

**A HISTORY**  
**OF THE**  
**DEPARTMENT OF**  
**POLITICAL SCIENCE**  
**1872 to 1994**

*This History was presented to  
President Nils Hasselmo  
at Eastcliff, on May 15, 1995,  
on the occasion of his honoring the  
Department of Political Science as  
“A Model of Scholarly Leadership  
and Academic Excellence”.*

***Authors in order of their appearance:***

Charles H. McLaughlin  
Frank J. Sorauf  
Samuel Krislov  
Thomas M. Scott  
Robert T. Holt  
W. Phillips Shively  
Virginia H. Gray

*Edited by Samuel Krislov  
October 1994*

# Table of Contents

Editor's Note	4
Preface	5
1872 to 1966	6
The Sorauf Years: 1966 to 1969	17
The Krislov Years, Part I: 1969 to 1972	21
The Chairmanship of Thomas M. Scott: September 1972 to 1975	23
The Second Krislov Chairmanship: 1975 to 1978	25
Academic Years 1978-79 Through 1980- 81: Robert Holt, Chair	27
The Shively Years: 1981 to 1984	29
Virginia Gray as Chair	31
The Fogelman Years: 1988 to 1995	33
Appendix I: Distinguished Graduate Awards	36
Appendix II: Charles McLaughlin Lectures	37

## **EDITOR'S NOTE**

In conjunction with the celebration of the 125th Anniversary of the College of Liberal Arts in 1994, the Department of Political Science decided to bring up to date the history of the department prepared in 1977 by Charles McLaughlin. That history, originally prepared at my invitation for the self evaluation document developed for an external review committee, was later printed and presented in mono-graph form to Charles McLaughlin at his retirement. Written with his characteristic precision and wit, that history has proven useful as well as highly readable. All involved in this project quickly agreed that it be preserved intact, that we could only diminish it through change.

Rather than commission a single author, our chair, Edwin Fogelman, decided that each former chair write a history of his or her years and that I redact their efforts. Each of our chairs is the primary author of his or her history except that of the Fogelman years which I wrote in addition to my own.

I have not altered the originals very much (and only with the author's permission). Individual emphases and selection therefore will be apparent.

In the end, the themes inevitably converge, detailing the process of constructing and maintaining an academic department. Fundamentally, it must emerge from its building blocks, the women and men who are its members. Their products are the teaching program, their research, and the contribution to the life of the institution. The staff have their entrances and their exits, and make their marks in different ways only marginally listed here. However much they agree on the different needs and achievements, each leader will have subtle differences in how they value and assess these ingredients.

As this history demonstrates, departments like other institutions are not edifices built once and for all but an organic reality constantly changing and yet remaining, striving for more even as it is in constant danger of losing ground. I am in retrospect grateful to Ed Fogelman for assigning me the task of looking backward at three decades of the history of the department.

**Samuel Krislov**  
**October, 1994**

In our decision to publish this brief history, originally prepared as part of the department's self survey effort in conjunction with the University's regular review of departments, the Department of Political Science of the University of Minnesota is attempting to serve several purposes. At the very simplest level we feel that the document is a useful one, a history and compilation of our own past, some indication of the department's sense of uniqueness and purpose, and a guide to our future.

But in a larger sense the purpose of this publication is to recognize and to highlight the contribution of the author of this memo, Professor Charles McLaughlin, to the Department and to the institution of which it is a part. Universities recognize and reward the contributions of scholarship and teaching and Charles McLaughlin has had his share of recognition in both of these spheres. The record of his lasting contributions to scholarship can be found in their frequent citation, and the record of his teaching is to be found in the achievements and the fond memories of his students.

But universities as a whole do not recognize well the contributions of those who build the institution. In so far as they do, they tend to recognize the formal leaders, the officeholder, the prominent alas too often the figurehead. The contributions of those who build effectively and quietly are too often forgotten.

Charles McLaughlin was such an institution builder. The record of his building is to be found in many different places. In the Department of Political Science there is almost universal recognition that he by virtue of his wise judgement, patience and incredible effort almost single handedly turned a department that had been losing strength into a department with spirit, with structure and with mutual respect. Within the University his contributions to International Studies, both in the form of research and in international cooperation, were seminal. He founded and directed the International Relations Center, now the Harold Scott Quigley Center of International Relations. As Chairman of the Guiding Committee and first Dean and Acting Dean of the program that became the Office of International Programs he led the University of Minnesota into the area of international cooperation. As Chairman of both the Senate Judicial Committee and the Judicial Tenure Committee he contributed to the traditions of due process and equitable treatment of faculty that are the hallmark of the University and that put it in the very top rank of procedural care for the rights of its faculty. As a citizen of the University his judgment has been sought at every level of decision making by thoughtful leaders. His care and his willingness to listen have led him to be an ideal arbitrator in many sensitive issues at the College and University levels. Finally, his skill as a draftsman has resulted in his writing several constitutions and providing models, thereby, for many units that do not even know that they have benefitted by the handiwork of Charles McLaughlin,

One of the reasons universities do not adequately reward such functions is that it is hard to know how, indeed, one can repay that kind of debt. To give us our own self image, to structure a way of building and finding the best in us is almost beyond our ability to recompense. We hope that in a small way the publication of this history will symbolize our own sense that Charles McLaughlin has given to us not just a past but more importantly a future. By this publication, we hope to symbolize that his moving to the ranks of Professor Emeritus does not destroy our link with him, but keeps it forever new.

Samuel Krislov, Chairman  
Department of Political Science  
June 1977

\*Original introduction to Charles McLaughlin's *A Short History of the Department of Political Science*, printed in 1977.

## 1874 to 1966\*

\*This chapter, written in 1977 by Charles H. McLaughlin, was originally printed as *A Short History of the Department of Political Science*.

Political Science at the University of Minnesota goes back very nearly to the beginnings of instruction here. A Preparatory Department, or Latin School, opened in October 1867. In 1869 William Watts Folwell became President of the University. By then the Collegiate Department, which carried training through the sophomore college year, was in operation. The Announcement for 1871 72 show the curriculum included an optional course in Civil Government in the freshman year, but this seems to have been given only once or twice. When the College of Science, Literature and the Arts opened in the fall of 1871, the program projected instruction in “political science” and “the American Constitution” in the senior year; therefore this began in 1872 73. This course continued for many years only at the senior level.

In the Calendar for 1875 76 there is a first listing of “Departments of Instruction” authorized by the Regents. One of these was Social Science, which then included civil government, international law, the history of civilization, and political economy. The subject of logic was illogically attached to this Department for several years, as later was comparative philology. At first the assistant professor of history taught civil government and international law. President Folwell, who, as his successor President Cyrus Northrop remarked, was interested in everything from Plato to hog cholera, was also University Librarian and Lecturer in Political Economy. At first he taught the history of civilization, based on Guizot, “political economy and national economy,” and apparently also the comparative philology. But he soon gave up the history and philosophy and took up instead the civil government and international law, retaining economics. As he developed the work in civil government, the course began with principal chapters of De Tocqueville’s *Democracy in America*, proceeded to critical reading and discussion of “the leading titles of legislation,” then considered briefly the organization of city, village, and township government. International law was usually taught as a separate course of lectures but sometimes was outlined briefly as part of the civil government course. The political economy course Folwell expanded to two quarters, the first given to elements of economics and economic history, the second to the American national economy. The latter was primarily concerned with administration and finance, but as time permitted Folwell entered into such policy areas as taxation, national banking, protection, public education, and money. Some of these he later developed into separate courses. This pattern of instruction continued to 1879.

From 1879 to 1906 there was a Department of Political Science, with Folwell in charge through the whole period. After resigning the presidency in 1884 he was of course able to devote more time to teaching, but he continued as Librarian. The Department, despite its name and Folwell’s assumption of the title of Lecturer (later Professor) of Political Science and Lecturer in International Law, continued to be in substance a social science department. It offered instruction in political science and political economy, i.e. economics. In 1893 sociology was added, taught by Samuel G. Smith, D.D., Lecturer in Sociology (later Ph.D. LL.D. and Professor of Sociology). Sociology courses continued under the aegis of Political Science until 1902 1903, when a separate Department of Sociology began. Before then Smith has also instituted some work in anthropology, which continued for some time in the Sociology Department. In 1897 Frank L. McVey, Ph.D., was added as Instructor in Political Science. Like Folwell, he taught courses in both political science and economics until 1902, but then became Professor of Political Economy and devoted his time wholly to economics. Hannah R. Sewall was an Assistant in Political Science from 1893 to 1901, during which time she advanced from B.A. to Ph.D., but she seems not to have offered any courses. William A. Schaper, Ph.D., began as an instructor in 1900. When McVey moved wholly into

economics, Schaper and Folwell gave all the political science courses until the latter's retirement in 1907. It is evident from the course offerings that McVey brought a new emphasis on the economics of the market as opposed to the political economy of Folwell, and this is reflected also in the new Bulletin heading, "Economics, Public and Private." During this period there was some expansion of political science offerings. A basic course in American political institutions was begun, and McVey introduced another on Minnesota political institutions, for which he prepared a manual. Folwell continued to teach international law, and added a course called Elements of Jurisprudence, which was not so much jurisprudence as the term would now be understood as a synopsis of private law, administrative law, and comparative constitutional law. Schaper introduced undergraduate courses on the state and government, treated in both theoretical and functional terms, and distinct courses on national, state, and city government. By the academic year 1906 07 the curriculum in political science included ten courses: Folwell taught international law and a seminar on political schools and movements (in addition to courses in public economics), and Schaper offered elements of American government, comparative government, elements of jurisprudence, theory of the state, municipal administration, an introductory service course in political science for engineers, and senior graduate courses in politics and administration, and American constitutional law.

From 1906 to 1913 the title of the Department was changed to Economics and Politics, which obviously was just a better description of the teaching mission the Department of Political Science had been performing. From 1906 to 1909 offerings of the departments of Economics and Politics, History, and Sociology (including anthropology) were brought together in one section of the College Bulletin as a social science group, with a statement emphasizing that these disciplines were "intimately inter related," and were all important to students preparing for law, business, public service at home or abroad, journalism, social welfare services, or teaching the social sciences. Students interested in one social science were admonished to familiarize themselves with the elements of the others, those who specialized in any one of them to acquire "more than the elements of the others." Beginning in 1908 a table was given for several years listing courses in economics and political science recommended as training for thirteen different occupations.

Folwell's retirement in 1907 may be taken as the conclusion of the era of unified social science instruction, although the transition was not an abrupt one. His personal emphasis upon public regulatory aspects of economics, which had led him to develop substantial courses and seminars in taxation, public finance, and transportation, and his interest in policy aspects of education, social welfare, and criminology, made it natural for him to view politics, economics, and sociology as parts of political science. Nevertheless there was an evident centrifugal tendency for these disciplines to spin off into somewhat autonomous instructional blocs within the Department, which increased as younger colleagues with more specialized teaching and research interests were added. McVey was able with Folwell to straddle two disciplines, but the training and orientation of Smith, the sociologist, and Schaper and Cephas Allin, political scientists, were toward single disciplines as we now know them.

