

**Viki Sand
Narrator**

**Lucile Kane, Rhoda Gilman and James E. Fogerty
Minnesota Historical Society
Interviewers**

July 12, 1993

**Edward C. Gale Room
Minnesota History Center
Saint Paul, Minnesota**

LK: Viki, the girl from the Valley. We would like you to tell us a bit about your parents, where you were born, when you were born—the setting for the girl from the Valley.

VS: I've thought about everything having to do with the Historical Society, except that question.
[Laughter]

I know this by heart. I was born in Fargo, North Dakota. My family essentially is from northwestern Minnesota—Clay County and Becker County. Both of my mother's parents were orphans and my father's family moved from Iowa.

One of the interesting things about this trip is that this is the first trip back to Fargo for me since my grandmother died—for the whole family. So we are all gathering to continue the whole legacy of close extended family. At one point, I think, all of my cousins and aunts and uncles on both sides of my family lived within fifty miles [of each other.] And so it was all about that.

I graduated from Fargo Central High School in 1963. Actually the thing that got me to the Minnesota Historical Society, and probably everywhere else, is the fact that when I was a junior in high school, I won a trip to the UN [United Nations]. When you grow up in a clan like I did, with all of its values and structure and the kind of security that that brings, to push the edges of that isn't always so easy. It doesn't seem to be. But for me it was never an option. I always thought I would play second base for the [New York] Yankees. It was always about [leaving]—I never thought that I would stay there.

That trip was sponsored by the Rebekahs and the Odd Fellows, and it went to the UN. And it was a week in Canada—Ottawa, Montreal, Quebec City—then down into New York, Vermont. We stopped at Hyde Park of course, at the Vanderbilt Mansion and the Roosevelt House. Then a week in New York, which was just unbelievable for a junior in high school. I am so envious of kids who now, you know, have European exchanges and going and doing all of that. Somehow I could never just figure out how to do that. I think that would have been too hard. I wouldn't have known how to

do that.

So we were a week in New York—at the UN. Everything was possible in the early 1960s, and every ideal was possible. Then I went to Moorhead State College. Everybody I knew in high school was going to University of North Dakota or NDSU [North Dakota State University]. I think something like forty-five or fifty percent of the class went to college. I don't know if that's high or low, but it seemed high at the time. But I went to Moorhead. And I went because I had a friend, Gerald Appolatto, who has since died, but who taught English and was a Shakespeare scholar and was from New York. He was giving a talk on the Theatre of the Absurd.

John Neumaier, who was president of Moorhead State College, and who was like this extraordinary person who was so sophisticated and didn't speak with a Swedish or Scandinavian, or generally Scandinavian, accent. He said things like "When you go off to college..." I remember this convocation—actually that was later. But what the point was, "Read the *New York Times*. Sometime before you are done, just read the *New York Times*." Because he knew who we all were. We were all of the same agenda, people who had left—parents who had left—farms. I mean, aside from the professional core class of the Fargo-Moorhead area with all the colleges and universities and medical centers and all that stuff. For all the rest of us, we were... I was the second kid in my family to go to college. It was like "Wow! It's all out there."

So then I came down here [to the Twin Cities]. I was married at the time. My background was history and political science and Neil Thompson was my advisor. Neil then wrote the Capitol history book, [*Minnesota's State Capitol : the art and politics of a public building*], which was wonderful and we maintained contact. I take some pride in his doing that. But we just stayed in touch the whole time because they had switched and lived in St. Cloud. So I'd stop by as I'd make my trek [from Moorhead to St. Paul].

I was married at the time to Tom Sand, who now, I think, works with the [Minnesota] State Senate. But at that point, we moved down here. It was 1967. I had graduated from college. We graduated from college one Saturday and got married the next and were in St. Paul two weeks later. He was working for St. Paul Civil Defense and I didn't have a job and it was the glorious Sixties. Is this going on too long?

RG: No.

VS: It was the glorious Sixties and so there wasn't a concern about whether or not you could get a job. It was where would you get it and what would you do? [Laughter] Somehow life was clearer—economic life, anyway. So I went to the Minnesota State Employment Office and the [Minnesota] Historical Society—this must have been in July or early August, sometime in there—and the Society had just posted the job, "Educational Supervisor." You had to have a teaching degree, a B.S. in history, and that's all it said.

So I applied, I came up. I can't remember exactly, but I remember going to the Library of the

Society before I talked to anybody and there was a [copy of the] *Gopher Historian* there, and I saw this name that I knew I couldn't pronounce—Hermina Poatgieter—as the editor of this. And I said, “Well, I'll learn how to spell it!” [Laughter]

I remember talking with Helen White and Bob Wheeler and Hermina—I must have talked to Hermina, but I don't remember that so much. I don't remember talking to Russell [Fridley]. And because the job had just been posted they said to call back in a month. So I called back in a month. I don't think the Society necessarily knew what it was looking for, exactly, but I called back in a month, and Vivian Swanson looked at my file and said, “Well, there's a note at the top here that says you took another job and aren't interested.”

