

Agreement: Signed, on file, no restrictions

Subjects

Disc 1

| | |
|-------|--|
| 0:00 | Brief synopsis of connection with Macalester |
| 2:17 | Time at Macalester as a student |
| | Finding out about Macalester |
| 4:03 | First impression of the campus |
| 5:19 | Living on campus |
| 6:33 | Academic life at Macalester |
| | Reflections on G. Theodore Mitau |
| | Other prominent professors |
| 9:10 | Typical class description |
| 10:48 | Class requirements |
| 12:30 | Double majoring |
| 12:54 | Student life at Macalester |
| 17:13 | Political climate on campus |
| 18:33 | Significant issues that people rallied around |
| | Stillwater Conference, dropping of Bachelor of Science degree, significant changes to school |
| 23:20 | Curriculum change |
| 24:22 | Relationship between students and administration |

| | |
|---------|---|
| 24:38 | Composition of the student body |
| 27:44 | Reflections on Kofi Annan |
| 28:48 | Study abroad programs, SPAN and SWAP |
| 30:37 | Studying and using Spanish language |
| 32:24 | Physical layout of the campus Campus buildings, Little Theater, dorms Administration |
| 36:13 | Life After Macalester New York University Law School and involvement as an alumni |
| 37:25 | Getting involved in the Alumni Association and then the Board of Trustees Career Counseling Programs for Macalester students Late 1960s to early 1970s President Arthur Flemming EEO Program Vietnam War Protest Financial issues, disaffection of DeWitt Wallace |
| 41:43 | Alumni reactions to changes at Macalester in 1970s |
| 43:51 | General difficulties or struggles on college campuses during 1960s and 1970s EEO Program College debt Involvement with Alumni Board |
| 48:54 | Process of becoming a Trustee |
| 49:22 | Significant issues while on the Board of Trustees |
| 50:48 | Divestment and South African apartheid Sweatshop issue Other Board committees served on General overview of Presidencies John B. Davis DeWitt Wallace |
| 59:14 | John B. Davis, Presidency of Bob Gavin |
| 1:04:37 | Difficulties faced during Gavin presidency |
| 1:10:04 | Presidency of Mike McPherson Planning General fundraising |

Disc 2

| | |
|-------|---|
| 0:00 | Presidency of Brian Rosenberg |
| 3:18 | “Need-Blind” admissions |
| 5:36 | President Rosenberg’s reaction to and handling of “need-blind” |
| 12:08 | Other campus issues of concern, SLAC Change in student activism |
| 17:00 | Final reflections Stillwater Conference and changes in 1960s and 1970s Highlights of being a board member |

1985 Centennial Celebration of the college

Interview with David Ranheim

Sara Nelson, Interviewer

**January 11, 2007
Macalester College
DeWitt Wallace Library
Harmon Room**

SN: My name is Sara Nelson and I'm a student at Macalester College conducting interviews for the Macalester Oral History Project. Today is Thursday, January 11, 2007, and I am interviewing David Ranheim, alum and Trustee, in the Harmon Room in the Library. So if you could just start by stating your name and how old you were when you first came to Macalester, as a student and then as a Trustee.

DR: Okay. Alright. My name is David Ranheim. I came to Macalester as a student beginning in the fall of 1960...as a then eighteen year old kid out of a small town high school in southern Minnesota. You want me to just give you sort of a brief synopsis of—

SN: Oh sure. Yeah.

DR: —of my connection with Macalester to sort of frame it? Would that be helpful? Anyway, just to give you a brief, brief framework, I hadn't really heard much about Macalester College at the time that I came here. But I did come here as a student and I can tell you more about how I happened to come here and why. I then graduated in 1964, left the city to go to New York for law school, came back right out of New York University Law School in 1967—the fall of

1967—. Began getting involved fairly soon in alumni activities, just sort of on an ad hoc basis—I'd come to campus occasionally. Eventually was elected to the Alumni Board, in the late '60s, early '70s I would say. Became president of the Alumni Association in 1974. In that capacity served on the presidential search committee when we picked John Davis, who was our next president. Came on the Board in 1975 when he came in as President. Continued on the Board for thirty years until May of 2005. And so I have now been off for about a year and a half, but have continued to be involved on sort of an ad hoc basis, and certainly continue my interest in the college. So that's the broad overview [laughter] and within that we could talk for the next two days probably, about all kinds of topics and reflections and so forth. And I'll take your direction as to how much you want me to expand, and where you want me to begin and when you want me to stop and so forth.

[2:17]

SN: I think that we should start with your time as a student here. Some of these topics we'll probably touch on again in your time as an alumni, but if we could just start with your time as a student.... So how did you first find out about Macalester?

DR: Mainly because a high school friend of mine in Frost High School, which is a small town in southern Minnesota, had an older brother who was here at Macalester, another one of my high school friends had an uncle, who I believe was a Macalester alum and lived in St. Paul. And the two of them I think had talked from time to time about Macalester. I will say, though, that Macalester wasn't the one that I had thought about initially. I thought I was going to go to a school down in Iowa—I had looked at Drake University. I thought I wanted to be a business

major, be at a place that had a good business program. And I was for some reason thinking about Drake, which was not that far from my then hometown. But I, as I heard more about Macalester, I thought, well, it's worth looking. And so I came up and made a visit and decided to come here. Just an aside on that—back in those days, as you can maybe imagine, in 1960, I guess 1959 coming into 1960, it was...the college search process was far less sophisticated, intense [laughter], than it is these days. Oftentimes college decisions were almost arbitrary in some ways. So, that being said, I certainly gave some thought to Macalester...decided that this was a better choice for me, a small liberal arts college rather than a university type of setting. So I decided to come here, and arrived here late August/early September of 1960.

[4:03]

SN: What was your first impression of the campus?

DR: It was actually quite—in some ways it seemed quite small. There weren't all the buildings that we have these days. It was certainly far less...updated than it is these days. But it was very pleasant. I mean it was just a nice campus in the middle of the city. I was not a city kid. I was a small town kid, so it was comfortable to at least have that residential experience in the old Dayton Hall, which no longer exists. Of course that was taken down for the Campus Center. But it was a very pleasant campus. I enjoyed the setting—being in the city. And then just started getting involved in, mainly, studying, and paying attention to the first things first. I had always been a fairly dedicated student, and I kept that up especially in my freshman year. And we were called freshmen then, not first years—I assume now its first years?

SN: Yeah it is.

DR: But mainly that first year, at least my impression was, that I needed to work hard. That this was definitely the big leagues in terms of academic competition. And that I needed to pay attention to what I was doing in order to be successful.

SN: So you lived on campus?

DR: I lived, I lived in Dayton...

[5:19]

SN: Did you live on campus all four years?

DR: Yes, I did. At that time, by the way, Macalester tended to be a little bit more of a...a little more of a commuter college. Not a huge commuter college, but a lot more kids commuted—even lived in their homes around the Twin Cities and commuted to campus. Others would live off campus and just come to campus for classes. So there was a sense of more...some people lived here but a lot of people didn't. I lived here all four years, and just made the choice to do that. In fact I don't think I ever really thought about moving off campus and trying to have an apartment and all that that brought with it. So I lived in Dayton Hall, the old Dayton Hall, my freshman and sophomore years. And then—that was, by the way, single sex dorms, it was all men—and then I moved to Kirk Hall for my sophomore—excuse me—my junior and senior years, and thought that was really getting into the big leagues because you have the sections set

up and then suites and all of that. It was a much more comfortable living, and that, too, was an all male dorm at that point. And I really enjoyed it, I enjoyed the living arrangements, especially Kirk Hall my senior year because I had a nice corner suite overlooking the campus.

[6:33]

SN: Oh, that's nice. Can you talk a little bit about the academics when you were a student?

What did you major in?

DR: I could talk a lot about the academics, and I'll try to give you at least a synopsis because I know you don't want to spend the whole time on that. Academics were very strong. I was very impressed with the quality of the faculty and the teaching, the attention, the one-on-one. I was just thinking yesterday about some of the teachers that I had. First and foremost it was Ted Mitau—G. Theodore Mitau—who's legend, of course, on campus. And I've told the story many times in a much more extended form, but in a nutshell, Ted Mitau was responsible for my doing what I did in life—becoming a lawyer and being involved in public service and so forth. He was the person that got a hold of me in Poli Sci 101, and asked what I wanted to do. I told him I was going to major in business and be an accountant. And he said no, no, no, that you want to do more than that, you want to go to law school. As he put it in his rather stern voice, “No, you want to go to law school and be with the big boys.” So I was a small town kid and I thought, well, he must know better, maybe he saw something in me that was appropriate for that field. And so literally at that point, I did start getting more involved in his classes—political science classes—and ended up with a double major in political science and economics. And it was largely due to his influence on what I should do. But going beyond just all of his courses, which

were terrific, you know, constitutional law, political philosophy, state and local government, poli sci 101 as I said, all of these things. He was just a terrific mentor and professor. But others, too...academics were just terrific. In the English department, Pat Kane, now deceased, was terrific. I really enjoyed her a lot. Yahya Armajani was outstanding. Huntley Dupre, Max Adams—the chaplain at the time. There were just a host—Tom Hill, in the Philosophy department. Hugo Thompson. Some of these were giants of the, of their respective fields, and really just gave me a whole new perspective on life. Being, as I say, from a small town, and not really having the academic experience that maybe some other city kids might have had in high school, I was just very impressed, and in a very favorable way. So I enjoyed it, I worked hard, and just really had a terrific experience.