The change in departmental designation to Economics and Political Science, which began in 1906 following the creation of a separate Department of Sociology, continued until 1913. Professor John H. Gray, an economist, became head of the Department, and Cephas Allin, M.A., LL.B., was appointed Instructor in Political Science. Allin's main strength was in British government and colonial administration, international law, and diplomacy, but he also assumed part of the work in American and comparative government and developed upper division courses in comparative federal governments, and the politics of England and the British Empire. Until 1910 11 Schaper and Allin taught all the political science courses. In that year they were joined by Jeremiah S. Young, Ph.D., who had been brought in the previous year to give

extension courses and then entered the regular staff. He gave courses in American government, commercial law for engineers, state and local administration, and modern political thought. This enabled Schaper to develop new courses on comparative Latin American governments (later oriented toward Latin American relations) and European municipal administration. Young introduced in later years courses on police power, business law, and legislative power and methods. Through the 'twenties he had responsibility for the large introductory course in American government, for which he wrote a text.

On June 11, 1913 the Board of Regents authorized separate departments of Economics and Political Science. Schaper was then the only full professor in the Department of Political Science, but he was on leave of absence in 1913-14; until his return Young acted as Chairman. On his return Schaper was Chairman from 1914 to 1917, when he was summarily dismissed by the Board of Regents for alleged pro-German sympathies. It is evident now that his attitudes (probably not very discretely expressed, for he was a positive man) did not go beyond insistence that the blame for the first World War did not rest wholly upon Germany, a view that later became generally accepted but was premature during the wartime hysteria. Belatedly the Regents realized the injustice of his dismissal and tendered a public apology to Schaper in 1937 and 1938, coupled with a material amend. Harboring no resentment, he later bequeathed this money to the Department as a fund to support research. The incident helped to persuade the Regents to include a strong declaration of intent to protect academic freedom in the Tenure Regulations of 1939.

In the years through the first World War the Department was augmenting its regular strength and increasing its offerings and adding instructors who served for short periods: Matthias Olson (1913-1914); Benjamin W. Palmer (1915-1916), an attorney who also returned as a part-time lecturer during the 'twenties; Ben A. Arneson (1916-1917); Percival W. Viesselman (1917-1919); Albert J. Lobb (1918-1920). One permanent addition of particular note was made in 1916, when William Anderson started as an instructor. He was to serve with distinction until retirement in 1957, probably contributing more than any other member to the shaping of the modern Department.

The curriculum in these years showed development in most areas, with substantial elaboration of courses in American government, comparative government, and public law. In addition to the introductory course in American government, then a structural-functional discussion blocked out on national, state, and local levels, there were advanced courses on legislative power and methods, police power, political parties, state and local administration, and contemporary political problems. The basic course in comparative government was followed by more specialized courses in comparative federal governments, comparative administration, comparative European governments, European municipal administration, government and politics of England and the British Empire, and comparative Latin American governments. The principal gap was Far Eastern government. There was an elementary course in law (earlier called Elements of Jurisprudence), followed by American constitutional law and international law. Service courses were also provided in commercial and business law. The international field had not been at first an elementary course until Allin initiated World Politics, which succeeded a wartime course several members of the History Department and William Anderson arranged. Allin also taught international law, diplomacy, and colonial administration, and Anderson gave for a few years a course on American diplomatic problems. The Department's coverage of political theory was very slight. There were courses on theory of the state and on modern political thought, and Allin for a few years offered Ancient Philosophical Theories of the State. Introductory treatment was provided by Anderson in Principles of Political Science. During the war members of the Philosophy Department, Professors Wilde, Swenson, and Lodge, gave a course on Philosophy of the War. Wilde's continuing interest in the development of political philosophy and in political and social ethics led the Department to rely upon and to cross-list for political science credit his courses in these

subjects all through the decade of the 'twenties. The Department also gave service courses in American government and law for students of engineering and agriculture and a course in government for teachers.

It cannot be said that graduate training was a principal enterprise in the years before World War I, although it is first mentioned in the Bulletin for 1884 85, where Folwell indicated it would be "conducted on the 'seminary' plan of the foreign universities [his postgraduate work was in Germany], the particular subjects being selected by individuals, or groups, under advice of the professor." He began in 1890 91 and continued for many years to conduct a Friday afternoon seminar for graduate students and interested seniors for graduate students and interested seniors that ran over a variety of topics. After his retirement this seminar was continued by Schaper, Allin, later Young as a joint offering. But candidates for graduate degrees enrolled mainly in regular courses open also to upper division undergraduates and were assigned additional work for graduate credit. Their research was individually programmed and supervised, at first in the seminar mentioned and toward the end of the period in research seminars created for principal fields of study; in 1918 19 there were three. Most students were candidates for the M.A. degree only, and went elsewhere if they wished to obtain a doctorate. Only four Ph.D.'s in political science had been granted before the War, in 1899, 1901, 1908, and 1913.

Cephas Allin became Chairman in 1917. He devoted himself to departmental interests even to the detriment of his own research and writing, and proved to be a discriminating recruiter of staff. In 1919 he was able to bring in Robert E. Cushman, who had strength in constitutional, municipal, and labor law, and Quincy Wright, who took over and expanded the international law and also developed courses in international organization and the conduct of foreign relations. Both were superior scholars with strong research interests. Wright won in 1922 the \$2000 prize of the American Philosophical Society for his monograph, *The Conduct of American Foreign Relations*. Unfortunately they could not be retained in the face of very attractive offers, although Allin made vigorous efforts to do so and both had been quickly advanced to full professorships. In 1923 Cushman went to Cornell University and Wright to the University of Chicago. In 1920 Harold Scott Quigley was brought from Hamline University, where he had founded its Department of Political Science in 1917. He was allowed a two year leave of absence in 1921 23 to teach at Hsigh hua College in Peking and to study Far Eastern political institutions. On his return he initiated courses in the government of China and Japan and the international relations of the Far East and began to produce influential textbooks and monographs that did much to open up this field of study. He also developed the upper division course in international organization and relations and after Allin's death took responsibility for international law until 1936.

William Anderson also moved forward rapidly as a research scholar and writer in American government, with a rapid succession of monographs on the history of the Constitution of Minnesota, city charter making in Minnesota, American city government, and the units of government in the United States, followed by a textbook on American government that introduced a new emphasis on the political process and intergovernmental relations. In later years he was to open up the latter field by directing a major research study of intergovernmental relations in a number of functional areas as seen in Minnesota. To encourage the research of colleagues on local government and assist graduate students with their research he organized in 1919 and directed until 1928 the Bureau for Research in Government, which sponsored the publication of a series of research monographs. He was very active in professional organizations and on government commissions, helping to found the American Society of Public Administration and in later years becoming the President of the American Political Science Association and serving on the U. S. Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

When Cephas Allin died in 1927, Anderson assumed the Chairmanship. For a few years before the Great Depression there were resources for some expansion of staff. In 1927 Joseph R. Starr, who was completing his Ph.D. here, was made an instructor; he concentrated on European government and continued at the University until he entered military service in 1943. After the War he moved to the University of Maryland. Oliver P. Field came as an associate professor and Lennox A. Mills as assistant professor in 1928. Field held the S.J.D. degree from Yale Law School and proved a stimulating teacher of constitutional and administrative law as well as a substantial scholar and writer in those fields. He appeared to suffer from anemia, for even in warm weather he wore, longjohns and a heavy sweater under his jacket. An extremely gregarious man, he spent a considerable part of his day wandering about the offices of several departments exchanging information and gossip with colleagues, thus leading one of them to dub him the town crier. Nevertheless he managed a great deal of solid work, apparently all done at night. Mills, a Canadian, was an Oxford trained expert on colonial government and imperialism, who took charge also of the elementary course in World Politics. His well organized and colorful lectures attracted many students to international studies. No doubt they also took delight in some small eccentricities of dress and manner. A short man, he invariably wore very heavy English walking shoes with three quarter inch soles, and often a tweed jacket with leather elbow patches. In his sleeve he tucked a very large red bandanna handkerchief, which occasionally during lectures he would flick out to polish his glasses or wipe his brow. He has a sovereign contempt for committee work and administrative chores that was not taken in good part by some of his senior colleagues, but made up for it by a long series of first rate monographs in his special field and by the care with which he supervised the work of his students. Benjamin Lippincott, after completing doctoral studies at the London School of Economics and Political Science, came to the theory field in 1929 and gave the Department for the first time strength in the development of political ideas as well as in modern political thought. He also created as an alternate introductory course a sequence based on fundamental concepts and principles of government, with some comparative materials. This could be taken instead of or in addition to the basic American government course. In research he had a special interest in civil liberties, and his liberal democratic ideas also influenced the Department to open its procedures to fuller participation by all members of the faculty. There can be no question that Professors Allin, Anderson, and Quigley as chair-men were scrupulously fair and conscientious in their recommendations on salary and promotion, but they shared such decision making only with senior colleagues. Nevertheless, they encouraged very open discussion in Department meetings about other policy questions, which no doubt was the necessary foundation for the later practice of open decisions openly arrived at.

The relationship of political science to other social sciences continued to pose problems of academic organization. Wartime collaboration of departments in special courses and their inability immediately to staff every area probably led to the substantial cross listing of faculty and courses among the departments of Economics, History, Philosophy, and Political Science that prevailed through the 'twenties and part of the 'thirties. Thus the Political Science curriculum for 1920-21 showed, in addition to courses taught by political scientists, four courses in modern history taught by Mason Tyler, A.B. White, Lester Shippee, and Solon Buck of the History Department, three on labor and socialist movements, public finance, and state and local taxation taught by Alvin Hansen or Roy Blakey of Economics, two on modern political thought and political and social ethics taught by Norman Wilde of Philosophy, and one on municipal engineering taught by Frederic Bass of Municipal and Sanitary Engineering. Later Professor Bird of Psychology developed a course in political psychology that was added. Students could take these for major credit in political science, although there was also a beginning of major credit and distribution requirements by fields that had to be satisfied by courses within the Department. The practice of cross listing continued into the 'thirties but dwindled to a listing by numbers of outside courses recommended as appropriate to supplement major courses in the Department. Reciprocally, the Department of History

continued during this period to list political science offerings in American diplomatic history, Far Eastern government and international relations, and American constitutional development. Other departments used political science courses in government and business and recent social legislation.

In the 'thirties the problem took the form of creating multidisciplinary majors for types of training that seemed especially to demand them, i.e., public administration and international relations. Professor Anderson had taken the lead about 1920 in working out inter departmental five year curricula leading to the M.A. degree in State and Federal Administration and in Municipal Administration and Engineering. A Special Training Course for Diplomatic and Consular Service was developed as an inter departmental major for the B.A. degree by Professor Quigley. He and Professor Allin served as the major advisers. Experience with these programs provided a foundation for the more highly organized multidisciplinary majors in public administration and in international relations which began in the 'thirties.