“No,” I said, “that's not true.” So then I came back and I interviewed again and sort of went through the whole process because it wasn't finished. But I talked with Bob Wheeler and he said, “We've offered the job to another person.” I said “Fine.”

At that point I was enrolled in graduate school at [the University of] Minnesota because, it seemed to me, when you can't find work, go to school. [Laughter] I had some kind of typing job for the Department of Education. Then the [Burbank-Livingston] Griggs house was purchased, and in the St. Paul paper there was this photograph of the Griggs house. Tom and I were looking for a place [to live], and I decided I'll just call and say—this must have been two or three weeks later, I said, “Why don't we just call and see if there's a carriage house?” You know, do something like that. So Bob Wheeler gets on the phone and says, “I think there has been a mistake,” or “We haven't filled it [the education job],” or something like that, and “Won't you come back again?” So I did another round of interviews. All of this was like within a six-week period, and then I was offered the job.

I pursued, on numerous occasions, with John Wood, who is the only person who I knew could possibly tell me the truth about this story. This is all conjecture on my part. John had come to the Society about six months before, I think about the same time that Lila [Johnson Goff] had come. What I understood was that the man who was the director at the Olmstead County Historical Society—whose name I can't remember at this point—was probably Bob Wheeler's favorite person [for the job]. And I suspect to some degree what John responded to, and as John was making his observations and establishing his position and what he would be doing here, that in fact... I mean, I'd like to think that he thought that I was a good candidate for it [the job], and that there were things that appealed to him about who I was and what I represented. When you don't know what you're doing, when you don't know exactly what kind of program... I think it might have been something of a little bit of a power play there, because I don't think I would have gotten the job if that wouldn't have happened. I never got John to tell me. I could never get him to tell me.

LK: Helen White was a strong advocate, too. You had an interview, and Bob came into my office and said, “I like Viki. She has passion!”

VS: I have to tell you, that's why I think I was hired. I absolutely loved history. I think it was like... College for me was like the most extraordinary time. It was the best. So I loved history and I loved

the idea of the educational component of it. While I didn't get a teaching degree to teach particularly, that framework of thinking, that sort of missionary quality, I think, was there, and that I knew how to organize things. I had been president of the Student Senate [at Moorhead State], and Snow Week chairman and Homecoming chairman. So I knew how to do all that stuff. So I think that it was those two things, and that the Society probably didn't know exactly what it wanted in very complete terms.

LK: Yes. They were ready for a change in the program.

RG: I wondered, was it at that time—I seem to recall that you had a lot of political connections and were very interested in politics. Was it then, or later, that you were active in the campaign of Nick Coleman for the nomination for governor?

VS: What happened was when we got down here—Tom and I were Republicans. I was president of the Teenage Republicans in Cass County [North Dakota], and had had an opportunity to go to Washington [D.C.] to work for Mark Andrews. But my parents wouldn't—I needed \$78 for the bus ticket and they just didn't like that idea. That was the moment I decided that it was time for me to take responsibility for my own life.

Anyway, we were both Republicans. We came down here, and Tom went to work in the [Minnesota Senator Eugene] McCarthy movement, and we nearly had a divorce then—two months into it—because politics for me is not a casual discussion. [Laughter] The notion that I was all of a sudden living with a Democrat seemed almost more than I could bear. We had no money because I had no job, and we borrowed against his [Tom's] insurance policy to pay some bills. It wasn't a big deal.

One of the checks he wrote was for \$100 to go to a McCarthy fundraiser at the Connolly's—Carol and John Connolly's house. So here we are, twenty-one- and twenty-four-year-old kids, showing up at this hundred-dollar affair. Even these days a hundred-dollar fundraiser is different than a five-dollar fundraiser. So, we go and we are instantly in the midst of the McCarthy movement—campaign—the anti-war movement. It wasn't the McCarthy campaign, it was just the anti-war movement. And McCarthy was there and there were like thirty-five, forty people. There was the whole array of people who were in that.

Tom then started to do the newsletter for the anti-war movement. We were just hanging out, like center circle, you know, of the anti-war campaign in Minnesota. Carol Connolly told me later that she thought that it was my family that had money. [Laughter] They were sure that that was true. Anyway, we ended up in the middle of it. Then when I started at the Society, Lila and I shared an office. Lila had worked back in Publications, and [I wonder] how June [Holmquist] stood it—I'm not sure she did—but how she stood it, with us sitting back there. Well, it was an extraordinary act of patience. [Laughter] She was very serious. We couldn't talk to her about a lot of stuff.

Lila had been in the Sandy Keith campaign against [Karl] Rolvaag and all of that. Tom and I and Lila and Bob Goff became very close friends, and Tom went to work for Nick Coleman in his

advertising agency. We started right then. At that point, you couldn't run for another office, if you had been a part of the legislature that raised the money. So the first campaign of that campaign—and it would have excluded Wendell Anderson and Nick Coleman and everybody else—was that we had to pass the “best man” amendment—which was called, of course, the Best Man Amendment. In 1969, I think. It was the anti-war movement and then Nick Coleman's campaign. We just did that for two-and-a-half years. It was very exciting. It was extraordinary. It was all by luck to have ended up sort of playing in this arena, and all you have is passion and energy.