[9:10]

SN: What was a typical class like? Was it mostly lecture, or was there a lot of discussion?

DR: It depended on the professor. There was a lot of discussion, too, a lot of back and forth—especially in some of Mitau's classes, there was much more of a Socratic method. Others maybe tended to be more lecture. But again, interchange...all of these were the star professors that knew how to bring things out of people, and to get interchange going, and not just give you the rote lecture that you were supposed to memorize and give back on a test. So there was a lot of interaction. Another one, by the way, Roger Mosvick, in the Speech Department. When I came here I probably couldn't have stood up in front of my family and talked in a coherent way. And I took a speech class from him, and then eventually got involved in the debate program, and started debating. And then decided when I went to law school that I was going to be a trial

lawyer, and I ended up being a trial lawyer my whole law career. And I think at a point my mother still wondered how that ever happened, because she didn't envision me in that kind of a role. But yet again Macalester had a lot to do with that in terms of the training, and the encouragement from people like Mosvick and Mitau, and getting me headed down that path of primarily written skills—a lot of writing. I wrote papers all the time for—including for Pat Kane and others that I mentioned. And the writing skills and the oral skills to me are the foundation of what you really need. If you have those, then you can do lots of things, and learn lots of other things.

[10:48]

SN: I interviewed Professor Lanegran this morning—

DR: Oh yeah Dave Lanegran

SN: and I think he graduated around the same time you did—maybe a couple years before. He talked about how there were a lot of requirements, and required classes in that time period. Can you talk about that a little bit? Did you like that?

DR: Actually I thought that that was sort of part of the system, and back, maybe especially at that time, there was less student feeling that the students ought to have ultimate selection over everything. That this was just the way it was—these were the required courses, you had so many of this and so many of that—and we did it, and no one really complained. I thought it frankly gave a pretty good structure for the whole program. That's not to say that—I think that there

was a fair amount of flexibility, especially in the third and fourth years. But with my double major there were certain things I needed to get done, so I don't think I had a whole lot of opportunity to venture too far and wide because I needed to get my requirements done. But it didn't bother me. It just...in fact, I thought it was appropriate. If you wanted to head for a certain direction, presumably you needed to be prepared and fill in all of the blanks. I think Lanegran might have been a year ahead of me. Maybe the class of '63?

SN: Yeah, I think so.

DR: I think. But yeah. And of course Pat Kane was his sister. You know that as well. So that was another connection here: his sister was one of my professors. So...but no, it was a very, a much more, maybe more structured time, and I'm not sure exactly how much flexibility there is now. But any of you have some of the same kinds of demands if you want to get where you want to get in terms of the major, especially if you have a double major or another area of interest. You just sort of do it.

[12:30]

SN: Was that common at the time: double majoring?

DR: I don't think so. Not so much. Mine was almost accidental, because I retained my interest in business and economics, but I also wanted to get the political science, primarily with Mitau's encouragement. He said that you can do it, and so I did it. I really took his lead on some of those things.

[12:54]

SN: So what kinds of activities did you participate in as a student, aside from your studies?

DR: Right. Yeah, I studied a lot. I tended to—I was not able to study in the room. I couldn't study with music. I was one of those people that just didn't like a lot of stuff around. So I had a favorite carrel over in the library, which is now, of course, the Weyerhaeuser—the administration building. And...I just would go back in the stacks and be quiet and studied a lot of the time. To the point where probably some of my roommates and friends wondered, you know, why I wasn't willing to come out and have more fun. But I just—I was a very serious student, and that's the way I approached it. But I also felt that I had plenty of time for entertainment and fun—what I did beyond just studying. First year it was pretty much just studying and working. I also had a work study kind of thing. I worked in the cafeteria, back in the kitchen. Eventually, I think fairly early on, it might have been even my second year, I was asked to be one of the cashiers. I actually got to sit at the cash register and check people out with their old meal tickets and so forth. And that gave me some outlet to talk with kids and see others. Ms. G—Dorothy **Gritzinger** [sp?] I think was her name—was the old head of the foodservice, and somehow took a liking to me and thought that I could do this little more senior job. So I was happy, of course, to get out of the back room of the kitchen and work out at the front. First year I did, mostly as I say, studied, and worked, and had some fun, but I didn't really—I don't recall joining a lot of things that first year. And then little by little I got more active in the second and third and fourth years. And I think that the yearbooks that I had a chance to look through yesterday helped refresh my memory on some of that. I got involved

pretty early on in what was called the Pre-Law Forum. I was very active in that and enjoyed working in that extracurricular group. I was in something called the Jaycees, which I'd almost forgotten about—and was for sort of business and economics type majors. And spent some time with that. I was in Toast Masters, which met periodically. It was basically learning how to—again, public speaking, standing up in front of your friends after dinner, being a toast master, being a host, being an MC. So I was involved in that, and that also helped a lot of my public speaking skills. I was involved in—believe it or not, I didn't even remember this until I looked at the yearbooks yesterday—but I belonged to the Young Republican Club. Which is so unlike me, in every year since, almost. I'm almost...very surprised that I was actually in the Young Republicans, but I came from a small town Republican family, a very conservative family, and I may have just thought, I guess, well, I'm supposed to be a Republican. It turns out, I think, by the time I left Macalester I was not a Republican, and never have been since, so that changed quite a bit. I don't remember being terribly active in that. There were things like United Nations Week, and International Week...Political Emphasis Week. I didn't get involved, I don't think, in leadership roles in all of those things, but I participated in a lot of that kind of thing. On the music side—and music's always been a big part of my life, still is up to the present—I got involved in first band, with my baritone horn. Macalester's band back in the sixties, early sixties was not [laughter], was not very good. And I got tired of it all after a couple years and decided I would spend my time elsewhere. But I've always liked to sing, and so all four years I sang in the—there was both the Big Choir then, Choral Union I think it might have been called. I think that's what the book identified. And also the Little Choir, which was a smaller group that did a different kind of repertoire. So I enjoyed the singing and did a lot of wonderful concerts, including some over at the old Northrop Auditorium with the Minnesota Orchestra and things

like that. So I had a lot of other outlets as well as just the academics. It was a fairly eye-awakening experience, just doing all of these things and doing it at a level that was pretty high.

[17:13]

SN: What was the political climate on campus like?

DR: It was...I'm trying to recall. I don't have the sense that I viewed it as particularly liberal, or left, or right. It was just, it was just...it supported a lot of different views. There were always different kinds of speakers coming in: convocation speakers, chapel speakers, and so forth. Both of which were required, by the way, then—both convocation and chapel were required. I served as an usher and bean counter at some of those things, too. But again it seemed a fairly—I wouldn't have defined it as really...a particular political emphasis at that time. It seemed fairly open to all kinds of different ideas and thoughts. As it has continued over the years, I think in spite of the fact that some think of Macalester as more left or more liberal—professors and students and so forth—I think Macalester has always done a good job of keeping an open dialogue about all of these things. Even at times when there might have been more radical elements on either side. But in general it was a pretty—I didn't view it as a hotbed of either liberalism or conservatism.

[18:33]

SN: Were there any kind of significant issues that people rallied around?

DR: Frankly I don't remember any major things, or protests or...huge things. I mean, just a couple of key events that happened during that time. One was the Kennedy assassination, which was the fall of my senior year. And I remember it very well, as everybody does that remembers that event that was alive at the time. Russell Kirk, who was a very distinguished sort of national commentator—philosopher, I believe? Political philosopher?—was on campus to speak at Convocation, and had spoken. And I was sort of helping to host him, including at the luncheon afterwards in the old Cochran Union. And it was during that time that someone came in and announced that the President had been shot. So that was a major forming event, of course, during my last year. My first year here, in the fall of 1960, was the Nixon/Kennedy election, and the first debates. And so that was certainly a big event going on—now those were more national events, not local issues. But they certainly helped shape a lot of things that were going on during those times. I might comment also, just in thinking about sort of what the college is and what it was then, and how it's evolved over the forty-seven years since, forty-six years since. At that time, there were Bachelor of Science programs, in nursing...and some other fields. There was also an education college, basically, an Education Department. So I think you could get a Bachelor of Science in education or something like that. I think it was the Miss Wood's School [Stella Louise Wood]. It was an old building over near what's now the Alumni House—used to be the President's house. So there were a lot of sort of almost more vocational kinds of degrees. But early on in my time here, and it might have been actually in about 1960—I wonder if it was even the spring of '60 before I came or after I came—but right around that time, the then president Harvey Rice convened what was called I think the Stillwater Conference. And out of that came a decision to emphasize the liberal arts—do well what we do best. Convert only to a Bachelor of Arts degree...over the next like four or five years. I noticed when I graduated there

were still Bachelor of Science degrees being given, but that might have been about the last class that had that opportunity. The decision was that we should be a strong liberal arts college, a four year bachelor's baccalaureate degree, and that was it. And that really has shaped the life of the college—the academic life of the college—ever since. So that was really a sort of a watershed moment in Macalester's history, right at the start of my time here. And it has served us I think very well ever since. So those were some of the things that were happening in terms of emphasis, and that I would say is one of the most major significant events, because it really marked who Macalester would be and who it would continue to be. And as of this time, even now, I think we always envision ourselves as being that. We're not going to branch off and have a law school or a business school or Bachelor of Science programs in vocational areas and so forth. So it really was something that helped set the mission. And that was also a conference, or about that time, where decisions were made about faculty hiring, which happened in really over the next decade, during my time here and after. The curriculum...strengthening the curriculum, looking to make Macalester a much more national place. When I came, by the way, it was much more viewed as a regional—a very good—regional liberal arts college, but certainly not on the national scene. We weren't comparing ourselves with the people...with the schools with which we compare ourselves today. It was just a whole different feeling about what Macalester was. But then that conference, and Harvey Rice, and the Board and faculty at that time were making decisions that would chart the course that we're still on. So it was a very, very important time. I didn't know all of that so much at the time—I mean I sort of had some sense of what was going on. But as an eighteen year old, nineteen year old student I didn't have quite the appreciation that I now have in retrospect, knowing the history of the college.