There was of course little recruitment during the worst years of the Depression, but as the financial problem eased slightly it was possible to bring in Asher Christensen in 1934, Lloyd Short, Clarence Ludwig, and Evron Kirkpatrick in 1935, and Charles McLaughlin in 1936. Christensen became a very popular lecturer in the introductory course in American government, expanded the work in Latin American government to a three quarter undergraduate sequence with a graduate seminar, and took up courses in government and business, and recent social legislation. Kirkpatrick shared the work in American government and brought added strength in political theory in both lower and upper division courses. Both had strong interest in local party politics and worked closely with students who were then actively embarking on political careers, such as Hubert Humphrey, Orville Freeman, and Arthur Naftalin.

Lloyd Short, taking up the plans worked out by William Anderson, initiated the Public Administration Training Center, a unit of the Department with an interdepartmental advisory committee, which offered a well integrated program of graduate training for students who wished to enter responsible positions in government service at the national, state, or local level. During its early years the Center enjoyed foundation support of fellowships that enabled it to attract and train first rate graduate students, many of whom later achieved positions of prominence in public service or academic administration. The Center also developed an excellent specialized library of public administration; fortunately it had the expert services of Myrtle Eklund, whose knowledge and energy procured much fugitive literature of great value to this field. Clarence Ludwig, who was a part-time member of the Department, added great strength in municipal administration. He had served as city manager of Albert Lea, as a field director of the American Municipal Association and consultant of the International City Managers Association. He became Secretary of the League of Minnesota Municipalities and Head of the Municipal Reference Bureau, making their resources readily available to students of public administration. In the Department he gave the upper division and graduate courses in municipal administration. Anderson, Short, and Ludwig all took part in the three quarter Special Seminar in Public Administration for majors in the field.

Quigley and McLaughlin developed in more gradual fashion a center for training students in international relations. The roots of this center as a physical unit go back to an effort made by a committee outside the Department, headed by Cyrus P. Barnum, and enthusiastic advocate of international organization, and including representatives from the Office of the Dean of Student Affairs, to interest a broad range of students in the problems of international politics and world order. In 1932 they published a special Bulletin listing courses in a number of departments that students could elect to gain some insight into these matters, and a small student center was created where current periodical literature was available to them. It became headquarters for the then vigorous student International Relations Club organized by Quincy Wright and

later advised by Quigley. In 1936 the Department assumed responsibility for this center, providing a half time teaching assistant to supervise it and occasional secretarial help. Meanwhile Quigley had organized and until 1947 served as chairman of an interdepartmental advisory committee for the major in international relations that succeeded the slightly more focused training for Foreign Service Officers. Direction of the International Relations Center and the International Relations Club was taken over by McLaughlin; these continued during the inter war period as centers of extracurricular student activity, from time to time sponsoring inter collegiate conferences on topics of current interest and model League of Nations Assemblies. The staff also gradually assumed responsibility for counseling international relations majors and keeping student records. In 1947 the Center was separated from the Department and given a small independent budget. Following World War II the curricula supervised by the Advisory Committee were broadened to include a number of area study programs; Scandinavian, European, Latin American, Asian (East, Southeast, and South). When Quigley became Chairman of the Department in 1947, he turned over the chairmanship of the committee, now called the Interdepartmental Committee on International Relations and Area Studies, to Harold Deutsch of History, with McLaughlin as Secretary. Several years later McLaughlin succeeded Deutsch as Chairman of the Committee. He also continued to be Director of the Center, renamed Center for International Relations and Area Studies after he added to its functions the servicing of the academic training programs. It came to provide for them library facilities, bulletin preparation, student counseling services, and academic planning, standing in place of a departmental organization and office for the interdisciplinary programs. The Committee met in the Center, so that the two became associated. The staff of the Center was slightly increased. After McLaughlin, who carried the duties of Director and Chairman as additional duties with no relief from teaching load, had given up these positions in 1962 because he had become Department Chairman the preceding year, the Center was directed by an acting director until the appointment of Burton Sapin in 1965. At that time the position of Director was partially budgeted to the Center to free half time for administrative duties. The Center, now called the Harold Scott Quigley Center of International Studies, has continued since then its separate but always financially meager status as a teaching and research unit.

The Public Administration Training Center also continued as an autonomous unit within the Department for many years. Although it offered an interdisciplinary training program, its continuing departmental status seemed appropriate because of the very large core of political science courses in the program and the public service objectives of the students. In fact the interdepartmental advisory committee was not very active after the formative years. Direction of the program devolved almost entirely upon Lloyd Short and George Warp, who had been an instructor in the Department in 1939 40 and returned in 1948 as an assistant professor teaching public administration courses. When Short succeeded Quigley as Chairman of the Department in 1951, Warp became Associate (and in effect Acting) Director of the Center, and after Short's retirement in 1961 succeeded him as Director of the Center, and after Short's retirement in 1961 succeeded his as Director. By this time external sources of fellowship support had diminished so that fewer students of first rate ability could be recruited. The retirement of Anderson in 1957, of Ludwig in 1959, and Short in 1961 also considerably reduced the national image of the program. Warp adopted a lower minimum level of ability for acceptance of graduate students than that required by the Department in other fields, since these students could be trained to become very useful civil servants and were in demand. This, coupled with a feeling that the quality of the program was slipping, caused dissatisfaction among members of the Department, who were deliberately trying to tighten graduate standards at this time. When a University reviewing committee recommended the desirability of broadening the focus of training for public service, the Department supported plans that led to the creation of a separate Graduate School of Public Affairs in 1968. This School absorbed the public administration teaching staff and courses into its more broadly oriented public affairs program.

The result of this spinning off of the multidisciplinary programs initiated by the Department into independent teaching units, coupled with a gradual withdrawal from cross listing of courses, has been a sharpening of departmental focus, a more coherent effort within a smaller range. It has the disadvantage that many students with strong interest in practical vocational applications of political science are no longer among the Department's majors but find their natural homes in international relations or public affairs. Political Science majors at the undergraduate level are not trained for very specific vocational objectives, and at the graduate level are heavily slanted toward college and university teaching. Fewer members of the faculty have the strong involvement with practical politics and administration that marked the staff from the 'twenties through the 'forties.

The expansion of the Department faculty in the 'twenties and early 'thirties and the strong interest of the new members in research and graduate instruction led to an increase in graduate seminars and a tightening of graduate degree requirements. By 1933 there were research seminars available in all fields, although graduates still obtained most of their instruction in classes open also to juniors and seniors. Six graduate fields were then outlined: public law, comparative government, political theory (including the history of political thought), American government and politics, local government, international law and relations. Candidates for the Ph.D. in political science were required to prepare for examination in four of these major fields, generally interpreted to mean at least twelve credits of course work, including some seminar work, in each field. In addition they prepared two minor fields in another department, a total of 72 graduate credits. Two plans were (and still are) available for M.A. candidates, who were then received in considerable numbers since students were expected to prove themselves by taking an intermediate M.A. degree before proceeding to the Ph.D. Under Plan A 27 credits were required, of which 18 from two graduate fields were allocated to the major, the remainder to the minor. A substantial thesis was expected. Under Plan B, which substituted short research papers for the thesis, 45 credits of course work were required, with 21 to 27 in the major, 18 to 24 in the minor. In 1931 Professor Anderson had introduced a two quarter course in Scope and Methods of Political Science, one quarter of which was added to the major requirement. This course marked the first movement toward training in methodology except as it had been provided in seminars in particular fields. Anderson, although also interested in normative theory, was essentially an empiricist who appreciated scientific methodology and had training in mathematics and statistics. He was well in advance of the field in making methodology an element of graduate training.

The six fields for graduate training were eventually rearranged to provide four principal fields (technically subfields, since in University practice the discipline is called the field), with subdivisions of each: American government and politics, diving into national and state governments, local government, public administration, public law; comparative government and politics, divided into Europe, the Far East, the British Empire and Commonwealth of Nations, Latin America; theory, divided into history of political ideas and analytical political theory; international affairs, divided into international law and diplomacy, international organization and relations, regional international relations (Far Eastern, European, Latin American). In 1954 a non concentration field in political behavior was added. Ph.D. candidates then prepared in two subdivisions within a field of concentration and in another subdivision in each of two additional fields. This was approximately the pattern of work that was used until 1962.

In recruitment the Department has tried since the 'twenties to maintain staff strength in the principal fields and their subdivisions, replacing as well as possible members who died, resigned, or retired, and slowly increasing its strength as new positions could be obtained. There were no additions in the latter part of the 'thirties. When Field moved to Indiana in 1939, he was replaced the following year by Earl Latham, who was here until 1948. Herbert McClosky began in 1942, concentrating first on European government

but obtaining leave of absence in the 'fifties to retool in political behavior; however, an early study he published in that field attracted attention and led the University of California to draw him away. Werner Levi was appointed in 1945 to relieve Quigley of responsibility for international organization and politics, which he developed as a subdivision of international relations. He was lured to the University of Hawaii in 1963. In the 'fifties McLaughlin, who had been responsible for international law since 1936, was relieved of lower division courses to permit him to develop another subdivision in diplomacy and foreign affairs administration. Arthur Naftalin taught in the Department from 1947 to 1954, then left for some years of public service before returning to the School of Public Affairs. Mulford Sibley, who had taken his Ph.D. here in 1938, returned after ten years at the University of Illinois, making it possible to offer a four course sequence covering the history of political theories and to strengthen graduate offerings. In 1950 John Turner was added in comparative government. He worked in English and continental European government, and was able to take up the courses in Chinese and Japanese government when Quigley was forced by ill health to retire prematurely in 1954. After the departure of McClosky it was necessary to find additional strength in the comparative field, and Robert Holt was recruited in 1956. Turner and Holt reoriented the comparative courses to increase attention to comparative principles and institutions, and to methodology, reducing emphasis upon country courses as such.

Unfortunately the University fell upon lean years in the 'fifties, during the Chairmanship of Lloyd Short and was not able to enlarge the staff although enrollment was growing and new interests were coming to the front in political science. The Department operated efficiently and maintained its existing position well, but relative to departments in other major universities, which were expanding their staffs rapidly and developing new foci in behavioral and political process studies, it was losing ground. The only appointees, other than Holt, were Harold Chase, recruited in 1957 to replace William Anderson, who had been teaching constitutional law after Latham resigned; and Charles Backstrom, who came in 1959 and filled a gap in political parties and local internship programs left by the resignation of Naftalin. Perhaps a more aggressive demand for new positions would have been effective, for Dean McDiarmid appeared to do more for those departments that pressed him hardest; indeed it was found when he gave up the deanery in 1962 that he had authorized them to recruit for a number of positions for which the College had no funds.

When Short retired in 1961 and McLaughlin assumed the chairmanship, the Department decided that it must make a more determined effort to obtain support for staff. A paper was therefore drafted, for which the major credit belonged to John Turner, to demonstrate to the Dean and Vice President that the Department's faculty strength and salaries were lagging far behind those of its counterparts in competitive institutions. The demonstration was well received, especially by Vice President Shepherd, who promised support for salaries and new positions. Fortunately the financial situation of the University improved considerably and this was aided in one area by a grant in excess of a million dollars from the Ford Foundation to aid improvement of education about international relations. The Department addressed itself energetically to recruitment of first-rate staff, and was able to secure the services of Frank Sorauf in 1961, Edwin Fogelman in 1963, Sam Krislov and Robert Riggs in 1964, Burton Sapin and Richard Blue in 1965, and Roger Benjamin and Earl Shaw in 1966.