It's interesting to listen to the discussions about [President Bill] Clinton's staff. I do agree that they need somebody that is probably older than twelve, but that is what political campaigns are—it's energy and passion. And who has it? Well, you've got to be young, otherwise you'd be dead. Literally. So that's what we did.

Some of what happened during my time at the Society was really breaks—in an interesting way—in terms of that initial period, those three years. Then Coleman's campaign lost, and that in itself was sort of one.

I remember introducing you to George Latimer one time. He wanted to be the head of the St. Paul School Board. He had been involved in politics. I just sort of felt that I was stirring up all this stuff and just by accident I was out there. I was so excited about the Society and engaged in what that was doing. And because of what I perceived my job as being, it was very easy to say to people like Carol Connolly, “Carol, you have to keep all of your records. All of that anti-war stuff, you've got to save it.” I'm sure that she's given a lot of that. With Bob Goff involved and Nick Coleman, plus all of what John and Russell were doing with the Legislature. It seems to me that the Society, in an interesting way, was a focal point in a way that it might not have been before. I don't know the earlier history, but there were social connections and professional connections that were—

LK: Interesting introduction of new staff member bringing this type of contact and interest right with it.

VS: Yes, it really was. Then the women's political caucus—

RG: [You] helped organize.

VS: It just seemed like it all fit together, that everything was the same. Life seemed integrated.

LK: Yes. What was your first reaction when you walked into that building, or had you visited the Historical Society before?

VS: No. I didn't know what a historical society did. You have to understand, Fargo has a lot of things that set people up to live a good life, but museums aren't one of them. Historical societies certainly weren't a part of my framework. The first museum I ever went to—I went with a friend, I was a junior in college—and went to the Walker Art Center. I saw an exhibition of George Segal

and those wonderful white plaster casts, and there was one sitting at the bar, the soda fountain. I have since met him—in Soho in New York—on the street, actually, because I was with someone who knew him. I said, “I know you don’t need to hear this. I know that this sounds like I am twelve years old, but I so loved your work.” Fortunately artists always like hear to that, no matter how naive the comment.

LK: Yes.

VS: It was like a whole new world. The thing about this, I couldn’t believe it. I just couldn’t believe what it was like. Because it was like everything. It was really an entree—that’s the wrong word. It’s like it all just opened up. I mean I don’t think I ever walked up the front steps [of the Minnesota Historical Society], or downstairs, without saying “Holy Toledo! I work here!” It was really extraordinary.

LK: And we get so used to historical societies we forget that it was an unusual concept to bring together museums and libraries and publishing and the whole works in one institution.

VS: Exactly. I think that since I have been on the East Coast, I have come to realize museums and historical agencies work in different ways. Here, I think, it really is an extraordinary center. I think great strength comes from... There is a real role for historical societies in the broadest definition—in the definition of what that means. I think that’s beyond museums, beyond libraries. It seems to me, as I always interpreted it, the Historical Society was about all the history of all the people in this place.

LK: Yes.

VS: That’s it. The way I understood my job, I really did approach it this way—that sort of education background training, that sort of stuff, was that it was my job—mine and the Education Department’s job. But for a couple years it was my job to listen to Nina [Archabal] and to try to do “good.” But here were these great collections. One comment that I was reminded of, something that we talked about yesterday, [is that] here are these great collections, all of the ways one records that history. Here are all these people, and that it was the role of the Education Department to act as the—what our contribution to the organization was, was that we knew how people learned, that we could create using various specific formats. It was our job to figure out what it is or how it was that somebody could respond to these collections. I think at that time—and I still think it’s true—it is to find yourself. That’s what historical scientists do for everybody. They provide the vehicle so that you go into them [collections] and find yourself. I remember that when I started, Hermina used to say things like, “Well, at least what I do doesn’t hurt anybody.” [Laughter] “And that’s more than most people can say about their jobs.” And I know what she meant and I basically agree.

I believe that historical societies, however, can hurt people. I believe that history can hurt people in very personal ways. Because it denies their identity and place within human society. So you need to work at that. It’s not about shrinking or excluding. It’s always about expanding. I am perfectly

prepared to say that if somebody, if the agency, the organization, has done everything it can do to the best of its ability—make the story available—the piece... You know, if somebody wants to be a schlump, then it's perfectly their right. [Chuckles] But most organizations have a long way to go before they can turn the responsibility on the visitor or the public. I don't know of anyone—any organization—that should feel comfortable that it's done everything it can do in fulfilling its mission. So that's how it was defined. That's how I saw it.

To sort of play back, I didn't know what a historical society did. So I remember the first week that I was there, which was October sixth, or something like that, 1967, I went around to everybody. I just talked to everybody.

LK: I know you did.

VS: I didn't go to June [Holmquist] until the last because I was afraid. Because what I had really figured out about June from the beginning was that she understood how much I didn't know. It wasn't clear to me that she was prepared to be charitable. [Laughter] It was incredible. There I was, out there talking to everybody—Gene Becker, talking in the stacks, talking to you, to just everybody.