[23:20]

SN: Was that change something that was widely discussed among students on campus?

DR: I don't remember it being a subject that people said, oh my goodness how can you get rid of this? There probably would have been, or at least you would seem to think there would have been discussion about that. That some people said, well, why can't we have these special programs, and why can't we have more vocational oriented things, some of us will want that. That may have happened, it probably did happen, but I don't have any recollection that that was a big issue on campus. I don't remember students or faculty standing up and saying oh my goodness this is—if anything I think there was a tendency towards the opposite. That this is good, that we're really defining ourselves, defining our mission, and let's stick with what we can do best, rather than trying to be everything to everybody, it was real—interesting. Today if that kind of a decision were made, I suspect [laughter] there could be a lot of...there'd just be more general activism I think on campus.

[24:22]

SN: So can you talk a little bit about the relationship between the students and the administration. Was there animosity, understanding?

DR: Um, it was a different time. I think the best way to sum it up is to say that—Harvey Rice and his wife Dorothy Rice, were the quintessential first couple. The president...the first couple of the distinguished white hair, distinguished bearing, and so forth. And the thought of my just emailing—of course you couldn't email—it was just going in and expecting to talk to the

president, or even writing him a letter, or calling him Harvey—that wouldn't have entered my mind. And I don't think it entered most students minds. It was a different time in terms of the way you viewed authority, especially the president of the college. There was much less activism I think in terms of wanting to be in the face of the administration about issues. All of that changed later, especially in the latter half of the sixties. But during my time here, I think it was a much more—I don't know, its hard to describe it—to those of you that didn't live through it. But it was a much more, sort of a...structured isn't quite the right word, but it was just a much more accepted way that, this is the way things were, the administration had their job, the faculty had their job, the student's job was to be here and learn and get involved in other activities. But there wasn't a sense that there should be some ongoing interchange, dialogue, with the administration, and raising issues...attacks, provoking things and so forth. It just—it just didn't seem that was the atmosphere at the time. And it really, I think that's generally true of the way college campuses were in the first half of the sixties. Not so much later, but during that time it was—that was pretty much the way it was. The administration did its job and we assumed that they knew what they were doing, and we were there to do other things [laughter]. That's the way we approached it.

[24:38]

SN: So what was the student body like? Was it mostly white, male students?

DR: Well, not just white male, in fact there were a lot of women too. Although frankly there was probably more of an even balance back in those days then there is now. Societally, these days there's a much more probably 60:40 female. Then, it probably tended to be more evenly

split. More...yes—white. But also, there was some diversity—certainly not as much as there became later after the EEO [Expanded Educational Opportunity] program and the Flemming era and so forth. But there was some diversity, multicultural domestic diversity. I remember actually more international diversity—the then WPI, the World Press Institute, actually was much more active on campus. They lived on campus, lived in the dorms and so forth. And had much more interaction—they were here for full academic years rather than just a few months. And so there was that international component. You got Kofi Annan, who was here as a senior my freshman year.

[27:44]

SN: Did you know him?

DR: I didn't know him. I suppose there are a lot of people that would claim to know him now in retrospect, but I don't recall getting to know him at the time. I was a lowly freshman, too busy at the library to worry about that. But of course then, we obviously met him much later when he came on the Board of Trustees, and we actually got to know him and appreciated that. Looking at some of his pictures too in my freshman yearbook yesterday was interesting just to see him as the soccer player...active in a lot of different clubs and things. But who knew then that he was going to be the Secretary General someday of the United Nations. But there was that sense of the strong international component, which was of course way before its time. Now everybody wants to have that, and talks about the international program on their campuses. But Macalester really was a very early on arrival at that particular table, starting with [President] Charlie Turck going back into the late forties and through the fifties, so...

[28:48]

SN: Were you involved in study abroad or travel abroad while you were a student?

DR: I didn't actually study abroad during any of the various things like SPAN [Student Project for Amity among Nations] and things like that. But, I think it was my senior year they started what was called SWAP—Student Work Abroad Project or Program—under the auspices of the Reader's Digest and Hilton Hotels. So it was the Wallace—basically through Reader's Digest and Hilton Hotels. And that was...the idea of that was, during the summer time, to place Macalester students in Hilton Hotels around the world. And to have them work in hotels and gain that international perspective. So I did that...applied for that, and was accepted to the program and spent the summer after I graduated actually in Madrid, working at the Castellana Hilton in Madrid. And...as I was looking through some of my memorabilia yesterday, I found my diary and letters that I sent home from that summer in Madrid. I just skimmed through some of that, and it really brought back a lot memories of some of the people that I worked with and the...just the benefits of that kind of program. But that was...I had friends who were scattered all over the world on that program. It was really my first international experience—I think that was my first. Unlike today, where kids, our kids, many kids, are flying all over the world when they're toddlers. That was my first international trip. To fly from New York to London on BOAC [British Overseas Airways Corporation] Airlines, and all of that, and then onto Madrid—it was quite an experience. And that was eye-opening also, just to be a part of something like that.

[30:37]

SN: Had you studied Spanish while you were here?

DR: I did. I actually had studied Spanish, and so that was perfect. I had had no language experience up until Macalester, but I studied with Señor Dasset—Robert Dasset. Also now deceased, but a wonderful, wonderful man—great teacher. I studied two years of Spanish. I was reasonably conversant. Although I quickly found when I got with the fast speaking Spanish in Madrid in the hotel workers area, that a lot went right past me. But at least I had some kind of a working knowledge of the language, and was able to communicate with some of the folks there. And then I actually was able to use that also the following summer, just jumping ahead for the moment. After my first year at New York University Law School, I was on an exchange program in Chile, with the University Concepción in Chile. And spent the summer down there and traveled all over South America. It was a chance to use my Spanish there as well. The problem in Spain was that it was the Castilian Spanish, and so I had to learn to speak with the lisp that accompanies the Castilian Spanish. So that too was all part of my growing up, if you will, internationally.

SN: Are you still using Spanish?

DR: Very little, very little [laughter]. I've forgotten a lot of vocabulary in the last forty-five years, forty years... But it's...I can still carry on a very sort of basic conversation if necessary, but that's about it. We actually had a Spanish exchange student daughter several years ago, and I kept wanting her to speak Spanish so that I could sort of refresh my memory. But she didn't

want to do that, she wanted to speak English of course, because she was here and needed to learn English. So I didn't have a chance to use it much with her either. It's still there a little bit, back in the dark recesses.

[32:24]

SN: Is there anything else you want to talk about during your student experience here?

DR: Um...oh, I think we've covered a lot. One thing I haven't talked about, and I was reminded yesterday looking back through things, was the physical campus. Some of the buildings, and so forth. As you probably know from some of the history, there was a huge building program sort of during the sixties, most of which came into fruition after I had left. For example the whole Olin...hall of science, the whole fine arts, Janet Wallace Fine Arts Center, all of that was in the works when I was here, but it didn't come online until after I left. So in terms of buildings, a lot of the sciences were in what's now Carnegie Hall, which was then Carnegie Science Hall and had most of the science activity there. I remember going to a geology class there, which was my required science course, and the only one I took I think [laughter] as a social science major. But where the fine arts center sits now was something called the Little Theater, which was like barracks. In fact it was, it was old World War II type barracks of some sort. But a lot of classrooms in there, including what was called the Little Theater, where a lot of classes were held—auditorium type seating. That's where some theater was done, where plays were given, but also where Political Science 101 was held. I still remember Ted Mitau marching up and down the aisle, with his lectures and so forth. So it was just a whole different physical layout over there. Um...a lot of the stadium stuff, that was not there. What's now Shaw Field is where

the football field was. The bleachers were sort of in front of where the gymnasium is. So it was quite a different physical layout. The dorms I mentioned earlier, they were all single sex dorms at that point. The men actually on this side of Grand, and all the women were across on the other side. Turck and Wallace and Bigelow were all the women's dorms. Dupre didn't exist, and I don't think...Doty didn't exist then. And then Kirk and Dayton were the two men's dorms on this side of Grand. So they figured that Grand Avenue would help separate us as well. But there were still times when the men would venture over of course, with the dating scene and all of that. And the fish bowl, what was called fish bowl, the lobby of Turk Hall, in moments before the required hours—there were hours, the women had to be in certain hours—the men didn't. The theory was that if the women were in then the men probably would be in too. So some of those things again were just harking back to a different, a different social era completely. Today students wouldn't be able to live with that kind of a situation I don't think. But I think that in terms of the... Oh the administration, by the way to round out on that. Harvey Rice of course was the president. Fred Kramer was the Dean of Students and I had a lot of interaction with him on my various club activities and student activities. And then the Academic Dean or actually Provost, I think it was probably my last couple of years here, was Lou Garvin. Lucius Garvin. Who was really, in many ways the architect for a lot of the faculty hiring that went on in that mid-sixties time frame. A lot of the people that continued here for the next thirty, forty years, including maybe some people that are still here that I don't know about. So anyway, those are just some other sort of random thoughts about the time, and the people, and what was going on. But it was a very interesting time, that sort of helped set the stage for a lot of things that were to come at Macalester.