This infusion of strength enabled the Department to improve and diversify its offerings, strengthening the coverage of methodology and in American government emphasizing political and legal process, and public policy studies. The comparative field was kept strong, the theory field strengthened and enlarged by the addition of empirical theory. This substantial improvement in the position of the Department has been continued during the past ten years by a series of vigorous Chairmen (Sorauf, Krislov, Scott), with very

good support from the college and University administrative officers. Some personnel has been lost to other institutions or deliberately released but has been promptly replaced, and new positions have been added to fill remaining areas of weakness. Although the patience of members of the Department has been considerably taxed, the almost continuous process of recruitment has been conducted with great thoroughness, beginning with discussion to define the position and proceeding to the collection of dossiers of a large number of applicants, careful weeding out of all but the ablest, and a final choice from them only after hearing oral presentations, interviewing the candidates, and meeting them socially. The result has justified the effort by bringing in younger staff members of great potential in both teaching and research. In the past ten years the Department has added Robert Eyestone, Robert Kvavik, Terrence Hoppmann, Enid Schoettle, Charles Walcott, Gary Wynia, Phillips Shively, Terrence Ball, August Nimitz, Brian Job, Sam Kernell, Virginia Gray, John Sullivan, William Morris, Raymond Duvall, and Scott Ross.

These staff accessions have brought a considerable ferment of ideas about facilities, methods, and curriculum. Flanigan developed the Political Science Laboratory and working with others outside the Department built up computer facilities readily available to our staff and students. A simulation laboratory was set up, and a Comparative Data Archive formed. Several members of the Department worked on laboratory manuals for use in appropriate courses. The increased size of the Department has required an improvement of administration, accompanied by the appointment of a Director of Graduate Studies and a Director of Undergraduate Studies, each aided by a mixed faculty student committee; and administrative assistant; and additional secretaries. An older set of procedural rules formulated in the 'fifties was revised and incorporated into a Department Constitution covering additional matters. The system of student advising was revamped to centralize much of the detailed work of approving student programs, leaving the faculty free to concentrate upon more important counseling problems.

But perhaps the chief departmental effort has been in reworking the graduate program, a subject of recurrent attention since 1962. Without attempting to follow the changes in detail some principal features can be mentioned. Since 1964 graduate majors have been restricted to courses of seminar level, thus separating graduate instruction from undergraduate. The field structure has been modified several times, only to turn in its current form to something very like the fields which were used from 1954 to 1964. However, the present subdivisions of these fields do reflect much better recent emphases in political science teaching and research. Thus instruction in political analysis is offered in a distinct methodology field. The theory field includes not only development of political thought and analytical political theory of the normative type but also empirical theory. American government retains national government, and state and local government, but each emphasizes the political process; judicial process studies are added to public law; and subdivisions on politics and behavior and on public policy appear. International relations retains its former subdivisions but emphasis has shifted from diplomacy and foreign affairs to foreign policy analysis and from organization and law to politics. Comparative politics, apart from an area emphasis for which there is continuing demand, breaks its comparative studies into analysis of structure and process at the subsystem level, and analysis of system structure and change. Among the substantive fields the Department continues to impose requirements of concentration in some with a distribution which includes others, but it has also moved to a much stronger effort to give its graduate majors adequate methodological training, partly by required courses in political analysis taken in the first year, partly by required research papers in the first and second years for the supervision of which a special seminar is provided in each substantive field. A tracking system based on review of the first year's work permits some students to move directly to the Ph.D., requires others to take the intermediate (and where appropriate, final) M.A. degree. An effort has been made to solve the long standing problem of excessive time in obtaining the doctorate, often caused by the need to seek employment before completion of the dissertation. The

Department has structured graduate course requirements to permit completion of course requirements, preliminary examinations, and dissertation within three to four years, and obtained Ford Foundation support for a number of years to enable it to subsidize Ph.D. candidates throughout their work. In recent years it has deliberately limited the number of graduate students it admits, so that its now diminished support funds will be sufficient to provide for most. This has had the advantage that higher admission standards can be used, and that a tight job market placement can still be effective. A departmental placement officer is appointed each year to assist those who are completing their degrees.

Although these revisions of the graduate program have occupied a great deal of the Department's attention, it is not intended to suggest that the undergraduate program has been slighted. It has required less reorganization of curriculum, but in terms of student enrollment remains much the larger program. By careful recruiting the Department has maintained a long tradition of effective undergraduate teaching. It has for a decade regularly obtained student evaluations of teaching and included them among other evidence reviewed in considering promotion and salary recommendations. The Office of the Director of Undergraduate Studies has improved counseling services and reviewed the curriculum. A substantial honors program has been developed that is open to superior students, with standards and degree requirements somewhat higher than the College specifications. In fact the Department experimented with an honors program as early as 1928, long before there was a College honors program. It then assigned students to tutors and modified the regular course requirements to permit them to complete some of their work by independent supervised study; a senior thesis was also required. Apparently this program was too great a burden for the small staff to sustain, and it was dropped. But the Department later developed small tutorial type courses supplementary to its basic courses to encourage more concentrated study of limited topics, and then senior courses of seminar type for majors. It now encourages its graduate students to obtain some practice in teaching by preparing and teaching such courses under faculty supervision.

---

*The preceding account is necessarily a sketchy and incomplete one, particularly in its coverage of recent years. Many points of interest have been omitted. But it is expected that others may in the future complete the account.*

## THE SORAUF YEARS: 1966 to 1969

These three years were in many ways a continuation of the five years of Charles McLaughlin's chairmanship, especially the tasks of rebuilding the department's graduate program, of restoring its scholarly reputation, and of building new traditions of departmental governance. However, the "outside world" repeatedly intruded on the department's agenda in those years. The protest movements in the aftermath of the assassination of Martin Luther King and against the war in Vietnam, and more generally those for social and political change, often touched the department's work.

### Department Building and Rebuilding

In simple numerical terms the department grew steadily between 1966 and 1969. In September of 1966 the department's line item budget listed 21 names, 12 of them professors and associate professors, 9 of them assistant professors and instructors. By the beginning of 1969-70 the total had risen to 26, 13 in the top two ranks and 13 in the other two ranks. There were also two vacant line item positions. In the intervening three years the department had lost Walter Klein and John Penikis and Burton Sapin (who became a Dean at George Washington University), and it had acquired Benjamin, Crew, Eyestone, Hopmann, Kvavik, Schwarz, Walcott, and Wynia.

In early 1967 the department "acquired" another tenured professor: the president of the University, Malcolm Moos, who had built a substantial reputation as a scholar of American politics before entering academic administration. His sole flight into teaching for the department was an overproduced and underattended evening lecture in Mayo Memorial Auditorium. In these years the department hired its first woman for a tenure track position. Ellen Pirro, a Yale ABD, came in 1966 to a position in international relations. In these years the department also added three women colleagues, all faculty spouses, who held continuing temporary appointments. Two, Enid Schoettle and Sheilah Koeppen, were later advanced to tenure track appointments. One, Joanne Arnaud, was not, and that decision would result in litigation during the Shively years.

The department's staff also grew by one in the period, from three to four. Recruitment continued on the basis of the McLaughlin principle of looking for the responsible and hardworking candidates from Minnesota's smaller towns and cities. The result was a staff of the high quality the principle predicted. They worked, it should be added, in a grossly underfunded world of purple dittos, carbon copies, faculty dictation, a primitive copier, and museum quality typewriters. The superb and unflappable Marilyn Christianson of Red Wing, appointed departmental secretary in the last McLaughlin year, continued in the position until her departure to Seattle in late 1969 for fortune and marriage.

---

*Editor's note:* A faculty member who had a competing evening class met a harried Sorauf who had to treat this Moos lecture like a Hollywood production. "How was attendance?" Sorauf was asked. "Thin, but not embarrassing" came the reply. "And the lecture?" A moment of reflection produced the verdict: "About the same."

On the programmatic level, the reshaping of the graduate program became a departmental obsession. The annual review of graduate students (the “Rite of Spring” one secretary called it) reinforced the department’s collective responsibility for its graduate students, as did the institutionalization of the Directorship of Graduate Studies. The department’s first DOGS, John Turner, continued for a third year in 1966-67; his exemplary service was central to the success of the department’s new graduate program, and it also was key in convincing a wary Graduate School of the value of the office across the university’s graduate programs. William Flanigan served admirably in the office for 1967-69, and was continuously reimpresed for service time and again through the decades.

The polishing of rules and curricula for the graduate program continued unabated and usually in excruciating detail. But one singular event contributed enormously to the program: the Ford Foundation grant. Initially, the Foundation approached a number of Graduate Schools, including Minnesota’s, to apply for grants with programs that would reduce the number of years to the Ph.D. to four. The University’s Graduate School entered with proposals from a number of departments, but it failed to win university wide funding. Ford did, however, single out one Minnesota department, Political Science, with a substantial grant to be used chiefly for graduate fellowships. The grant helped the department recruit a truly national graduate student body for the first time. As for the goal of the four year Ph.D., the department probably did as well as other grant recipients.

All of this is not to suggest that the undergraduate program was ignored. Departmental oversight continued, and the percentage of undergraduate courses taught by regular faculty remained high. Moreover, the departmental honors program, begun in the early 1960s, continued as an exemplar in the College under Tom Scott’s directorship. The major innovation in the 1966-69 period was the addition of an internship program. Largely under the initiative of Charles Backstrom, the department began by winning the agreement of the Minnesota House of Representatives to appoint interns. (The state Senate initially was quite certain it did not want long haired students traipsing through its more sedate spaces.) The major support in St. Paul and in fighting off patronage appointments to the internships came from Rep. William Frenzel, later Congressman Frenzel. Backstrom’s strong insistence on the primacy of the academic side was widely admired on campus, particularly when looser standards in the 1970s threatened the reputation of such programs.

Finally, the business of “department building” went on apace. Discussions at evening meetings, somewhat loftily called “constitutional dinners,” hammered out a series of written departmental policies on subjects such as the taking of leaves and the defining of “merit” for the purposes of promotion and salary increases. Those meetings, as well as the regular meetings of the department, became exercises in building and transmitting departmental norms and in exercising the then novel participatory ethos. Collegial democracy, moreover, was regular, if to a fault; in academic year 1967-68, for example, the departmental minutes show 20 separate departmental meetings for the academic year.

The amount of meeting going was in part a reflection of the continuing recruitment of new faculty members. It also reflected a disposition to deal as a department with matters of lesser moment. At three meetings in the fall of 1966, for example, the department considered the excess of concrete and the need for trees and general beautification on the West Bank. And in the minutes for August 16, 1968, Secretary David RePass reports the final (ultimate?) item this way: “We agreed that the best and perhaps only means of communicating to students that we have two new courses (Scandinavia and Africa) is to use the Personal ads in the Daily. Watch for strange announcements from your true love (the Department).”

Finally, amid all of this activity the department made one major constitutional change in the 66-69 period: the establishment of the Merit Advisory Committee. Ever since the decision to decide salaries openly in a department meeting, chairs had brought in a set of salary recommendations to begin discussions with the full professors. After doing that once, Sorrauf proposed the Merit Advisory Committee (MAC). The Committee remained in its original form -election by the whole department of representatives by ranks - until the constitutional amendment of 1994.