LK: Leaving shock waves behind, as I remember. [Laughter]. Viki said, “My idea, my concept of manuscripts...”

And I said, in rather Olympian tones, “I'm an advocate of the Peckham theory—the great Howard Peckham—the first responsibility of the curator is toward the materials.” And then I probably became even more lofty when I said, “The Kane corollary is maximum use by people who should be using the manuscripts.”

Viki Sand said, “Who decides?” [Laughter]

VS: Well, yeah.

LK: It was what you were just talking about, a different view of how you use the resources that are here, to say nothing of what kind of resources you should be bringing in.

RG: A great gust of populism burst through the Historical Society.

VS: Well, that's what the Red River Valley is all about. [Laughter] The framework at the beginning... Well, I visited everybody and I just had the greatest time. It was like a whole new world, and I learned a lot about history and we talked about those nine-fifteen coffee breaks and all of that. But the other thing that happened at that very time was that the American Association for State and Local History held its first seminar on historical interpretation. Russell was the president of AASLH. So when I started—I think this was the end of September, I wasn't officially on the staff—Bob Weaver just said, “Why don't you come to this. I think this would be good.” So for two weeks I was

listening to everybody who was doing anything in the history profession in the country. I am not saying that there weren't others, but these were like prime-time folks. I think the guy from North Carolina in archival records—what's his name?—and Colorado...

LK: H.G. Jones.

VS: H.G. Jones, right. Bill somebody, whose name I don't remember now. But Colorado was doing some very exciting things. Olive Foster from Illinois, who was running the junior historian program. So there were these two weeks, and then another thing happened, which was that Russell was going down to Madison and said, "Do you want to come along with me to the Wisconsin Historical Society?" Well, I've since learned, clearly, with Clifford Lord and all of that, and the great tradition of the Wisconsin Historical Society, and Doris Platt who's down there in education—so there it was.

I think later we came—some of us arrogantly—we came to believe that the Minnesota Historical Society had sort of picked up the legacy and carried it to a new dimension. But again, one of the keys to that, I think, was that John Wood... I have some thoughts about John's role as a manager and how I think he and Russell were absolutely complimentary and absolutely skilled in creating, establishing a management framework for it.

But I then went off to Colorado. What became sort of the pattern is that it would be important to deal with something like school programs in the Historical Society—or curriculum kits. And I said, "Colorado's doing some great stuff out there." In hindsight it wasn't as great as anybody thought it was, but it was pretty exciting at the time. So he [John] said, "Why don't you go out there?" So I went out to Denver and then spent time at the Colorado Historical Society, and as a historical agency at the time, it was doing some of the best stuff.

When the Capitol Tour Program happened, I did this extraordinary ten-day tour of capitols all through the South. I picked the South because I thought that that was the one place in the country that was sort of serious, that would be serious about history and its capitols. Well, it was the most extraordinary personal tour, to go to Arkansas, Montgomery, Texas, Austin, Atlanta, Washington, then to the UN in New York, and then back here.

John supported that. Olive Foster told me, "Steal from the best," when I was there. John Wood supported it, in terms of his 3M [company] experience in that sort of philosophical framework—a commitment overall to the goals, allowing people a certain autonomy within the framework of the organization to carry back [ideas]. For me, the Society was supporting me becoming a professional. I think I was returning that, because I think that I could bring it back in a way that we could translate it. The view was never about here, or internal, in my mind, it was always about the audience. That it's got to work somehow. And then, well, what do you mean? There are a lot of places doing that. Or, why don't we try that?

RG: This was a whole new breath of fresh air in my recollection, because the Society in my knowledge had never sent anybody around in this way before. Obviously there was some note struck

between you and Russell and John that made this financially possible, among other things.

VS: Yes.

RG: And that put them up to encouraging you to do it, and I am interested in what you say about Russell and John working so well together. Could you expand on that a little?

VS: I think that the way it worked with Russell, with me, is that... I remember the teachers' institutes. The Society had been running these institutes. There was one—I can't remember the time of year that it was held, must have been in the fall, the chronology doesn't seem right—but anyway, they had had this teachers' institute, and I think that forty-five teachers had come, and they had a committee, and everybody was working as best they could and it all seemed fine. I went to Hermina and I said, "Why don't we do more and do them around the state?" Or I may have said that at a committee meeting, actually.

Well, you would have thought that the end of the world had come. It was just stone silence and "Well, I don't know that they'll be able to. What we'll really need to do is maybe invite teachers down [to St. Paul] so they can see how we do it here." Well, they had only had forty-five people there, and it's not like this was the biggest deal since sliced bread.

It just seemed to me that you could put it around the state—being from the Red River Valley, [Laughter] and knowing that. Anyway, it was terrible, it was trouble. So I remember going in to see Russell and he was sort of smiling, and he said, "I'm sorry, I don't know what happened." But he made some remark like he knew what had happened—that's how I remember the story. But he was sort of smiling, and I gave him the reason why I thought it made sense and all the rest of it. He then said, "There really is a point to the answer to your question." I said, "Don't decide yet. Let me see if I can put this together and just give me some time, and then if it doesn't work, it doesn't work. But the Society—we'll decide later." He said, "Fine."