[36:13]

SN: Now I guess we can move on to the after Macalester stage.

DR: Right, yeah, after Macalester

SN: So after you graduated you went to law school, in New York. Did you stay involved with Macalester affairs while you were there?

DR: I did. Out there, because there were clans, and still are of course these clans all over the country. There was a...Beverly O'Reilly I think was the name of the woman—a long time Macalester friend and fan and alum, and now deceased also. She was sort of heading up the New York clan, so periodically there would be meetings out there of the Macalester clan. And I remember going to some of those. But again, I wasn't involved in any intense or ongoing way because I wasn't back here. And I was frankly extremely busy with law school [laughter] and other priorities at that point. So I stayed in touch enough to know what was going on and once in awhile somebody from Macalester would be out, and I would sort of try and keep up a little bit with what was going on. But that period from '64 to '67, when I lived in New York was fairly, was probably my least involved time at Macalester over the last forty-five years.

[37:25]

SN: How did you become involved with the Alumni? Is it the Alumni Board or the Alumni Association?

DR: Well initially the Association. And I don't recall the exact timing. But I came back from law school in the summer of '67 and joined my law firm at that point—the Dorsey and Whitney Firm in Minneapolis, where I've continued my whole career. And I, fairly early on—maybe not the first year or two that I was at Dorsey—but fairly early on, I started just getting involved and expressing an interest in becoming involved in alumni activities. And started...once you express an interest, as you know, people will take you up on it because they're always looking for people that are willing to help out in one way or another. I got involved doing some career counseling programs I think at Macalester. And I don't remember the details of that, except that it was an effort to match students with professionals, and be able to mentor and just come and talk with them and so forth. So I was involved in organizing that in maybe, in the late sixties, early seventies, something like that, I don't recall exactly. But little by little I just sort of...Sandy Hill was a good friend of mine, and will always...been a long time good friend of mine. And he was very involved of course at the time with alumni activities and the development activities. And I think I just expressed interest to him, and then he would see that I'd get invited. So it just was a variety of ad hoc kinds of things from that period of about '68, maybe '69, leading up into the early seventies. Times which were rather turbulent by the way, I don't know if you want me to comment now while we're on that time frame, but it was a very... I wasn't as close to it then because I wasn't a Trustee then so I wasn't right in the thick of it. But there was just a lot of foment and difficulty. [President]Arthur Flemming was terrific in sort of opening our eyes to the whole EEO program, Equal [Expanded] Educational Opportunity program, and bringing in multicultural students. And his heart was in the right place, and he did a terrific job with sort of expanding all of that. But the fiscal side of it was not handled as well. The result being that the whole Wallace interest became disaffected, so that created sort of a cascade of financial issues

and other issues. And that really continued...of course, at the same time Vietnam was going on and the protests over that. So there were sit-ins in the president's office, and all kinds of things surrounding this whole very turbulent time. And that really is when frankly student activism also really picked up on campus. I think the combination of things involving the EEO program and Vietnam and the protests over the war. All of that was very, very...troublesome, and Macalester was not unique in terms of what was going on—on campuses across the country. But I remember sort of being a part of that in a way, but not nearly in the way that once I became a trustee I would have been involved. Then of course Flemming left, and Jim Robinson came in as the President. And was...stuck with some of the same issues—the financial issues created by the disaffection of the Wallace's and the Reader's Digest. Um, the overall problem of dealing financially with the EEO program. A lot of things that were just very very difficult. So both of those tenures as presidents—both Flemming and Robinson—were very difficult. The Rice era had really been quite comfortable and calm. Transitioning from Charles Turck to the new era in the late sixties and seventies. The Rice era was really fairly stable and no huge controversies or problems. But then in the latter half of the sixties—and Rice left in '68—then things really picked up in terms of just the foment and difficulties. So that was not...again, I wasn't that close to it, except that I knew things were not going well. So for that eight year period it really was a very difficult time.

[41:43]

SN: How do you think Alumni reacted to those changes and difficulties?

DR: Uh...not well, I think. Because at that point, the alumni were mostly, of course, twenties, thirties, forties, fifties alumni, and tended to probably be more conservative. And...so they couldn't understand I think, either issue really—the whole multicultural issue, and the issues that were brought to campus by trying to be more diverse and having more diversity in that area. That was not something maybe that was as appreciated. And then secondly the whole war protests and those kinds of things. Whenever you talk about these things you're bound to over generalize. Because I mean there are a lot of Macalester alums who were very, very understanding of all of those issues. And in fact sympathetic to some of them. So I don't want to paint with too broad a brush. But in general, I think those times painted a picture of Macalester that lived for a long, long time—with especially some of the older alumni—and frankly, created issues for them about that liberal place, that place that's way off on the left, and the protests and the sit-ins, and all of that. And that's the image that a lot of people have of Macalester, and frankly it continued for a long, long time. Because the reality lags...rather the perception lags the reality substantially, especially when it's a negative perception. So that...we were burdened with that for a long time. But we've finally gotten out from under that, but it was not done easily or quickly. It was just a very, very tough time and then combining that with the financial problems and having to reduce staff and faculty and all of those kinds of things created some real...some real morale issues on campus. So you had this constant, just difficulty and wondering, is the college going to survive. What's going to happen to it, what are we going to be? It was a very, very...very, very tough time.

[43:51]

SN: I'm not really sure the degree to which you can answer this question, but are those troubles things that were unique to Macalester, or were a lot of colleges facing those difficulties during the early seventies and sixties?

DR: Ah, the whole war protest part and that side of it was not unique to Macalester. And a lot of schools were going through that, and some of them maybe weathered it a little better than Macalester just because of their alumni base, or who they were as an institution. Um...what I think was unique to Macalester though, was the EEO program—being positive on the one hand, but not being funded properly. And not being I think, negotiated as well as it could have been with the Wallace's, which then caused them to basically take away their support, because they originally had funded that. But I think they were not happy with the way it was being run and administered and so forth. And as a result when they pulled their funding, which caused as I said sort of a cascade of other financial issues—that was unique to Macalester. There may have been other schools around the county that had maybe similar kinds of things that were happening—major donors withdrawing their support because of whatever, whether it was the war or something else. But at least this part of it, this piece of it I think was unique to Macalester. And again, others could speak more directly to that being on the inside. I wasn't as much on the inside at that time even though I was involved in alumni activities. But that was my impression at least of what was...what was going on. That this was fairly unique to Macalester's situation, to the point that we were millions of dollars in debt to the old First National Bank of St. Paul in the early to mid-seventies. And that was the issue that the college had to deal with, that the board had to deal with. And it was about at that point that I came into the picture in a more active way at the board level. I did...I went on the Alumni Board maybe in the late sixties, early

seventies sometime and served whatever, a term or two. And then as I said became president of the Alumni Association in '74-'75. And then that's when I was...at the end of that year was elected as an alumni Trustee. There are two categories of trustees as you probably know—there are alumni trustees and regular trustees.

[46:18]

SN: Can you talk a little bit about the process of how one becomes a trustee?

DR: Ok.

SN: Or maybe your experience, how you became a trustee?

DR: Well...there are two different processes. The alumni trustees are nominated by, and elected by the Alumni Association. So those that were active in alumni affairs, as I was, and was on the Alumni Board and then President, that was kind of a natural stepping stone. If people felt that you had done a good job in those areas, that you would then be considered for nomination as an alumni trustee. There are two alumni trustees in each of three Board of Trustee classes. So I was elected then as an alumni trustee, and that's pretty much how alumni trustees I think continue to be elected. They must...they have to be elected by the Alumni Association but they have to be elected by the Board then, just like any other board member. They have to be elected onto the board by the board. And then other trustees... So that was the route I followed, and there are a lot of alums on the board. I don't know exactly what the makeup is now, but there are very few non-alums on the Board of Trustees at the present time. That wasn't always so. At one

time, I think there tended to be more non-alum trustees. Non-alum trustees tended to get involved just through...by expressing interest, or because their families had long association with Macalester. Like Ted Weyerhaeuser for example, of the Weyerhaeuser family. Though he was not an alum. Members of the Twin Cities business community that were important to have involved at Macalester...would be solicited and cultivated by the board, the nominating committee, the governance committee of the board. Um...alums who were not first elected as alumni trustees, nevertheless might certainly be on the radar screen of the administration. People that might be good candidates to come on the board. So there are a variety of ways. But you're always looking for good, potential board members in any institution. Whether it's non-profit or for profit. But that's the way I came on the board, was through the alumni route. And then after two terms as an alumni trustee, then was elected—and they're three year terms by the way. Then I was elected as a regular trustee and continued on.

[48:54]

SN: And you served as Chair of the Board of Trustees in the eighties, I think?

DR: Right, '85 to '89. So, I was...I had been on for about ten years. I had chaired the search committee when we picked Bob Gavin as president. So he came in, in '84. And then Ted Weyerhaeuser was still chair of the board at that time—of the board—and then I became chair in '85 and continued through '89 as chair of the board.

[49:22]

SN: Ok, so what were some of the significant things that you did during your time on the Board of Trustees?

DR: Oh boy.

SN: I'm sure there are a lot.

DR: Yeah, and again...you might look for more, even more detail in some of the Jeanne Kilde interview stuff if that's somewhere. You might also, if you haven't had a chance—when I retired, when I stepped down from the board in May of '05, Mark Vander Ploeg, the then Chair of the Board, made a very nice statement about my service to the college, and captured several of the points in there and those remarks I know are printed, because I have copies.