### **The Outside World Impinges**

The turbulent events of the 1960s and 70s began at the University in 1968. Militant students from the far left interrupted several of the events of the Moos inauguration in May of that year, and black students occupied Morrill Hall for a day in January of 1969 to support their demands for more scholarship money and an Afro American department. In a department of political science (as opposed to a department of poultry science) the new politics were felt very directly. But that closeness to “the action” at least spared the department the long debates over “relevance” that plagued so many liberal arts disciplines at the time.

A few political science lectures, largely in courses on political philosophy, were interrupted by demonstrations or angry monologues, and dissenting and disagreeing student comments increased in virtually all courses. Several times, indeed, the faculty talked at department meetings about how to deal with disruptions and extensive student remarks. One department member even endured a brief strike conducted by a handful of pickets; it turned out, though, that the cause of the action was no more revolutionary than displeasure with difficult multiple choice questions. More proactively (as we never said then), the department also sponsored a number of open forums, called “teach ins,” on Southeast Asia and American foreign and defense policy. Dick Blue, the department’s specialist on South Asia, was a singularly effective moderator, because of both his expertise and his sympathetic public style.

Perhaps more lasting in its impact was the rise of the “student power” movement. In the three years from 1966 to 1969 the department initiated student evaluations of undergraduate courses and graduate student representation on departmental committees. It also responded to student demands for more “relevant” courses by increasing its offering of “topics” courses and by writing other new courses (e.g., the politics of ethnic communities) into the continuing curriculum. In 1968 it did; however, resist a proposal from undergraduates for a faculty student “council” in the department.

Finally, the times impinged on the department in one grand explosive event: the appointment of Hubert H. Humphrey after his defeat in the 1968 presidential election. The ballots had barely been counted in November, 1968, when President Moos announced that Humphrey would accept a professorship in “our political science department.” Not having been consulted, the members of the department, including the chair, learned of the appointment in the Saturday newspapers, Moos having made the announcement at the previous day’s meeting of the Regents. The appointment was a part of an intricate package in which HHH would spend two of every four weeks on his public life and divide the other two weeks between Macalester College and the University.

A great deal hit the fan in the following week. At an angry meeting the department voted unanimously to remind the President that academic appointments at the University had to be voted, initially at least, by the unit in which the appointment was sited. That position, the department hoped to make clear, was prior to and separate from the merits of any appointee. As the department’s wisest counsellor

and elder diplomat, Charles McLaughlin was charged with drafting a letter stating the department's position. The result was a direct and blunt letter, softened only somewhat by its elegant style. The President was greatly angered, and a time of arctic cold descended on the department's relations with Morrill Hall.

Eventually the Humphrey appointment was made a roving one. The Vice President and his men agreed that he would be best employed as a one time visitor in on going courses. He even began to warm to his appearances at the University, partly perhaps because the civility of University students was a welcome refuge after the confrontations he endured on the Macalester campus. In his appearance in political science courses, at least, his success as a teacher was mixed. Perhaps it was unreasonable to expect him to forget the events of 1968 and his need to justify his role in them, and it was certainly unrealistic to expect him to shed a senatorial style of long and nostalgic recollections. After less than an academic year the Humphrey venture into the classroom ended.

The residue of bitterness lasted longer. After some negotiations, however, the President and the department resolved to kiss and make up. The President and Mrs. Moos hosted a dinner to reconciliation at Eastcliff, and good relations were largely restored. The Humphrey people in the state remained convinced a good deal longer that the department's opposition to the inappropriate actions of the President masked a more profound antipathy to Humphrey himself.

The Department did not hesitate to speak out on many other issues. Tom Scott's discovery that enrollment projections at the University were based on previous University enrollments, ignoring high school enrollments, led to a memo, a departmental meeting with several vice-presidents and changes in University data gathering.

An even more basic and visible change came to the West Bank as a result of Mulford Sibley's critique of the sterile concrete environment of what was a new campus. After Sibley sharply called attention to the inhuman drabness, one of his suggestions was suddenly and dramatically accepted. Workers with jackhammers carved diamond-shaped holes in the year-old solid concrete, and planted saplings which now grace the area, and at least modify the harsh setting. The Department has proposed the trees be named Sibley Grove to honor his many accomplishments.

## **Conclusion**

The greatest miracle in all of this commitment to the collective enterprise is that the department managed also to improve its image in the discipline. That resulted in part from the success of Minnesota undergraduates and graduates in the profession. Gary Orfield, Herbert Weisberg, and Norman Uphoff, three of the department's first honors graduates in 1963, started a steady stream of Minnesota BA's entering the best graduate programs and eventual success in the profession. Indeed, two BA's from the later 1960s, James Stimson and John Sullivan, eventually joined the Minnesota faculty after graduate work and success elsewhere. But in major part the image improved because of the professional and scholarly visibility of the faculty. For example, in the years 1966 through 1969, the following books appeared: Flanigan's *Political Behavior of the American Electorate*, Eidenberg's *An Act of Congress*, Holt and Turner's *Political Basis of Economic Development* and their book on the parliamentary election in Barons Court, Krislov's *The Negro in Federal Employment* and *The Supreme Court and Political Freedom*, Riggs' *Forging World Order*, Sapin's *Making of U. S. Foreign Policy*, and Sorauf's *Party Politics in America*.

In short, while the late 1960s were years of hard work, they were years in which a new and young faculty discovered and were energized by a number of personal and collective goals. But while the work of rebuilding was hard, even exhausting, only later did the department discover that it really was easier in many ways to build and rebuild than it was, in later years, to consolidate and preserve.

### **THE KRISLOV YEARS, PART I: 1969 1972\***

The first Krislov term was one of consolidation of gains made, and one of selecting new targets from the position of knowing a strong department had been assured from achievements of the previous administrations. The clearest evidence was from the American Council of Education's 1969 ratings that were published indicating the Department was among the top dozen political science programs in the nation.\*' At about the same time a CLA study found students rated political science as the department in the study with faculty most accessible to students.

The Graduate Program became more clearly defined as "the crown jewel" of the department, benefitting from the Ford Grant received in the Sorauf years as well as NSF and NDEA funds. Evolving from past practice and experience, we concentrated on careful evaluation of proposed students, admission of a small number and careful follow up of their achievements. Students were seldom formally dropped from the program but candidly informed early on of our evaluations including our doubts. With strong financial support they could move quickly through the program. We had the second smallest program in the Big Ten, but Minnesota products attracted professional attention in those years, gaining positions at Syracuse, Vanderbilt, NYU, Indiana, Tulane, Wesleyan, and Texas, and creating individual scholarly records. Our number of degrees granted topped programs four and five times larger.

\*Krislov was to serve two separated years as chair and two one year terms as interim chair. These will be treated in sequential fashion.

\*Subsequent ratings by the National Science Foundation accorded us ranking in the top ten departments.

Other "innovations" emphasized our commitment to graduate work. A tradition of austerity was modified when at the request of the graduate students a student lounge was made available. The students had gotten first refusal on furniture discarded from the West Bank Union so no departmental funds were involved, but the discussion on the matter indicated purists thought we were getting soft and losing the hard Minnesota edge. (The department did buy furniture in the later 1970s and this set can be seen in its now tattered shape in Social Science 1450 even today.)

The department also set up a placement function for Ph.D. products which is now duplicated in virtually identical form in all major departments in the profession.

Important additions to the department included Terry Ball, August Nimtz, and Phil Shively. Eugene Eidenberg took leave from the Department to work in the Vice President's office, never to return. He went

to administrative work in universities and HEW, finally serving as Secretary of the Cabinet in the waning Carter years, and is now Vice President of MCI.

Ben Lippincott retired and his party filled the Campus Club, with remarks by Hubert Humphrey and Eric Sevareid intermixed with collegial jibes by Sibley, Chase, McLaughlin and others.

Another personnel development occurred when Enid Schoettle was given tenure, with a two thirds load, an arrangement made possible by the literal wording of the tenure code. We and the Academic Vice President's Office thought we had found a way women faculty could maintain a family situation and have job security. Experience was to demonstrate women overwhelmingly preferred a full time status with its costs even during the early years of child raising and virtually no one in the University has taken advantage of the precedent and still existing possibility.

Another personnel innovation involved the recruitment of Davis Bobrow (then an assistant secretary of Defense), and Ted Marmor from Wisconsin. Both sought joint affiliation with the Department and the Public Affairs School (later the Humphrey Institute). As Bobrow was firmly housed in the Department and Marmor in Public Affairs the matter should have been simple. But the minutes show frequent issues kept bobbing up and wasting departmental time. As a result the Department has continued to view joint appointments with suspicion. (Both Bobrow and Marmor were to leave Minnesota a few years later.)

Several projects involving multiple faculty and students were undertaken largely in this period. The Flanigan/Fogelman project in longitudinal data resulted not only in their own publications, but also that of graduate students most notably Larry Dodd's study of cabinet turnover in Europe. Several undergraduates in the project also went on to scholarly distinction at other schools. The series of empirical manuals published with Little, Brown Publishing were developed by over one third of the faculty and a dozen graduate students. And the *Law and Society Review* used graduate student editors who were to make their mark in the profession generally and an undergraduate staff that almost to a person now practices law in major Twin Cities firms.

The Department also began an era of major contributions to University governance. Charles McLaughlin was the architect of the tenure policies of the University and head of the Judiciary Committee for many years. Krislov was head of the Consultative committee, the Executive Committee of the Senate, and later of the Judiciary Committee. Shively was to serve as head of the Consultative Committee in later years and both he and Gray served in later years as faculty legislative liaison. Frank Sorauf was Vice Chair of the Senate and Harold Chase was a conspicuous faculty leader. This was a tradition of the Department, related to, but different from service in administration. In the 1980s a younger generation, in an era of severe understaffing, criticized such service as diverting effort from the department. By and large that generation has chosen to contribute to the research and curriculum functions of governance but continued to avoid the role of political leadership of the University.

## **THE CHAIRMANSHIP OF THOMAS M. SCOTT**

### **September 1972 to 1975**

The three academic years from 1972 to 1975 were in many ways a time of transition from the years of growth and development just preceding and the years of maintenance and belt tightening lying ahead. Also, there were the beginnings of what were to become important issues in the life of the University of Minnesota although their impact at the time was not always recognized. Finally, they were years of considerable personnel change as faculty were recruited, retained, and resigned.

The refinement and maintenance elements were reflected primarily in considerable attention to both the graduate and undergraduate programs. A committee proposing major revisions in the graduate program, chaired by Professor Roger Benjamin, made its first report in the spring of 1973 and the department continued to discuss and modify the committee's recommendations for several subsequent months indeed until the next major revision took place. The major issues addressed by the program revision included redefinition of the field structure, elimination of the "first year exam," establishment of a first year evaluation system for new students to properly advise them about their prospects in the program, and revisions in the graduate examination system. Subsequent debates about and perennial revisions of these same elements of the graduate program suggest that all issues were not permanently resolved in 1973.