Well, I knew it was a sure bet. You come from Fargo, you have some insight into the world. So, I knew we could do this. So we went from one to seven the next year. They were all over the state. It was probably the best education I'd ever gotten.

One of the things about it was... Rodney Loehr and Rudy Vecoli—that's how I met all those folks. Because I'd go in to June and say, "What's the book on this?" And she'd say, "It hasn't been written yet." I'd say, "You're kidding, how am I supposed to learn about it?" And she'd say, "Why don't you go talk to 'X.'" I don't remember the years now, but we had the guy who went with Eric Sevareid on *Canoeing with the Cree*. So we had him speaking at Bemidji, and we had Rodney Loehr. And then we had the Indian conference at Mille Lacs, which was the first that they said was really radical because we invited these two—at the time Virgil Weir and somebody else—to come and talk about Indian projects. One of the people on the panel was an Indian. Well, that was kind of incredible. It never occurred to me that it was radical. That's the point, it just made sense. "How are you going to do this?"—that became the pattern.

What I think Russell understood about me—first of all he loved talking about politics and he loved that sort of enthusiasm about politics. He also understood that I would throw myself on a sword before I would discredit the Society. I always sort of set it up—like “Let me do it. We don’t have to decide now. Let’s just see if we can put it together and then you decide.” And so there was that framework.

I think he genuinely was taken with it. He was doing what he wanted to have done. It never would have happened if he didn’t want it. Because that was also ethic, it wasn’t by directive. But if he didn’t want something to happen, it didn’t happen. [Laughter] So I think he was engaged. But I also think it was that we were using the best people we could find that we were successful. We’d say, “Let’s do this,” and then people would show up. It seemed unbelievable. And so that was that pattern.

I always saw Russell, in my mind, as sort of the intellectual framework of it all. I would talk with him occasionally to convince, most times just to sell, that this was within the definition of what we are trying to do here. So it would be that approval, in that sense. When I came back to do the Indian—the Ojibwe—history project, when I came back from Bemidji, the only person I talked to about it was Russell. I said nobody’s going to buy this thing, even John, because of the risks and what it involved, and the scale of the project and everything. And again, we didn’t have anybody who could do it. He was the only one I went to, and I just said, “This is an idea here, and I don’t know that it’s going to work, and there are a million pieces here, and it’s got to be done with Indian people, and I don’t know how that is going to work, and let’s—if we can just go—just don’t decide.”

Because I knew June wouldn’t buy into it. And I knew John Wood wouldn’t buy into it and he had been a great mentor and patron. What John liked about me was that I was oriented to products—you know, products—that you deliver a service at a given time.

One of the first things was the suitcase exhibits that were developed. Simple, incredibly simple things, but they were booked all the time. The Chautauqua Room, the lesson programs, and school attendance just went out the window. The teachers’ institute—you have forty-five people in St. Paul. And the first year you have seven [statewide sites] and I think there were a hundred [people] at Mille Lacs. Against the scale of what the job was, it was that much [gestures with hand]. Against the perspective of what had happened at the Society, it was like the world.

John was a mentor. That’s how I viewed him [on] things about management. I am trying to think whether it’s about structure and a kind of autonomy. One example, the Publications department—that everything had to come through the Publications department. Well, John understood—and I really mean to separate this from politics at this point—the Publications department couldn’t produce all the stuff that the Society needed to be publishing at that time. It couldn’t do it. It made sense that you, within a framework, allow another avenue. I think that the sort of central secretarial pool, with Ardene [Flynn], that somehow you couldn’t have everything funneling through that office and expect to have the kind of growth that this organization loves.

The whole notion John always spoke about—create the job, salary, create the job description, put the salary to it and then hire somebody. He’s the one that I remember talking in those terms and trying to fairly pay people and not having such discrepancies. The whole idea of management by objectives, how to measure the work you do, no matter what it is you are talking about.

LK: He was even teaching us the language, wasn’t he?

VS: Exactly.

LK: We didn’t know those words.

VS: Well, I remember Ron Hubbs, when he became president of the board [council], had this meeting. We were all going to do long-range planning, and I think I had been at the Society—this must have been 1972-1973—we are sitting there and Ron Hubbs is giving this talk on long-range planning. And the division heads are sitting there looking at each other, trying to be polite—because Ron is the nicest guy—but it was like old hat. We had been doing it at that point for three or four years.

And the whole business about setting goals, accomplishing those goals, moving toward the mission. All of that language, it seems to me, came with John—issues about purchasing, creating an internal accounting system. Larry Oliver—God bless Larry Oliver—but the Society just wasn’t going to expand if Larry was going to be signing every check, you know.