SN: Oh, ok.

DR: Um...Bob Gavin and Mike McPherson also both wrote letters at that time and that recounted some of things that we were involved in. And then I actually also made a statement to the Board of Trustees—which they actually transcribed and printed. And so you might just, as a part of this project, I would suggest you get your hands on those and take a look at it because it could fill in some of the blanks. It may repeat some of the things I've said here, because it's some of the same things obviously come out. But that might give you a good idea, too, of some of the things that went on. Again, in sort of a brief overview, why don't I try to tell you some of the things that I did during all of that time.

SN: Sure.

[50:48]

DR: My first few years on the board, mid seventies to maybe '77-'78, I was learning. I was watching. I was a fairly young board member. I came on the board when I was thirty-three years old. I was a young lawyer, um...but I wanted to be involved and I thought I had something to offer. But still, I viewed boards as kind of these older, more distinguished folks, that had a lot more to say, and a lot better wisdom than I did. So I was there to learn initially and I didn't want to be too forward. But then fairly early on, I said there are things that I can be helpful with, and probably one of the first major things I recall stepping up and volunteering for was the whole South Africa issue, and—

SN: Apartheid?

DR: Divestment and the whole Apartheid issue—a huge outcry of course over the whole country and that was the big campus issue at the time. Divestment from the companies holding—doing business in South Africa. And so that was very much on everybody's mind, and I said that...maybe our social responsibility—I don't recall if we actually had, I think we did have something called a proxy committee to vote the college's proxies. And maybe that evolved into a social responsibility committee. But even if it wasn't a separate sort of free-standing committee, there was a definite need to deal with that South Africa issue. So I basically volunteered to chair a group or a task force or a committee to look at that whole issue and come

up with a policy—which we did. And that I presented to the board after all of our committee work and it was adopted and is still on the books today I think in one way or another. As well as a general investment policy that we adopted back then. So that was my first sort of getting, really getting my teeth into something in a major substantive way—doing something that I felt I could be helpful with, and going beyond just attending meetings and hearing reports. Um...and then, I continued to be involved in a lot of committees. I mean over my whole time I chaired just about all of the board committees at one time or another, except probably finance and audit. Although I think I served on those at one time, too. I chaired the development committee on my latter years on the board. I chaired the academic affairs committee. I don't think I was ever on the admissions committee, and probably not the student affairs committee. I chaired the buildings and grounds committee, and served on it for many years. Social responsibility committee. I chaired a sub-committee of that dealing with the sweatshop issue a few years ago—

SN: I read about that.

DR: —which you're familiar with.

DR: A lot of—again it was one of those, almost one of those South Africa type issues. Not quite that big or dramatic, but still a very significant issue, as you know on college campuses. So those were some of committee kinds of—oh the presidential review committee. As chair of the board, and after and being involved in a lot of the search committees, I was involved in that. Served on the governance nominating committee. Was on the last four presidential search

committees. I was on the one I mentioned when we picked John Davis. I chaired the one for Bob Gavin. I was on the one when we picked Mike McPherson, and I chaired the most recent one when we picked Brian Rosenberg. So that's given me a wonderful perspective, too, on the presidency, if you will, and the search process, and the people that we selected as president and so forth. And I can talk all day about those four different administrations, and the strengths of each, and how each was appropriate for its time, and so forth. So it was—that too I felt was a very—I wanted to be involved. In fact I think I volunteered to Ted Weyerhaeuser when he was chair of the board, in the early to mid-eighties when we were starting a search—when John Davis had announced that he was stepping down at the end of the '83-'84 academic year. I said that I would like to be involved in the search, and I thought I could provide some leadership. So Ted asked me to chair that committee. And then once Bob came, then I was kind of a natural to succeed Ted as chair of the board, and enjoyed that for four years working with Bob. It was a terrific relationship, and we made tremendous strides during the Gavin administration. Um—if you'd like I can just maybe back up and talk a little bit about each administration.

SN: Oh yeah, that'll be good. So, I guess we should talk about presidents now.

DR: Right. Yeah, that might be a way to sort of get a lot of information out, because in the context of each of them I tend to think of that in sort of those presidencies and those tenures. Going back to when John Davis came in, and I alluded to the difficulties in the previous eight years. What we needed at that point was someone who could basically heal the institution, not just fiscally, but from a morale standpoint. From so many standpoints. So we needed someone that knew how to run an institution, could restore faith in itself, rebuild confidence in the

institution. To be able to relate to the faculty issues, but not necessarily...didn't have to be an academic superstar in order to be sort of one of the club at that point. And basically to restore order. And John Davis was the ideal person to do that. John would be the first to tell you that he would not at that point—being Superintendent of the Minneapolis Public Schools—have been considered a member of the high academy from an academic standpoint. But he was a terrific administrator, an educational administrator, a strong leader, very bright, very intellectual. But hadn't been a part of that academy, didn't come on the normal track for being a college president. But he was perfect for that time, because he had credibility...he was terrific from a personality standpoint. And restoring the relationships, and human relationships among the faculty, with the faculty, administration and faculty together, with trustees, and very importantly with the Wallace family—Dewitt and Lila Wallace. That was just—that's the relationship that needed to be restored, and one of the first things John did was go to New York and meet with them—restored that relationship. It resulted in something called I guess the Wallace agreements, for lack of a better term, which essentially allowed the college to get back on its financial footing. To use endowed, restricted endowment to pay off the multi-million dollar debt to the First National Bank of St. Paul. To get us restored to a new starting point. And then the college agreed and has met that agreement every year since, to have a balanced budget, and not run deficit budgets, as it had been doing. So John gained the confidence of the Wallaces, of the faculty, of all of the constituencies of the campus, and of the alumni. And sort of said there is order that's now coming to the place again. The turbulent times are passing, and let's get on with the mission at hand. So there are a lot of things in place from the Rice era, as I said earlier, and continuing through the Flemming and Robinson eras in terms of quality of faculty, and quality of students, and increasing numbers of students from other geographic areas. So a lot of

the building blocks were in place. And we needed somebody like John to be able to restore, as I say, basic fiscal responsibility and morale. So his nine year tenure here was just terrific. I mean he did that. The college was back on its feet, and clearly was starting to realize some of the dream of people back in the early sixties—about let's get more on the national radar screen here, let's be a stronger, national liberal arts college. We were not there yet, but at least during that nine years John had provided a lot of leadership to help us get there.

SN: When was he president?

DR: '75 to '84.

SN: I'm just trying to get my dates straight in my head.

[59:14]

DR: Right, 1975, so as a mentioned I came on the board when he came in as president. And so I worked with him his entire nine years. He then, early in the summer I believe of '83, announced that he would be stepping down at the end of the following academic year. So he gave us a year's notice to deal with a search for a new president. And that's when as I mentioned earlier Ted Weyerhaeuser asked me to chair that search committee. [Pause] At that point what the board was looking at...for in a president, was probably somebody who was in the academy, if you will, that came from a similar kind of institution—liberal arts college setting—whose experience and heart and mind were attuned to the national liberal arts college scene. And would have the credibility with the faculty to make tough decisions. Would have the national

credibility to draw on contacts. In other words to just build and elevate the profile of Macalester—to put us much more on the national scene. And we found that person in Bob Gavin. He had been at Haverford basically his entire academic career for eighteen years—chaired the Chemistry department, became Provost, and was Provost for about five years. And then in fact served as acting president for one year when the president Robert Stevens was on sabbatical. So he had been through the process of preparation, if you will—a fairly typical and more normal track for a college president. And he got very strong references and recommendations, including from Robert Stevens, the then Haverford president. And so we selected Bob as a board, and basically the mission, the... instruction from the board was that we want to elevate this institution so it is much more competitive on the national level, with the likes of the colleges with whom we now compare ourselves today—which are the top, clearly the top tier liberal arts colleges in the country. Because Macalester wasn't there at that time. And...Bob did that. When he left twelve years later, we were clearly in a different league, operating at a different competitive level. The students with whom we had overlapped...the schools with whom we had overlapped for students—that were coming or not coming—were now many of those national, liberal arts institutions. As opposed to, say, the more regional kinds of institutions with whom we had been competing with years before. And Bob made a lot of tough decisions,...and that always creates difficulties...issues...people's feelings hurt about one thing or another. And that's always going to happen when you have a person that you, in effect, have brought in to be a change agent—to make things happen and move things along. So whether it's a school, whether it's a church, whether it's an orchestra, whatever it might be, when a person comes in—sort of in that in-between time of trying to get you to a level to which you aspire but which you haven't reached yet—it creates issues. And it did...with faculty and with others. But

again, just trying to step back and put the big picture on it. And I from time to time remind faculty of that—especially some of the faculty that were maybe not as pleased with the way things were handled during some of those years—especially the later years of the Gavin term. That...I think any fair-minded person would have to agree that when Bob left in 1994—excuse me 1996—after his twelve years here as president, this was a far better institution than when he came. And ultimately, whenever you look back, that's the test. Recognizing there are going to be some bumps and some difficulties and some dislocations along the way. But...as we said earlier, I chaired the board for four of the years that he was here. Continued to be a strong—worked with him in a very strong way over the many years after I went off as chair. And he really...he did a terrific service to the college. I daresay without that twelve year period of his leadership on some of these tough issues that we would not be what we are today. And that in some senses is spoken perhaps as self interest because I first chaired his search committee, I chaired the board with him for four years, and continued to be a good friend and supporter of his. But even those maybe in a little bit more objective position, I think would have to agree, that he had a major impact on what this college is and has become.