There were at least three other issues of importance to the graduate program during this period. Most significant, perhaps, was the gradual phasing out of support from the Ford Foundation grant which had been so significant in building the program. The department struggled with ways to replace the support for graduate students the grant had provided at the same time the national competition for graduate students was increasing and other institutions were improving their levels of support for new students. It was also a period of some difficulty in graduate student placement; in particular placing the relatively large number of students with Political Theory as their primary strength. And it was becoming almost impossible to place students who had not actually completed all requirements for the Ph.D. All of this signalled the beginning of the end of the boom years for academics and created both internal and external problems.

The department also re evaluated the undergraduate program. In 1973 74 it undertook a thorough analysis of its courses and enrollment patterns and a survey of Senior majors in Political Science. In addition, under the leadership of the Director of Undergraduate Studies, Gary Wynia, it encouraged and supported the establishment of an Undergraduate Political Science Association and provided office space, supplies, and moral support.

Proposals to revise and renew the undergraduate program were brought to the department by a committee chaired by Earl Shaw in the spring of 1974 and debated, amended, and adopted over the next several months. The report was far reaching and dealt with many issues including undergraduate advising, the content of the basic introductory courses, honors or accelerated sections in the introductory courses, training in methods for undergraduates, the departmental Honors Program and the evaluation of honors' students, upper division seminar work, courses on the political behavior of women, and field work courses and internships. In addition the department extended and refined its policy of evaluating all undergraduate courses and their instruction. It is interesting to note that the renewed university wide interest in undergraduate education in the early 1990s includes many of these same issues, especially the quality of undergraduate advising, improved opportunities for better students, and alternative educational experiences including field work and internships. It is also interesting to note that some twenty years

later the university adopted a course evaluation policy not unlike what the department had adopted in the early 1970s.

The department was also interested at this time in improving the teaching capabilities of its graduate students, most of whom follow careers in education. Specifically, it added a seminar on "Teaching Political Science" to the graduate program and adopted a system of "Satellite" courses which permitted advanced graduate students to teach small topics courses to interested undergraduates as satellites or adjuncts to the basic introductory courses.

The period from 1972 to 1975 was also a time when hints of things to come mostly undesirable things were beginning to become evident. One such hint that warned of what turned out to be a short lived crisis was the admonition to turn off radiators in offices to help conserve fuel in the face of the 1973 oil crisis. Eventually, the oil and the radiators were turned back on but the consequences of that and other external events started the university on an unabated downward fiscal spiral. Rumors of a hiring freeze persisted in 1973 and, while they did not materialize at that point, they did affect the department's faculty recruitment strategies. By the spring of 1973 a 30% university wide cut in support for Teaching Assistant lines was implemented. And in the Fall of 1973, the department was asked to submit its first of many retrenchment plans by preparing for either a two percent or a five percent reduction. In the early 1970s there was sufficient flexibility in departmental budgets so that such requests could be managed without doing major damage to departmental programs but as that flexibility was reduced in future years, subsequent retrenchments, and there have been many, have cut much closer to the core of the department's strengths.

Early indications of increased university interest in formalizing procedures and processes (accountability) were evidenced by the requirement that each department prepare and adopt a constitution consistent with university guidelines. The Political Science constitution was developed under the leadership of Charles McLaughlin and was, therefore, virtually without fault. In addition the university established and implemented procedures for monitoring outside consultancies by faculty and in 1975 required the department to establish policies to put its practices in conformity with new federal and state "open files" laws.

Finally, departmental records for this period show hints of the slow but unmistakable advance of the technological age. While the minutes of meetings were still produced on ditto masters, the department did acquire its first Xerox machine in what was both a technological advance and an entrepreneurial godsend the department significantly improved its cash flow for several years by servicing other departments and charging by the page for photocopies. Creature comforts were not ignored the building was retrofitted with air conditioning, and new furnishings for the front offices were acquired. On the other hand the computer age was still in its infancy. The records show that the department acquired three new electric typewriters in 1974 to be distributed to faculty on the basis of seniority and a note in the minutes in late 1972 expressed the frustration with primitive computation technology when a faculty member suggested that the department "trade in its big WANG for several smaller ones."

The early 1970s was also a period of considerable change among the faculty reflecting in part the final stages of the growth period in the 1960s, and the continuing mobility of university faculty across the nation. The department devoted substantial resources, primarily of time and energy, to personnel issues in those years, whether recruiting new faculty or trying to keep those it had. In 1972-73 the department recruited and hired three Assistant or near assistant professors: Virginia Gray in state politics and policy,

Samuel Kernell in presidential politics, and Brian Job in international relations. In addition, there were two major retention cases: Frank Sorauf who chose to stay, and Peter Aronson who decided to leave.

Personnel issues were different but only slightly less hectic in 1973 74. Two major holes in the faculty were created when Professor Harold Chase went across the river to Morrill Hall as Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Professor Frank Sorauf began a five year term as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts. Recruiting that year was limited to replacing the modelling position vacated by Aronson and the department was successful in hiring William Morris. Another addition to the faculty that year was the invitation extended to Peter Magrath, who was voted in as a full member of the department in addition to his other duties as President of the university. (He replaced Malcolm Moos who left to head a think tank in California.) Not surprisingly neither President ever in fact taught a class.

The major retention case for the year involved Davis Bobrow who left to chair the University of Maryland Department and subsequently to be a Dean at the University of Pittsburgh.

Personnel issues in 1974 75 resulted largely in a draw. Professor John Sullivan (a former undergraduate), was recruited from Indiana University, where he had tenure and accepted an offer to join the department and strengthen the department's offerings in political psychology, but Robert Riggs accepted an offer to teach in the Law School at Brigham Young University. On the other hand two important retention cases were resolved satisfactorily when both W. Phillips Shively and Samuel Krislov decided to stay at Minnesota. John Turner was honored as Regents' Professor, beginning in 1974 until his retirement in 1988.

### **THE SECOND KRISLOV CHAIRMANSHIP: 1975 1978**

Tom Scott, who had served so well as chair, was offered the Directorship of the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs in 1975. As this is the core of his research he did not seek a second term. Unfortunately for the Department he has remained in Urban Affairs for two decades, making him available for only one or two courses a year.

The Department then asked Krislov, who had suffered from battle fatigue at the end of his first term, if he would serve again. On sabbatical leave abroad, he accepted more readily than if he had been in day to day service.

This period involved some considerable stringency for CLA and we had to work more strictly in terms of replacement often delayed for years of departing faculty. The need for wide recruitment in the International Relations area, though, was painfully clear since Riggs and Bobrow had left and Enid Schoettle went to the Ford Foundation at first on a leave basis, later permanently. Furthermore, interest in international relations was burgeoning. At both the undergraduate and graduate levels enrollments within the department were on a steep increase, while the international relations major outside the department (but largely staffed and supported by us and the History Department) was on its way to becoming a leading field of study and student major in the college. The LR. faculty therefore did (and do) double duty as advisors and mentors.

All of the faculty actually recruited in this period were in international relations. Bud Duvall and Scott Ross were appointed in 1977 and Martin Sampson in 1978. While Ross left after a few years, Duvall and Sampson have been a core for a high turnover group.

In 1977 we had an outside review, which proved only vaguely helpful. The reviewers thought we were excessively devoted to teaching, and over evaluated each others' work on a year to year basis. We decided they undervalued teaching, but have tried to take a longer range view of individual achievement. They also thought we were too lenient on tenure, particularly recommending that we abandon the granting of tenure at the Assistant Professor level. Almost coincidentally the University had moved from a 4 year probationary period to a 6 year one, so the Department adopted this recommendation as a very prudent measure.

Charles McLaughlin retired and the Department gave him a send off on a Mississippi riverboat. Guests were piped aboard, and later for dinner and remarks, by bagpipes appropriate to saluting The McLaughlin. With virtually no seats available, remarks were blissfully short.

By 1978 things improved financially so that when Sam Kernell went to the University of California and Dick Blue to the U. S. Information Agency, we got quick authorization to replace them. A year's search for those spots was unproductive, however, and the hiring took place in the Holt years.

The more stringent financial situation ended an era in which we hired temporary faculty due to general enrollment pressure and only occasionally when people went on leave. With Chase and Sorauf not available, Roland Pennock from Swarthmore, Bob Seddig from Allegheny College and Harry Stumpf from New Mexico took over our judicial process and Constitutional law offerings. Many visiting international relations scholars also helped fill in the gaps in that program. An arrangement to have Karl Popper visit with us for a quarter as Hill Professor was cancelled at the last moment for health reasons, to everyone's disappointment.

Support for research expenses continued to be an issue for our younger scholars. Computer costs and field research costs particularly impacted on the newer, more empirical fields precisely hurting younger scholars who could least absorb such costs. The Department established a research fund allowing matching expenditures up to \$200.00 or so, but the problem continued to plague the Department and significant steps were to be taken in the Holt, Shively, and Gray terms that followed.

Growing review of promotion and tenure decisions from above were evident in these years. The Department's consideration process and procedures were carefully reappraised and were found remarkably in consonance with those now required at the college and university levels. The timing, however, was changed so that first consideration was moved to a preliminary spring list, arrived at over a year before promotion. This allowed a more thorough file to be developed. Most significantly the outside letters of evaluation by scholars in the field, which were now routinely required by the college, became available to those voting on tenure or promotion in the department, adding an outside perspective that previously had been sought only in controversial cases. The procedures adopted in 1978 have (with tiny changes required from above or dictated by experience) served well to this writing.

## **ACADEMIC YEARS 1978-79 THROUGH 1980-81 ROBERT HOLT, CHAIR**

When Robert Holt became Chair of the Department it was becoming apparent that certain features of University decision making had changed quite radically. First, Retrenchment and Reallocation (under whatever name) which had been to the University what revolution was to Thomas Jefferson a healthy thing to experience every generation or so became what revolution was to Trotsky a permanent feature of the social order. Second, the Rajender case took the issue of gender equality in hiring out of the realm of rhetoric and put it into the arena of court monitored procedures. In doing so it fundamentally altered the University's affirmative action program. Totally independent of these two changes, the revolution in data processing and in symbol manipulation not only changed the way in which political scientists did their business, it also changed what they could reasonably do. The Department tried to react to this changing environment in a number of ways.

### **Retrenchment and Reallocation**

With the prospect of a budget in which expenditures were projected to exceed income, a decree came down from central administration that all the colleges should be taxed, but, in an effort to stimulate optimism (if not wishful thinking) the total tax would exceed the budget shortfall and thus funds would be available for reallocation. What turned out to be the time honored criteria of R & R headed by quality, centrality, and comparative advantage filtered down from on high through the Dean's office to the Departments. The department's initial response was one of calm and deliberation. It produced the required documents that showed beyond the shadow of the doubt of any reasonable person, that on those criteria the department really deserved to make out quite well perhaps even a little reallocation. The reality of the process, of course, had little to do with these criteria and much to do with identifying departments that had money that was not tied up in long term commitments. These tended to be the better managed departments. This practice was compounded with a new policy, namely, "transfer of effort."