The thing we never got Russell to do—I think during that time and I don’t know if it ever ended—but he absolutely would not release control of the postage. [Laughter] He was willing to do a lot. I have to tell you, “Give it up, Russell!” [Laughter]

That’s how I saw the Society operating. From my point of view, because of the programs and what I was involved in and how it fed into what John was doing in terms of the Legislature, and what Russell and John were doing, I always felt like a favored person. As I said, I think it was fundamentally based on being able to—

LK: Well, you may have helped us, Viki. Time came when we could make long-distance telephone calls without it being a special event. Postage and, well, all communications.

VS: Yes. It was just amazing to me.

RG: I can remember that John Wood was one of those [people]—it was about this time—who broke down the Society’s habit of sending a whole car full of people across the continent to attend AASLH [American Association for State and Local History]. He added up the number of staff hours and the cost, and succeeded in persuading Russell that it was cheaper to fly.

VS: Yes, because Russell loved to drive. Russell, you put Russell in a car and he was never happier. You know, those were the greatest trips that he and I had sometimes gone on. He just wanted to drive there.

LK: It took an accountant not long, when you add up the extended time and also staff members who weren't exactly fresh after trekking way across the country and arriving to—

RG: Yes. Six in a car. None of them were fresh.

VS: It was really amazing.

LK: Yes, so I think that we were making progress.

VS: At the time, I think that if you were to look at what was viewed as sort of front-line management—how does an organization grow and how does it grow effectively? I am sure that you could use the Society as a model. I think that idea permeated the whole place at that time. It was a special time. There will be other special times. You can't be in this building without saying that this is a special time. There have been others, there will be others. But that was one, and it was because everybody felt like they were on the front line of everything. Or everybody was trying to be. Nationally as well as—when I say frontline, I don't mean just in the context of Minnesota, the history of the Society—I mean in terms of the whole activity.

RG: Those were glory days. There was money available for education and cultural institutions that dried up very soon thereafter.

LK: Very interesting in expansionist mode. People in the 1950s, early 1960s, [were] just piecing together, trying for increments to budgets. The increments were small or not at all, so come the 1960s, everything is possible. The funding from federal grants poured in, and I think the people perhaps had a different outlook on the Society. You thought that a whole lot of things were possible, kind of a quantum leap instead of “maybe we can get a one staff position next time, if we fight real hard, and if we don't get it this time, we may get it next time.” So I think that is part of the excitement for us.

RG: Absolutely. I think certainly that my own personal recollection is that my whole view of the Society changed with you, and that was one of the reasons I moved from Publications.

LK: Yes.

VS: It was an extraordinary time. I just think it was an extraordinary time in terms of the energy of the time, and I think that what was happening with the Society really fit with that. That trip to Madison that I said Russell and I went on, it was to see them, but it was also to meet Bill Alderson, who was head of AASLH at the time. And also to meet Donn Coddington. Russell was interviewing Donn Coddington for the Historic Sites job. I don't remember so much about it. I had just met him,

and it was clear that Russell, on the way back—I guess I would have been surprised if he had not been hired. It just seemed like the deal. There was Donn, and Lila had been here six months, and John had been here about the same time that Lila had started, and then I came. But I think what also made it work—and I don't mean this at all gratuitously—politics of the Minnesota Historical Society, at least historically, certainly did fit in with this more expansionist point of view. It wasn't like this was a place that had vested interest in the status quo except, you know, in a negative way.

RG: Well, I think that's true of the staff and the director. I am not so sure that that was true of the Council.

VS: I had really very little connection with the Council. So I honestly don't know that. Because so much of the money came from the Legislature, in a critical way, I don't think anybody cared.

RG: Nobody was going to knock it. That leads to one of the questions I had. I know that curriculum units were the first really large program, and they were largely funded through what we now call LCMR. Is that not true?

LK: What is LCMR? I don't know what that is.

RG: Legislative Committee on Minnesota Resources.

VS: The way it happened was that we had \$30,000 from somewhere—I actually don't know where it was now—but somehow we had gotten an appropriation for \$30,000 to do something. I have to say I can't remember what it was for. I had gone to this workshop. It was the first... Is this the place to tell that story? [Laughter]

RG: Yes, go ahead.

VS: Just to back up a little bit. The programs of the Education Division—and I do want say something about Hermina a little before this is over—there was the curriculum resource material, in terms of the definition of the programs. As I was thinking about this this morning, actually, it seemed to me that what was there in 1967 was there in 1979. It just looked different. It was just cast in a different mold.

The *Gopher Historian* was the primary magazine for kids. The reason that was going to be in the new education program was that June and Hermina didn't get along. Or that June had said, "I'm not going to supervise her," as only June would say, and I am sure that Hermina said, "She's not going to supervise me." One of the funniest things in the history of the Society must have been the day I walked in at twenty-one-years old to be Hermina's super-boss. Think about that for a minute.

LK: We thought. [Laughter]

VS: I have to say that we became wonderful friends. We had our moments in the beginning, but I

think that's just because it was so insane. You know, it was just insane. But what, I think, Hermina came to respond to me was that again, it's not like what I was saying was so terrible or bad. People, I think, at the Society at the time—I guess as I think about them—were amazingly secure. I guess that's what I think about it. Somehow it wasn't threatening. It may have been outrageous on some level, but it wasn't threatening, as I think about it.