[1:04:37]

SN: So what were some of the difficulties that he faced during his tenure?

DR: Everything from a long-range planning process that focused on things like, do we want to be a preeminent, national liberal arts college, when some people might have been satisfied with being a strong regional liberal arts college. And so it in effect, having to step out and say we expect to, and want to compete in this higher league. There are many people that are

comfortable the way they are—and may not find it necessary, or comfortable, or desirable to compete in that league. So there were discussions surrounding the whole question of, do we want to use the word preeminent? Do we want to be involved in that national scene of comparing ourselves with a different level of institution? So there was a lot of push back on that kind of thing—about isn't it ok to be the way we are? Alumni wondering about, are we elitist? Are we being too aggressive? Are we being too ambitious? Why do we have to play in this big league? Why can't we be just the nice, comfortable, mid-level, regional institution? So there's a whole—I think a group of alumni that might have been just comfortable the way they were. Faculty who had been here for years maybe, and were comfortable doing what they were doing and maybe didn't want to be challenged to try to get to that next level. Tenure decisions that were made that were negative, which Bob was involved in as president. People developed support for tenure track—excuse me—tenure candidates and if not granted tenure, that creates a lot of angst amongst their colleagues, amongst students who were big fans of a particular faculty member. Hiring decisions—who are you going to hire to come into the department? All of these kinds of things were—if you're engaged in an overall effort to raise the academic excellence of the institution, are going to cause some people to be disaffected and unhappy. Especially if they are personally on the receiving end of a negative decision. So those are the kinds of things that were at work. Bob had a very direct style. He didn't beat around the bush. He didn't mince words. I think sometimes that would—people like to feel maybe a little more cozy and comfortable and so forth. And...that direct style maybe didn't sit as well with some. But I would have to say that overall there were a lot of people that were supporting what he did as well. And I think frankly what he did also during his time was to put back on the faculty, where it should be, a lot of the responsibility for making tough decisions. That was another issue. If

some of these decisions would be coming up through the faculty committees or tenure committees, or whatever. Sometimes it was easy for the faculty to not make the tough decision and just pass it up to the provost and the president. And then if they make tough, negative decisions, then they're viewed as the bad guys. And they were. Provost—and there was a lot of turnover on provosts and difficulties during some of that time. But part of the pushback—and I think again I credit Bob for a lot of that—for where we are today. Today there's a much stronger sense among the faculty that it is their responsibility to make some of these tough academic decisions. Whether it's about hiring, tenure decisions, curriculum decisions, all of these things ultimately need to be their—they need to take ownership. And I think in doing that over the last many years, in a much more proactive, aggressive way, and a lot of that I think again is attributable to the groundwork that Gavin laid in forcing that to happen—saying you can't just keep passing the buck up and making us be the bad guys...you have to take ownership of that process. So I think that those were some of the things that were going on sort of in a nutshell over that time. And again this is the kind of thing you could talk about forever because a lot happens in twelve years. But the board was always very strongly supportive of what Bob was doing, and felt that he was headed in absolutely the right direction. And as I say when he left he had done the job we asked him to do. So that was the Gavin era, if you will. And my wife and I still see Bob and Charlotte quite frequently these days, and enjoy talking about all kinds of things. Bob then announced, I think probably again in the summer of '95 that he would be leaving at the end of that coming academic year. So at the end of that summer of '96—spring of '96. And so again we started the search process. Janet Nelson, then a board member and an alum, chaired that search committee. And I was one of the trustee members. And Mike

McPherson came from Williams. Let's see, do you—have you ever met Mike? What year are you?

[1:10:04]

SN: No, I'm going to graduate in May. So my first year was Rosenberg's first year.

DR: Oh ok, so you've termed coextensive with Brian. Yeah that would have to be, that's right. This is his fourth year. Boy the time goes fast. Mike was a very prominent figure on the national scene. Was a well-known expert on financial aid and the financing of higher education—was gone to nationally for perspective on that. A very strong economist. Very strong at Williams, both as a teacher and administrator. And again, came from the kind of background that made a lot sense for Macalester in terms of a progression to a presidency. And again, he got very strong recommendations and references from the people that we talked with. And he was just clearly someone that was on the cusp, and was going to be named as a college president somewhere. It was just a question of by whom and when. And we felt that he was just the right person for Macalester at that time. Mike had a somewhat more...how should I describe it...congenial personality, just a little more low-key, little more laid-back. It's hard to find the exact adjectives. But, just a very engaging personal style, that was helpful for just dealing with faculty and alumni and students and so forth, especially after some of the difficult times during the Gavin years, when there was a lot of perhaps personal discontent if you will. And just a feeling that we needed someone that had more...I don't know if friendly is the word, maybe friendly style. Something that people could feel more comfortable with, but yet had the academic credentials to make things happen and to carry on the work that had been going on. So

again, I think Mike was right for his time, just as Gavin had been for his, and John Davis had been for his. Mike led us through a number of different things. I don't...there was a lot of...there was a very intense planning process during some of those McPherson years. Long range planning, strategic planning, and so forth—pointing towards the future, what we do at this place, what's our long term goal? There was a lot of work on that front. A lot of connecting with alumni, raising money for the Touch the Future Campaign—which was really the college's first major fundraising campaign ever in some ways. The library, by the way, back in the late-eighties—that was dedicated in 1988 I think—had been the subject of a separate, sort of fundraising dedicated effort. It was a ten million dollar effort—which I'm not sure how we built this library for ten million dollars—but at the time I guess it was possible. But that was...Mary Lee Dayton was the board chair at that time, and I think very active in the fundraising for that. But anyway, we hadn't had a major, sort of comprehensive capital campaign for ever. And so the Touch the Future Campaign was done—started probably on Gavin's watch, and then carried on through Mike's tenure. He spent a lot of time I know on the fundraising, because we needed to increase the donor base frankly. There was a lot of...a lot of...thought over the years that the Wallace's sort of took care of everything, and once *Reader's Digest* went public, and suddenly our endowment went from fifty million to five hundred million dollars almost over night, we thought that, well, Macalester has all the money it needs to do everything it needs to do. And so there had been a feeling that we should just sort of...that we didn't have to tap all that many other sources. But then that had to be built up during the campaign when the Wallace money finally was gone—they were both deceased. We had our last gift from them in terms of the stock, and it was pretty much done. So then we had to build up other sources of funding. So Mike did a lot of fundraising on that front, as Bob had done also. Another thing by the way, just

in terms of—so many things come to mind—but, Gavin emphasized the sciences and Macalester had not been particularly strong, historically—certainly when I was here and I think continuing for awhile afterwards—in the sciences. To have a scientist president, who could put the power of his persuasion behind that and his own academic experience behind it, and contacts behind it, really resulted in an upgrade of the science facility, the faculty—the whole science program. And then, ultimately leading up to getting that Olin-Rice upgraded completely. So it's not without reason that part of the atrium facility over there is named after Gavin because he was really responsible for a lot of that...a lot of that work. But anyway, back to the general fundraising—we had lots of other needs. It was a fifty-five million dollar campaign, which seems low these days when you have schools running two hundred million, three hundred million, billion dollar, billion and a half dollar campaigns. It's just a whole different fundraising world now. But anyway, Mike was here during the seven years from '96 to '03, and did a terrific job in all of those areas. I don't think there were any major...there wasn't the same kind of major shifts that I've sort of recounted during the Davis times or the Gavin times. I think there was, it was more—other than on the fundraising front—I don't think you would define it as a time of great leaps forward, in terms of major policy shifts, or policy changes, or things like that. The record will obviously reflect more about that. Historically people can reflect on that, may have reflected on that already. But my overall impression of that seven years is that it was...not as aggressive in terms of, this is what we've got to do and we're just going to take off and do something remarkably, dramatically different—other than as I say bring in the Touch the Future Campaign to a successful conclusion. In October of 2002 [pause] I was at a luncheon with my law firm in Minneapolis, and came out of the luncheon and had a cell phone message from Mark Vander Ploeg, the then chair of the board, saying that Mike had just advised that he was stepping

down at the end of that academic year, 2002-2003. And he was going to become president of the Spencer Foundation, which he is still at. And after getting over the initial shock, because I had always assumed that Mike would be here. He had been here six years at that point—he was in his seventh year. I thought he would be here a couple, three more years, maybe a nine, ten-year presidency, which is fairly typical these days. So I had no idea that this was coming, and thought that, my goodness—so suddenly, what do we do now? Because we have to presumably do another search. And Mike...in some ways it didn't surprise me as I reflected, because Mike I think had always been very interested in that whole foundation world. And had done a lot of money raising in that world...had interests that were at a national level in the whole financing of higher education as I mentioned earlier. So in some ways—and this was by the way probably one of the most prominent education foundations—so it was a natural leadership position for him. So as you thought about the opportunity for him and sort of where he might want to head for his next post...even though it might have been a couple years earlier than we had thought, it was understandable. So then the question is, ok, where do we...what do we need to do now? And pretty much I think on the same track we concluded we needed somebody that was engaged in a similar type of institution—a national liberal arts college. Came from that academy. But, anyway, Mark then asked me to come over and attend a press conference that afternoon where it was going to be officially announced. And sort of act on behalf of the board to make comments and so forth, which I did. And then about a week later Mark asked me to chair the search committee for the next search. So that...that search started a little later than typical. As I mentioned the other presidents had resigned usually in the summer so you had the summer and then the whole next academic year to sort of get things accomplished. This was almost the end

of October—in fact I think it might have been around Halloween that we just got the announcement and started work on the search.