Departments which had been cooperative in having colleagues teach in other units were to be required to contribute such service without reimbursement. Political Science participated in American Studies, African Studies, the International Relations program and Women's Studies. All our specialty programs (Russian Studies, Scandinavian Studies, etc.) wanted Political Scientists. If our personnel was to be drained off and we could not count on funds to staff the courses vacated, our own curriculum was at risk. The combination was not good for Political Science

It was clear that there was a need for resources that were not subject to retrenchment. Gifts and increased research grants would provide a partial answer. Ben Lippincott was approached and made a substantial gift to establish the Lippincott Chair in Political Economy (the first recipient of which was Mancur Olson) and another gift to fix up and decorate a conference and meeting room.

A fund was also established to provide summer support for those wishing to prepare a research proposal. This proved not to be too productive and was dropped, relying on the University's existing reasonably generous program.

## **The Rajender Case**

The consent decree on the Rajender case led to one claim against the Department. JoAnne Arnaud made clear her intent to present her case to the Special Masters during these years, although the actual case was heard later. The cynicism, however, began to set in. No one in the Department who was familiar with the events in question believed that there had been any discrimination on the basis of gender whatsoever.

## **Word Processing and Office Management**

During these years the department purchased its first word processor (\$20,000) with some opposition from members who felt that it would lead to too much publishing and the laying off of clerical help. Neither happened and very quickly the demand for time on the machine required the introduction of a rationing system. The long term problem was solved by the advent of the word processing PC. A proposal to acquire a card reading terminal to interface with the university's central computer was not deemed to be wise.

More significant than the new equipment was the change in the organization of the front office. One person became essentially an administrative assistant with explicit supervisory responsibility and the secretarial staff was oriented in the direction of providing more support to faculty. Ten years later there was an administrative assistant, an accountant, three secretaries, a department computer network and a computer lab. Furthermore, each of the secretaries specializes: an undergraduate secretary, graduate secretary, and manuscript/word processing secretary with all pitching in on other assignments.

Another important aspect was that the new equipment meant manuscripts could be largely handled in house. Most faculty prepared a disk which a secretary could transform into a corrected and more attractive manuscript. This was an important (but very partial) alleviation of the growing cost of research noted earlier.

## **Other Points of Interest**

A simple exchange of faculty with the University of Oslo was worked out as a more continuous one by Holt when he taught there in 1978. This provided us with interesting scholars from one of the strongholds of political science in Europe as well as good opportunities for faculty like Gray and Turner and Fogelman who taught there over the years. It also provided a model for our current exchange program in Turkey.

## **Personnel**

Dennis Simon, Susan Burke Olson, Bruce Berkowitz and John Aldrich were hired during this period. All left after brief years with us as did Terry Hopmann who had been a stalwart in the department for a long period. Hopmann had served as Harold Stassen Professor in the Humphrey School, so his loss opened up multiple gaps.

## Curriculum

The outside review committee had been specifically asked to look at the undergraduate program and had little helpful to suggest. Both it and the internal review committee suggested we build on and expand the “hard” social science graduate program beginnings we had created. John Aldrich was to help move us in the direction, as did the addition of John Freeman, subsequently.

The department at this time began to discuss (and even weakly implement) a move toward core field courses which it later embraced in part out of a sense of scarce resources. Those discussions were probably the most fruitful result of the 1977 review.

### **THE SHIVELY YEARS: 1981 to 1984**

The period of Shively’s chairship saw a continuation of the general modernization of departmental support and operations that had been going on under Bob Holt. At the beginning of the period, there was only a computer in one faculty office. By 1984, most faculty had computers on their desks, and the department had a computer laboratory with permanent staff. The Benjamin Evans Lippincott Room was opened, and the Vernie Wolfsberg scholarship and Harold Chase fellowship were established. The Lippincott Professorship/symposium was initiated, with Mancur Olson as first holder of the chair in 1982, and a symposium in 1984 featuring David Cameron, Peter Katzenstein, Robert Keohane, James Kurth, Charles Kindleberger, and Theda Skocpol.

The department suffered a serious loss with Harold Chase’s sudden death in 1981. Hal had been an extraordinarily effective teacher at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. A civil libertarian, and a highly decorated Marine Corps General and war hero, he had from time to time brought his strict code of honor and ethics to bear on issues both in the department and the University. He was our conscience, and always on the side of decency, fairness, and humanity.

In the normal regeneration that matches loss, for strong units, the department also was fortunate to attract two very talented new members during this period: Mary Dietz and John Freeman, both of whom would prove unusually valuable in later years. We have spoken here of the department’s “modernization”, but of course the University itself was also in need of much modernization at the time, probably more than the department, as is illustrated by an amusing incident in the hiring of John Freeman. John’s hiring was not fully settled until quite late in the spring of 1984, and by that time he and his family had arranged their affairs for the summer according to the pay schedule at MIT, where he was then teaching. MIT spread faculty salaries across twelve months, and John asked if for his first year only, his Minnesota salary could be spread over twelve months. After long negotiations with central administration this was arranged, but the end solution was that Vice President Ken Keller would physically walk down the hall and stand behind staff while they wrote the contract. The staff apparently resented deeply making this breach with normal procedures, and would only comply in response to a direct, personal order.

In the same vein, in 1984 the department initiated a newsletter to alumni. It turned out that the University alumni office was unable to identify political science graduates for us (this situation has since improved), so the department was reduced to generating a list of graduates by having an assistant dig through old grade books. The new world was beckoning us, but getting there proved difficult at times!

A major distraction in 1981 was a case brought by Joanne Arnaud, who filed a complaint of gender discrimination with Special Masters of the Court, who had been set up under a consent decree in the Rajender class action suit about gender discrimination at the University. Ms. Arnaud had been an adjunct member of the department, had been interviewed by the department for two tenure track positions, but had not been offered such a position. Though her charge of discrimination was eventually rejected by the Special Master as without basis, the suit tied up the department, and especially the chair, for much of the 1981-1982 year.

Probably the dominant theme of this few years was a set of related pressures on the department, and the department's attempts to deal with them, that had much to do with our move into modernity. We had long worked with fewer faculty, relative to large undergraduate enrollments, than our peer departments around the country. We had also always considered ourselves a "triple threat" department, aiming to excel at scholarship, undergraduate teaching and University service: The last of these had always put an additional strain on our resources, as various members had been seconded over to the College or to central administration for administrative duties.

Past generations in the department had absorbed the pressures implied in all this, but in the early 1980s this proved more and more difficult. Society had changed, and most faculty if they were married were now involved in two career families; competition for research support nationally had increased; tenure expectations in scholarship, teaching and service had increased; and above all, the amount of documentation and "seat time" required for the conduct of University business had increased. (The Arnaud case is just one example of the last of these.) Finally, in 1983 the department's already-large undergraduate enrollments also surged; at its height, the *average* enrollment in all political science undergraduate classes, including 5000 level courses and honors seminars, was over a hundred. Whatever of these forces was at work, the department underwent a period of ferment that ultimately proved productive, but involved a certain amount of tension as well.

The most obvious response to the pressures was a spate of outside offers and retention cases. At one point in the winter of 1983, five members of the department were simultaneously considering very attractive offers, and there were others in the air at the same time that never reached that stage of formality. Vice president Keller met with the department that spring to discuss the "crisis in the political science department". Most notably, several young members of the department, concerned about the department's general support for scholarship (both logistical and normative), formed the C.R.A.P. Group to press the department for greater attention and support for research. The acronym stood for Computer Rebels Against Paying, a reference to the lack of personal computers, and the charges for mainframe use. The group consisted of John Aldrich, Bruce Berkowitz, Bud Duvall, Virginia Gray, Brian Job, Dennis Simon, and John Sullivan.

Though as has been noted, discussion of these problems was not without moments of heat, the department was moved to institute a number of changes, and also sought and received substantial help from the College to meet our needs. Though the situation was certainly not perfect, by 1984 we had moved from a situation in which the expectation was that faculty would substantially pay the costs of their research out of their own resources, to one in which the expectation was that the department and University would support faculty in their research work. Specific changes in 1983 were:

- We obtained funding for a computer laboratory for the department similar to those in other social sciences departments. Bob Hammarberg was appointed as manager/consultant with departmental funds.

- In a University wide competition, the department was allotted money for a few personal computers for faculty offices the beginning of what would be a general outfitting of the department over the next few years.

- The department altered the formula for paying for incidental research costs. The formula was changed, with no upper limit, but requiring approval for major costs.

- The department initiated an experiment (since discontinued) of having members volunteer to teach an extra course for additional pay (at or above what extension offered), and using the extra courses that were generated by this to offer members who were engaged in research projects one course reductions in their teaching.

- The department initiated a program of very selective “bunching” allowing members, on application to the chair and for specific purposes, to cluster their teaching into two of the three quarters. This, too, has been discontinued, under conditions of current stringency.

- In light of the strain of student enrollments on a limited faculty and also because, as it turned out, we were already requiring quite substantial amounts of writing in our regular courses -the College exempted the department from requiring a major “senior project” of its majors.

None of these steps solved the basic problem, shared by all CLA departments, of a very small faculty relative to our student numbers. But the set of shifts did mark the transition from an era in which faculty were expected to “give at the office”, to one in which it was expected that they would be supported by the department and the University in doing their work.

### **VIRGINIA GRAY AS CHAIR: 1985 to 1988**

In 1985 the department selected its first female chair, Virginia Gray. This transition occurred smoothly, in part because the incumbent Phil Shively, anticipating the need for a generic title, had called himself “chair” rather than the then customary “chairman”.

Because Gray had already arranged a sabbatical exchange in Oslo, Krislov agreed to serve as interim chair, for 1985 1986. Kaare Strom was recruited from Michigan State University to replace Roger Benjamin, who moved first to Associate Dean of CLA and later to Academic Vice President of the University of Pittsburgh.

In the first year of Gray’s tenure the Humphrey Institute moved to new quarters, allowing the department to acquire the entire 12th floor of the Social Sciences Building. This new space allowed larger faculty offices, the consolidation of all TA offices into floors 12 14, an office for retired professors, the expansion of the computer lab, and the opening of a departmental library/reading room. The lab proved to be especially popular with grad students, who soon occupied it day and night. The main office became fully computerized, and most faculty members obtained micro computers for their offices, dramatically changing their work habits.

With respect to other resources the department obtained several new endowments as a result of the University’s Capital Campaign during Ken Keller’s administration. The department received a generous gift from Curtis Carlson, an endowed chair named in honor of his wife, Arleen, whom he met in a political

science class at the University in the 1930s. This chair was earmarked for American politics and was first occupied by Jim Stimson. Similarly, the department was the recipient of the Harold Stassen Chair, honoring Minnesota's perennial political candidate. This chair, shared with the Humphrey Institute, was earmarked for international relations and proved to be very difficult to fill on a permanent basis. Other funds were donated for a variety of purposes, most notably a graduate fellowship in memory of colleague Hal Chase.