Actually what Hermina and I talked about a lot was—I think that the *Gopher Historian* issue that did the Afro-Americans in Minnesota was the first time that, where she did it. I don't want on any level to minimize that she did it. She's the one who, I think, also never told people what happened to her while she was out there meeting up with African-Americans across the Twin Cities, and just what the stories were—and I think not always so well received. But no one ever heard that story. But she did it, and it was designed to absolutely respond to what the issue was at the time. She deserves immense credit for that, I think.

So, here was this magazine, which grew out of the junior historian movement, which was essentially about clubs and all of that in 1949, or whenever that happened. There was that vehicle, the major piece that potentially could have gone into schools or that at least said that the Education Department can begin to think about doing something at this level. At that point, in those three years, we had some successes. We had recast the lesson programs and done the kits, and the teachers' institutes were working well. We had done the Capitol Tour program, which I think we got into primarily because of the relationship between those two buildings [690 Cedar Street and the Capitol].

And to have Historic Sites doing tours of the Capitol and have us doing... Originally, I think that they were very strong and I think really were wonderful. I think that that changed, and I think had I stayed, depending what the politics might have been at the time, I think that clearly was an area that needed to be sort of redone. But the original concepts of it worked well.

We had been doing a lot of stuff. I had gotten a flyer from the [Minnesota] Department of Education addressed to something like "Occupant," and it said that the Indian—whatever it was called—William Tell was the guy in the Department of Education—had been hired by the department to deal with Indian education. It was the first time he had been there and they were going to have this conference in Bemidji.

Frankly, Nick Coleman had been defeated. It was one of the great losses, disillusionments, of my life. Tom and I were not in good shape, and I said, "Shoot. I am going to Bemidji!" [Laughs] "I'm going to get out of here." Also what had happened [was] trying to grapple with the whole—I wasn't joking when I said the job was to have all the history go to all the people. I remember sitting down at one point and doing a chronological and topical survey of Minnesota history in my mind. "What are the topics here?" And then listing where we had programs. We had a lot on the fur trade [Laughs]; we had a lot on pioneers; we had, relatively speaking, a lot on Indians.

Then everything else petered out. So here was this whole spectrum of Minnesota history that we

weren't producing anything for. So it was that framework and the whole deal about Indian people. I don't think there was any particular reason. It just seemed like [it was time to] "get out of town," I mean it was just "get out of town for a while." I went up there, and that was the first conference [involving] Indian people around education that had been organized in Minnesota. Everybody was up there, including Roger Buffalohead, Don Bibeau, Carl Gawboy, Paul Shultz, Ruth Meyers, Roger Jordain, Jon Buckanaga, Jerry Buckanaga, you just run the list. They did this conference.

It was my conversion experience, in terms of life and history and how does it all fit together. I remember sitting there as this all was going on. It was the last night, and we were at Red Lake and we were standing in line and we were having a whitefish cookout. I said to Virgil Weir, who was the principal of Net Lake School at the time, "How does this sound to you? It seems to me that teachers need tools. As we have listened to what the issues are in education and that no matter how sensitive, how in touch with, how whatever, teachers need tools. And as nearly as I can tell, I work at the place that has the greatest access to that information. What do you think? What about it?"

He said, "Sure." [Laughs] "Great."

That's where it started. Indian people had to be involved in it—the external politics of it. What I like about the project is that we did the right thing at the right time. It's never bad to do the right thing, anytime, but it's always fun to do it at the right time. It's a special thing to me. The Indian politics had to be the committee. Roger was critical to that. Of the people, Don Bibeau at the time seemed to be the one who could act sort of as chairman, who frankly had enough interest in it. Ruth Meyers was critical because of the Duluth schools. Jerry Buckanaga because of the Pine Point School, which was viewed at the time as one of the best Indian schools in the country—what they were trying to do.

So we were real good in the reservation areas, but we didn't have so many connections in the urban area and spent time doing that. I remember going to one meeting over in Minneapolis to talk, because I was just on the road the whole time. People meeting me and talking about it, what do you think, and all that. Mostly because the committee said I had to do that. That that's what I had to do. So I went to this Indian meeting. There were a lot of AIM—American Indian Movement—people there, but it was more just about urban Indian folk coming together about something, and I was on the agenda. And so I did this thing. People were crazed. They just really ripped about the project. I got home and said, "Holy Toledo!" I got a call, it was about four o'clock in the afternoon, and I got a call from Jerry Buckanaga, who said, "Hey, I heard some of my cousins gave you a bit of a rough time." And I said, "Yes. Where were you?" [Laughter] And he said, "Did anybody say 'No'?" And I said, "No," and he said, "Well then, what's the problem? Why are you so upset?"

No one had said "No," and I learned a little lesson about how this works. Why should people trust the Historical Society? It's not like we had had such a great record, so just do it. Indian people [had to be a part of it, had to reflect the collections, had to raise some new questions. The critical piece was it had to be as good history as the Minnesota Historical Society had.]

[Tape interruption]

...retiring. That might have been a position that we had, frankly. No, it couldn't have been. But there was something else. Oh, I know what it was.