[End of Disc 1 1:19:57]

[Disc 2]

DR: That search started a little later than typical. As I mentioned the other presidents had resigned usually in the summer so you had the summer and then the whole next academic year to sort of get things accomplished. This was almost the end of October—in fact I think it might have been around Halloween that we just got the announcement and started work on the search. And had it completed by mid-May with the selection of Brian Rosenberg. And again I could talk about lots of things there. Brian came from a terrific background with Allegheny College—had had leadership roles there, as well as being a long-time faculty member—a Dickens scholar...an English background, which was something different for Macalester after having had an economist and a scientist and some of the other disciplines. Had gone to Lawrence as the Dean of the Faculty—which they call their top academic officer—for five years with Rick Warch, who was a long-time, twenty-five year President of Lawrence. It's a terrific institution, and Rick is a terrific President and valued Brian very much as a provost. I mean, he was in effect doing presidential kind of work—really beyond the normal provost type activity, dean of faculty activity. And just had tremendous background and experience and credentials. And people sometimes ask me, what did the committee see, and what was it looking for and what did it find in the person that you selected? And what I usually say is that there are two things that you need

to run an institution successfully. Number one, you have to have the passion for what the institution is about, and you have to be passionate about—in this case—the liberal arts college, and Macalester in particular. And secondly, if you have passion but can't articulate the passion to the constituents that you work with...it doesn't do you as much good. So you have to be able to articulate it. And Brian Rosenberg can articulate that in ways that are just sensible. They relate, they're not academic sounding, they don't talk down, but they relate, whether you're talking to a faculty member, whether you're talking to students, whether you're talking to alumni, whether you're talking to funders that are potentially going to fund you. Whoever you're talking to, you have to be able to talk in a way that they get the message and get it quickly and understandably and get on board with the mission. And that's what Brian does so well. I mean he's just very...in my perspective having seen him in a variety of settings—and the students I'm sure have their perspective too on how he does that, how well he does it. Presidents have a lot of demanding duties in this day and age, a lot of which take them off campus, so they don't always see students as much as they might like, and the students might like. But my sense is that he tries to do a pretty good job in that area as well. So maybe you can tell me, is he...

[3:00]

SN: He does an ok job. I mean I see him eating in Café Mac with his family sometimes, so he's around.

DR: He's around, yeah.

SN: Its hard to...I work for the newspaper, and it's been our experience that it's kind of hard to get to actually talk to him, but usually he answers questions via email, which is good.

[3:18]

DR: Yeah. That is the difference from, as I said earlier, when I was here as a student. He at least is available by email...does come around from time to time...is seen as a person on campus. But anyway, clearly what he has is the background, the experience, and the integrity to be able to look at issues—analyze them, present them in a way that makes sense, and act on them, and take the next step, and do what's needed. In terms of policy issues, I've been off the board now the last—since May of '05—but I was here of course his first two years as president. And just watching the way he handled the whole “quality/access” issue—otherwise euphemistically known as need-blind—which I think sets a whole tone of its own—but that's another issue. On that issue—it's an issue which had been coming up for years. The board saw it. I think the presidents saw it. It was an extremely difficult issue to deal with in a way that made sense, and didn't leave the sense that somehow the college was selling out its basic, fundamental moral principles. And the way, the board had always looked at that issue and said we can't simply continue giving all of this money away. The percentage of the budget that it consumed, the percentage of the time, the overall time and resources that it consumed—and that we can be a diverse college, and serve all socio-economic levels, without giving away the store in a way that frankly prejudices the education—the overall educational quality—that we're giving to all eighteen hundred students. And that if we keep doing that we're either going to be out of business, or we're going to be a different place. But we can't keep doing what we're doing. And...it's an issue that had been on the table for a long time. It's an issue that we talked

with Brian about when he came in, when we selected him, and it's an issue that he dealt with within the first two years of his presence on campus.

[5:36]

SN: So it was something he was...he knew that he was going to have to deal with when he came in as president?

DR: He clearly knew this was something that wasn't going to go away...that it had to be dealt with, one way or another, it had to be dealt with—even if it was to say, well no, we're just going to keep doing what we're doing and let the chips fall. I mean that would be one option. Or, it's no, to be responsible, and to provide for the overall welfare of the institution and the quality—the educational quality of the institution—we need to make some tough decisions here. And it was clear that he was a person who had given a lot of thought to the issue in previous places. It's something that he clearly knew about and was prepared to deal with. And...with the strong support of the board, dealt with it in a way that—harkening back to my earlier comment—he not only felt passionate about its impact on the institution, but he was able to articulate the whole issue in ways that people could relate to. They might not agree with the ultimate decision, but they could understand why he was making the decision he was making. And why the board was supporting the decision that was being made—that it was something that had to be done for the overall quality of the institution. And, without, I think very strongly, not selling out at all our commitment to being multicultural, in terms of socio-economic diversity and other kinds of diversity. And I think that's being born out in the time since the decision was made, and will continue to be born out. But this...but it had an image—the whole question of need-blind has

such an aura around it, that people tend to think that if you go away from that somehow—oh you're just selling out...you're going to get a bunch of rich kids, and that's all you're really looking for because they can pay their way—and that's not it at all. What you're looking for is how can you have balance in that area of your diversity, just as you do in other areas. No one would claim that we need to have all poor kids on campus, but why would anyone claim that we can't have some rich kids too. I mean basically why can't there be a diversity of socio-economic ability? And if you're in effect saying that all the diversity has to be at the lower end of the socio-economic scale, to the detriment of the academic program, that's not being responsible I think, as trustees who have fiduciary responsibility for the institution, nor is it responsible for the president and the administration. Because you're in effect saying that, so that we continue to do good, by paying for anybody essentially that is qualified to get in here, and we're going to pay their whole way, no matter what, and we're just going to continue doing that—giving multi-millions away to do this, regardless of its impact on faculty salaries, and all the physical plant, and all the other things that the college budget must support—to me that is.... I think I said this at one of the meetings where I was at a public meeting sort of speaking, including to the alumni board at one point. I said, to me that's more...shows a greater lack of morality and moral commitment to the institution, than saying you're not going to give the next five scholarships to somebody who needs them. So it's really, it's...as in so many things, its not black and white. There's a lot of nuance...there's a lot of give and take. But it was the responsible thing to do, and I'm just very pleased that Brian had to the courage to do it. And he took a lot of heat for that. A lot of personal abuse, including from members of the campus community—which I thought was totally inappropriate. You can disagree with somebody, but to attack personally, I thought was really out of line. But that was something that to me showed that he was doing

again, what college presidents should do—what the board thought he would do when he came in, in terms of being strong and providing leadership and doing it in a way that—though yes, some people still disagreed maybe—but there was a lot of shifting of views over time, I think. Including among the students—you would know that better than me. But it seemed to me that a lot of students that might have started out initially thinking, oh my god this is terrible—ultimately realized the wisdom of it, and the reasoning behind it. And said, yeah we get it, and we get the fact that you're also committed to diversity, and you're not going to make us into a different institution that way. And I think, as I've said, that's been born out. Alumni were—many, many alumni—were very positively impressed that he did make a tough decision. Because it does affect when you're giving money to a campaign, to an institution, you like to think that it's being handled wisely. And this was evidence that a strong—a lot of thought had been given to how we're going to handle our money wisely. And this showed that, yes, we can have confidence in the institution, and if we make a major gift to a campaign, it's going to be well-used and well-spent. So I think from the alumni standpoint...I think from the faculty standpoint...I think there was generally strong support. The faculty vote was very strong. The Alumni Board, which you would've expected maybe to remember the good old days, and say oh my goodness this is not a good thing—unanimously voted in favor of it. So all in all, that to me is the one, one...key point in the Rosenberg administration. There have been other things too he's dealt with. And of course having been off the board the last couple years I'm not as close to some of the inside information anymore. But that to me proved his mettle in terms of what this institution has in a leader now, and will continue to have hopefully over the next several years. He is doing what needed to be done to make some of the tough decisions to take us to still the next level. Because we still have room for improvement in terms of our rankings, in terms of the

way we compete and compare ourselves to the national liberal arts colleges of great prestige. And he's continuing to do that, and I think we'll continue to do that. So in some ways he's the person to take us to that next, that next level. So I think that's...he's been right for his time, and I think will continue to be right for his time.

[12:08]

SN: So there was a lot of student activism surrounding the issue of need-blind, but have there been other issues in the past that have kind of galvanized students in the same way?