A major change occurred in the graduate curriculum during 1987-88 when the core seminars were introduced. These are broad survey courses in each field, from which the student is required to take three. Research seminars were introduced in which students worked intensively on research rather than reading the literature. Accompanying the new curriculum was a change in the exam structure in order to provide more flexibility. Instead of examining in three narrow subfields based on specific sets of courses, the student now examines in two broad fields after taking any courses within those fields and after mastering a reading list of the classics. This change allowed more variety in course offerings from year to year. Generally, the "new curriculum", which looked curiously like the graduate curriculum around the country in the mid 1960s, worked well.

Overshadowing these positive changes, however, was a major loss of personnel: during 1985-88 seven colleagues, many of whom had already physically departed via leaves, tendered their resignations (Bob Eyestone, Terry Hopmann, Gary Wynia, Dennis Simon, Susan Olson, John Aldrich, and Bruce Berkowitz) and one, John Turner, retired. To make matters worse, five other colleagues (Bob Holt, Brian Job, Tom Scott, Robert Kvavik and Roger Benjamin) were occupied in administrative posts, leaving only 19.5 persons in the department in 1986, compared to 30 people in the mid 1970s. Morale was understandably low, as these nineteen people had to cope with the undergraduate teaching responsibilities, carry on the graduate program, and staff all the administrative tasks in the department.

Energy seemed to be at a particularly low ebb when it came to the perennial recruiting of new colleagues. The department's poet laureate captured the lassitude displayed while listening to prospective colleagues:

*In the Arms of Morpheus*  
The speaker plods,  
Shively nods.  
Backstrom sleeps,  
And Ed hits the hay--  
Candidate x has scored a triple play.

By 1988 a considerable amount of soul searching went on about the orientation of the department and its future in the discipline. An outside review assisted in clarifying these issues and setting a new course for the department that would be implemented under the next chair's (Ed Fogelman's) direction. Also the arrival of new colleagues helped a great deal: first Kaare Strom, and then Jack Levy, Kathryn Sikkink, Steve Smith, and David Sylvan. Although some of these people did not stay long, they all provided much needed vitality; Smith and Sikkink formed the nucleus of a new generation that did stay.

In the midst of these pressures the department continued its strong tradition of quality undergraduate teaching. Four colleagues won college or university teaching awards: Martin Sampson, Raymond Duvall, Charles Walcott, and Brian Job and Charles Backstrom won a University award for advising. The program

was also enriched by continuing the faculty exchange with the University of Oslo and beginning an exchange with Bogazici University in Istanbul, Turkey.

Gray initiated a new lectureship, inviting a visit and presentation by a distinguished Ph.D. on a topic of his or her choice. Through the years this has renewed our contacts with graduate alumni, and hopefully provided a role model for current students. A list of the lecturers is to be found in Appendix II.

In 1988, a new outside evaluation committee, a very experienced one, shocked the administration by describing our situation as the most understaffed program any of them had seen or heard. While understaffing was characteristic of most Minnesota (and all CLA) departments, the outside report was emphatic and helpful to us in this and many other ways. The college leadership set goals for the revitalization of the Department as a result: While financial exigencies have both prevented full realization of those goals, and slowed down the rate of recouping of strength, successive CLA Deans have worked constructively to bring us back to something approximating our earlier size.

### **THE FOGELMAN YEARS: 1988 to 1995**

When Edwin Fogelman became chair the Department had experienced unprecedented losses in personnel. The last year of Gray's term had demonstrated the department could still recruit very well. But it seemed that the quality of the faculty continued to attract outside offers in numbers well beyond our previous experience. The chair accepted this in good humor posting a small sign on his door:

#### **Retention Capital of the Upper Midwest**

- No offer too large or too small
- Every offer carefully considered
- No reasonable offer refused
- Service day and night

While we lost some--Shaw and Walcott departed--retention was mainly successful--Shively, Krislov, Sullivan, Dietz, Gray and Freeman and later Smith were retained. Complicating the picture, however, was the quick departure of several recent recruits: Strom, Levy and Sylvan.

Ultimately fiscal problems at universities slowed the pace of those outside offers and allowed the Department to better deal with them. The silver lining in the departures many were felt deeply -was that the department emerged with a reasonable age distribution at a time when most faculties are badly aging and this bodes well for the future.

Recruitment in the International field -- a seeming sisyphian task -- brought Ido Oren, Jeff Legro and later Richard Price to the department. Together with some teaching commitments by Diana Richards, our new modeler (who replaced Americanist Modeler John Aldrich), this brought some welcome, badly needed faculty time into an area where students had been straining our capacities for years.

The other area which was badly in need of rebuilding was comparative government. After many years of distinguished service as Dean of the Graduate School, Bob Holt did return to the department in 1991. But Kvavik continued to serve as Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Benjamin who returned to the University for a brief period as Vice President and to the department for a brief two years of

teaching, left to head two divisions at the Rand think tank in California. Turner's retirement and Strom's departure also weakened the field. Recruitment of Evelyn Davidheiser and Dan Kelliher and Kathryn Sikkink were significant, but our coverage of "areas" remained circumscribed for a major department and even in comparison with former years.

An area the department was able to expand was political philosophy. It had a strong tradition with such figures as Sibley and Lippincott and a core of excellent scholar teachers. In addition to Terry Ball, Edwin Fogelman, and Mary Dietz, we recruited James Farr from the University of Wisconsin Madison and Lisa Disch, a young scholar trained at Rutgers. Like international relations this area has been a magnet for excellent prospective graduate students across the country.

After achieving relative stability in the crucial personnel situation, Fogelman was persuaded to serve a second consecutive term as chair. Wisely, he took sabbatical to catch his breath and Krislov served as interim chair for a year. We were able during that year to recruit James Stimson, chair of the Iowa department and a Minnesota undergraduate, to occupy the Carlson Chair as well as to recruit Legro and Richards.

The department continued to amass teaching awards. Ball, Dietz, Farr, Freeman, Duvall, Nimtz, Shively, and Sullivan all were honored. John Sullivan and Terence Ball were selected as Scholars of the College. Among our younger scholars Sikkink, Jacobs, and Richards received McKnight Professorships, John Freeman, received awards for a book on trade policy from the APSA. So did Kevin McGuire, a young judicial scholar recruited in the Fogelman years to replace Susan Olson in the judicial area. Research money from the outside was relatively high and helped cushion the problems generated by the University and state's fiscal problems.

Several Lippincott conferences brought a wide variety of speakers to the campus as did the MacArthur Foundation program which also provided support for graduate students. The graduate program continued to be highly successful, and the percent of applicants accepting our offers increased dramatically in recent years. Bill Flanigan served as DOGS several different terms during the Gray Fogelman years and together with Mary Dietz and Bud Duvall made the new program probably the most approved (by both faculty and student acceptance) we have had.

Anne Hopkins joined the administration as Vice President and Provost and was voted a member of the department. In 1995 she departed the University for another administrative position. Following a reorganization of responsibilities, Phil Shively accepted an appointment as Provost for Arts, Sciences and Engineering, strengthening the University but leaving a gap in the department's Comparative Politics program. Paul Light of the Humphrey Institute was also voted a full member, a rare development. He teaches one course a year in the department and has proven a valued colleague in other ways.

In 1991 Frank Sorauf was honored as Regents' Professor and later was also elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Jim Stimson was selected to be a Fellow of the Institute for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, the third member of the department so invited. Virginia Gray served as NSF Visiting Professor at North Carolina during this period.

The department continued to attract research funds, particularly from the prestigious National Science Foundation, the Social Science Research Council (SSRC), and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Fogelman spearheaded a college curriculum innovation grant from the Ford Foundation which involved a half dozen CLA departments. Research productivity once involving perhaps a third of the faculty now has become as it should be -universal and taken for granted. Our graduate students have in a difficult time for academics truly distinguished themselves in the field. Minnesota Ph.D.s now hold positions at the University of California (Berkeley), Yale, Wisconsin, Indiana, North Carolina and Stanford among leading programs in the U.S. We are equally proud of others at institutions like Stony Brook, Wesleyan, Florida, Florida State, Colorado, Syracuse, as well as Minnesota colleges and universities who have also made national reputations for themselves. That many of them also garner distinguished professorships and teaching awards is part of our sense of having fulfilled a major mission.

Members of the faculty played a key role in developing and supporting a variety of interdisciplinary programs and centers. Mary Dietz and Lisa Disch taught regularly in the Women's Studies Program. August Nimtz continued as a mainstay of the African and Afro American Studies Department. Terry Ball developed and team taught a series of interdisciplinary courses on environmental issues. John Sullivan initiated a Ph.D. Minor in Political Psychology as well as a Political Psychology Research Center. Bob Holt and John Freeman launched a parallel Ph.D. Minor and Research Center in Political Economy. Ed Fogelman was a cofounder and then Codirector of the Center for Democracy and Citizenship in the Humphrey Institute, with which Jim Farr was also affiliated. Bud Duvall helped to develop a Ph.D. Minor in Development Studies and Social Change and to expand the MacArthur Program into an inter university research and training program with Stanford and the University of Wisconsin.

Through these and other inter disciplinary, intercollegiate activities the faculty exercised an intellectual and pedagogical leadership extending throughout the University. This leadership was reflected in the numerous awards garnered by members of the department both within the University and in national competitions.

Within the department, Steve Smith spearheaded a reorganization of the introductory American Government course into a "Super America" class, combining a large lecture section taught by regular faculty with political analysis labs directed by advanced graduate students. Other faculty members, including Jim Farr, John Freeman, Phil Shively, and John Sullivan, developed innovative curricula and programs for high schools and colleges which received national attention. Again, the faculty was at the forefront of significant initiatives in research and teaching.

During a time of far reaching and often disturbing changes in higher education, which also affected Minnesota, the department sought to preserve its traditional strengths - a distinguished and creative faculty, an outstanding graduate program, a dedication to undergraduate education, an active involvement in the life of the University and the larger community. How well we maintain these strengths is our main challenge in an uncertain future.

# APPENDIX I

## Distinguished Graduate Award

1984	Malcolm Feeley
1985	Don Moon
1986	Nancy Zingale
1987	Larry Dodd
1988	Terry Moe
1989	Pamela Conover
1990	Tom Patterson
1991	Russell Hanson
1992	John Chubb
1993	Kathy Ferguson
1994	Stanley Feldman

## APPENDIX II

### Charles McLaughlin Lectures

1979

Professor Emeritus Charles H. McLaughlin, “National Interests and the International Law of the Sea”

1980

Mr. Thomas Hughes, “The Crack Up: Collective Irresponsibility and American Foreign Policy”

1981

Mr. L. Bruce Laingen, “Immunity and Diplomats: Lessons from the Hostage Crisis”

1982

Professor Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “Can We Control Nuclear Arms?”

1984

Professor Werner Levi, “The Politics of International Law”

1985

Professor Shabtai Rosenne, “The Changing Role of the World Court”

1986

Mr. Charles William Maynes, “In the Era of Gramm Rudman Should the United Nations Be Saved?”

1987

Professor Richard A. Falk, “From Nuremburg to Nicaragua: Reflections on U.S. Defiance of the World Court”

1988

Professor Einar Vetvik, “Developing International Legal Standards for Religious Liberty: Historical Background and Present Problems”

1991

Professor Oran Young, “Global Environmental Change: The Human Dimension”

1992

Sir Brian Urquhart, “Is World Peace a Dream?”