DR: Well the one more recent event, I mentioned earlier the sweatshop issue was a very strong issue, although we even... That issue it seemed to me was a little bit—there's a narrower group of students maybe that were really anxious about that. SLAC [Student Labor Action Coalition] is the organization that has worked through that. And when that came up, Mike asked me to chair a sort of sub-committee of the social responsibility committee to look at that. And we developed a policy which was adopted ultimately by the board. But that was an issue that created a lot of on-campus foment as well. Concern that we needed to make a statement about these issues of deplorable working conditions in Southeast Asia and elsewhere around that world...that generated a lot of controversy. I'm just trying to think if there are other things that were just...in recent times, actually in the last couple years—in fact my wife has commented on that fact that why aren't the Macalester students more vocal? Why aren't they more...why aren't they out protesting? There seems to be sort of an absence of noise over there about things and so forth...because we're fairly used to that. But I think it's a different time. I think again there's probably a different, a bit of a different model among students these days. And again you'd

know that better than me. But my sense is that there's not as much...not as much desire on the part of large groups of students to sort of be constantly active and in the face of the administration and speaking out on public policy issues and so forth, in sort of an on-campus way. That's not to say they aren't interested and involved and knowledgeable about them sort of behind the scenes, and maybe getting involved in local politics, or off-campus kinds of things and so forth. But there's not the same kind of sense that you need to go out and protest or set up tents or whatever it might be. And that students coming out of high school and into college these days seem to be of another...a bit of another generation. I'm not sure if the X-ers and the Y-ers and all of the others—I'm not sure what your generation is called—but it's a different, maybe a little different sense of...that we have business to do and we can be active but it's not in so much an in your face kind of a way. I continue to serve on the social responsibility committee for example, and there are, other than the sweatshop issue and last year the Coke issue—which was present the last couple years—the Coke issue, which we've been dealing with, again I think in a reasonable way... But there's nothing else that, at least on the agenda this year, where students have sort of been coming forward and saying, well how about this...we really gotta do something about this. There are always issues out there, but nothing has really built up a momentum to say that, boy this is really something terrible and we have to look at it and address it. So those are...I'm probably over-generalizing about your generation, but is that a fair sort of assessment?

[15:23]

SN: Yes...as historians will assess us... I mean, I guess I've noticed kind of a change in the student body over my time here. And its kind of...it's hard to articulate but maybe it's just

because I'm kind of less involved in the things on campus than I was my first two years here. I don't know. It just seems people are less involved in...protesting things. A lot of the people who were...that are involved in like radical activism and such have graduated. And so the movements kind of...a lot quieter. But I think people are kind of more into changing things at the grassroots level, like through internships or volunteer work and that sort of thing. So it's not like we're not involved but...

DR: No, that's what I said. I agree absolutely. And I think it has happened just in your time here. Because four years ago I would have said it was more, a little more activist. But literally just in the last couple years... But, you're right...people—Macalester students are very interested and involved and knowledgeable, as I say. But they do it in the ways you just mentioned—getting involved in things where they're sort of hands-on and out there in the community and—which ties into the whole question of civic engagement. I mean that's the whole point of that kind of emphasis now—in civic engagement, becoming global citizens, all of that. And I frankly think that's a much more effective way to do that, and to get that kind of educational and pragmatic experience, than just finding a knee-jerk issue to come and protest something about...

[17:00]

SN: I'm just trying to think of other questions—is there anything else you want to add?

DR: Well, I've tried to think about—I think I've reflected on a fair number of sort of the overall, the bigger changes, the policy changes, some of the emphases and so forth. But I would again

just going back to sort of reiterate, I think that when I was first a student here and the whole Harvey Rice and the Stillwater Conference—I really think that set us on a course that is where we still are today, in terms of, we're going to do what we do best, we're going to offer a baccalaureate, bachelor of arts degree... liberal arts institution. And we're going to compete at a national level, and be the very best we can be so that we don't get diffuse in terms of trying to be everything to everybody. And other institutions from different roots—look at institutions like St. Thomas that really become a... you know, used to be St. Thomas College and now it's St. Thomas University, where they've got the graduate programs and all the different kinds of things. And that's fine—I mean there are a lot of people that prefer that and need that, but Macalester needs to do what it does best, and it really has been its hallmark since even pre-Rice in some ways. You go back to people like James Wallace and Charlie Turk and others... They were very strong in that area—it's just that we also did some other things along the side. One thing I just wanted to, maybe if we... do wrap up here pretty soon here, I can sort of put it in perspective. One of my highlights as chair of the board—as chair of the board you get to do some ceremonial things that are just really fun to do. Whether it's presiding at the commencement kinds of thing—by the way an aside within the aside here [laughter]—One of the things I did also in my more recent years on the board, I had the privilege of being the citator, drafting and presenting the citations for honorary degrees for Stephen Paulus, who was a Macalester student at one point, graduated from the university, and Dale Warland who used to be on the faculty here of course—the Dale Warland Singers, a terrific choral conductor. So that was a real... one of my highlights when I was no longer chair of the board, but was on the board and got to present those at commencement. But anyway, you get to preside at different things and be involved with making remarks at... whether its alumni luncheons, or other college functions and

so forth—convocations, inaugurations, ceremonies, and those kinds of things. But one of the real highlights for me during my term as board chair was in the fall of '85, September of 1985. I was reminded of this yesterday also in looking at some of the pictures from that event. It was the centennial of the college, 1985, and all the former living presidents were invited back to the campus. And all came, including Charles Turck, who was then I think ninety-one years old maybe. He still traveled... he came back. So Charles Truck was the oldest. Harvey Rice was here. Arthur Flemming was still alive and came. James Robinson was alive. And John Davis. Gavin was president. I was chair of the board, and we had a huge centennial celebration. I think it was in the gymnasium, or was it the field house...maybe the field house. And it was just one of those wonderful days. And the former presidents who were deceased had family members—you know like grandchildren that were representatives at that ceremony. And it was just a real special occasion thinking about the history of the institution, and the last—let's see, since 1948—the last almost forty years at that point...were present right there, in terms of the presidents. And one of my ceremonial duties was to prepare and present sort of an introduction of each of them and have them stand and be recognized. And that was just a... sort of brought back a whole sense of history about the institution and how we sometimes get so focused on the present in our own little position, and our own role here. And really there's a long sweep of history here that is just incredible when you think about it. It's...as all institutions, they're built on a long tradition and legacy of people that were equally committed and passionate about the institution, and so on. That day, we were able to recognize those five former living presidents. But you could equally well have a day like that that would celebrate faculty members—some of the legends that I mentioned earlier that were here when I was here, and now there are many faculty members here that are the same for you. In fact in my farewell comments at the board

meeting in May of '05, I reflected on the fact that I'd had lunch with one of the graduating senior honors students who was a student of Ahmed Samatar [Professor of International Studies and Dean of the Institute for Global Citizenship] who's...I think is just terrific, he's one of my very good friends on the faculty—tremendous standards, tremendous commitment to the institution. One of his students happened to be my lunch partner that day of the last board meeting, and I was visiting with him about how he happened to get involved and so forth. And he told a story about how Ahmed—Dr. Samatar—had done for him much what Ted Mitau had done for me as a student and sort of getting me turned on to something and giving me encouragement...setting me off on a course. And I said, so history's repeating itself and it repeats itself hundreds of times over with students. This is what Macalester's all about—having these kinds of relationships with faculty and literally giving you a whole new perspective on life and what you want to do and how you want to do it, and just building something into who you are. And as I said in, at those comments at that board meeting, Macalester really is at least since about 1960 when I first heard about it, 1959, and then up to the present, it's always been a part of my life, always will be a part of my life. It's just a part of who I am, and it really is attributable to the power of a faculty member at a liberal arts institution like Macalester that cares. So, I hope you've had that kind of experience as well. What's your field?

[23:47]

SN: I'm a Geography major.

DR: So is Lanegran your...

SN: Well, actually I've done more course work with Bill Moseley.

DR: Ok, yeah. I know of him. I don't know him as well as Lanegran of course. But the same kind of thing—I'm sure you and a lot of your friends...a lot of the students...if they're open to that would name somebody that was very influential in what they've decided to do with their life. Not to say it won't change over time...

SN: I mean definitely in kind of how I think about the world and what I've chosen to study while here, which I assume I will take with me when I leave.

[24:24]

DR: Sure, of course. It's a great institution, and worth supporting. And frankly, worth getting some of this oral history down. I'd love to see what comes out of it in terms of—I'm sure you've talked with or will be talking with faculty members, perhaps other alumni...

SN: Well right now we're just doing sort of a pilot project. So I'm supposed to do eight interviews in January. And then if there's funding available they'll expand it. Make some available on the web I think.

[24:58]

DR: Because archiving things and preserving—especially oral history, too—is not often done by institutions very well. And suddenly somebody realizes, oh my gosh, why didn't we capture that. And something we should do as families also. I remember my sisters at one point finally—

maybe about a year before my mother died, which was eleven years ago today by the way, my mother died eleven years ago today. But anyway, just shortly before she died, they said why don't we just sit down with mom and sort of interview her and talk about her childhood and her youth and her growing up. And they did and got a wonderful tape. And it's really interesting to go back and listen to it. And that all would have been lost, because you don't keep many written records—there's not that much of a written record of some of these things, although you'll find a lot of this stuff in the written record. But perspectives and nuances and people's personal involvements and so forth. The only way to get it is to talk with them. So I applaud you for doing this. I think it should be fun for you. Who else are you talking to?

[25:57]

SN: I'm talking to Karl Egge, and Jim Stewart...Sandy Hill, Truman Schwartz. I talked to David Lanegran this morning...you...

DR: Pretty close to eight.

SN: Yeah...Virginia Schubert.

DR: Oh yeah, oh my goodness. You've got a lot of history there—oh my goodness, all of those people can tell you stories from now 'till...oh my goodness. Someone like Sandy Hill, oh my gosh, he's got...if you think I have a lot of history. Of course he is—let's see when did he come? He was here as a student of course, and he goes back into the '53 to '57, I think was... Anyway he was a student, and then he was away, but still very loyal to the college. And then

came back to the development office, alumni, head of the alumni...probably mid-sixties, about the time I left I think was when he came back on staff. We covered a lot of ground.

[End of Disc 2 26:58]