Anyway, so I came back, talked with Russell about it, and he didn't say no. [Laughter] So we started out— At that point, Rhoda and I—I remember Betsy Gilman, at age eleven, and Carolyn [Gilman] helping out at the History Fair. I loved talking with Rhoda. It was always fun. Rhoda's politics were always a little radical. I figured if you were going to become a Democrat, you might as well go the whole way. [Laughter] I loved talking about the Quaker stuff, and I loved the fact that when your kids went to high school they went to St. Paul Central, that that was really important.

I don't know why I did it, but we had talked some, because I was a little protective of this idea. I knew that this was not one to put out there necessarily, to let people take aim at, so to speak. And I remember just saying, "Would you do it? Would you be...?" Because there was nobody, frankly. Russell... The institution needed it. The project needed it. What makes me so crazy about multicultural education these days, and most of what happens in that whole arena, is that it's not good history. It's not good anything. And so, as I say, it had to be the very best history that the Minnesota Historical Society had ever done, to the best of our ability.

Well, of the cast of characters who were available, there was only one. When we talked about it, I can't remember, but I think you [Rhoda Gilman] didn't agree right away. I just knew that it was right up your alley. I don't remember if you agreed right away, but I don't think you did.

RG: I don't believe I did. I was very cautious about this.

VS: Rightfully so. I remember going home one night and thinking, "Oh my God, we are walking down this path." This was after you had agreed, and I said, "Well, Viki, somebody's now potentially risking a lot," in the sense that, frankly, it could have blown up.

RG: Oh sure. A couple of times it almost did.

VS: Dennis Banks, Russell Means and Clyde Bellecourt were all in town and functioning. It was just whether or not it was even going to work at all, not that you couldn't have done anything you wanted to do at the Society anytime you wanted to do it, but the point is that there is some risk in all of that. I remember thinking, "You better keep this one together, Viki, because this is serious now. Because a very serious person has said that she is going to take this risk." But once that piece was in place, obviously everybody was relieved. Russell, I think was relieved, clearly. Donn Coddington was stunned.

LK: I was Rhoda's reader for one of the early drafts of the manuscript, and I remember sitting there reading and I was off focus. [I thought] "What's going on?" And I was about midway through when I thought, "I know what it is, it's all skewed in a different direction, coming from out there, rather

than right down the line.” You read Taliaferro’s journal, you read this, you read that—“White man looks at Indian.” Remarkable reaction.

VS: I think that—and Rhoda needs to talk about this as well—I think the issue, what I always said about it, is that it wasn’t that we were rewriting history—in that sense—to make Indians look good. That was not our task. What I believe we were doing was going to the same sources, exactly the same sources—we didn’t go to any new sources. It’s not like we discovered a journal by an Indian that we somehow knew how to translate. It was that we were going to those sources with different questions. And when you ask different questions, somehow the material all comes out somewhat differently.

So the process—simplified—I think, was the definition. I think also that this was a commitment, at that time, not to do a textbook. The idea was that this was a historical society. A historical society has collections in different forms. We would create a total package. If a teacher was willing on any level to deal with it, you could do a whole deal about it. It didn’t have to go anywhere else. The decision about the printed material was there, elementary and secondary. The business about the filmstrips was very much about the photo collection, the photo archives of the Society. The reason for filmstrips was at the time—and I understand that the technology is very, very different—but the reason for filmstrips was that we didn’t want anybody, anywhere, not to have an opportunity to use it, that the poorest school district in this state would have access to that.

And then the range of materials. I think one of the unspoken heroes of this activity was Charles Morris, who was the designer. I still very much admire his design. I very much like the graphics of what we did. It’s now twenty years ago, but I like the look he gave to stuff out of the Education Department. He was really critical because he helped us think about the form that the information would be put into. Again, it was ease.

Rhoda and Dallas Chrislock—who is also a critical player in that—we’d sit down about any subject. As I remember the process, whatever the topic, whatever the booklet was going to do, whatever some specific filmstrip was going to do, whatever the subject was, [we would] try to get the framework from that conversation. Rhoda and Dallas would go off and do all the research and do all the writing, do the drafting, get it all, and then we would sit for hours at meetings while literally, line by line by line by line, we’d go over it, to try to make sure that it was saying what we needed it to say. I think that Roger Buffalohead’s historical point of view, as I think about it, was absolutely essential.

RG: He was critical, too.

VS: Without him it just wouldn’t have... He helped keep the pain that individual members of the committee felt to an extraordinary degree out of the material. He could do that and we could not. He would always keep reminding us of the bigger questions.

I think it was the first time—well I won’t say that. I think the material is good. I think it remains

good. I have encouraged Jean [Brookins] to look at it again. The Society has in cash, probably, a \$200,000 investment in that project—when you add up staff time and what the money was and the rest of it—and it remains good. It needs to be repackaged. It needs to be made into a contemporary form, and if it hasn't, all I am saying is, in this sense it doesn't matter.

It would be tragic, it seems to me, if there is information in that material, in any of those kits, and that somehow it is not being used because the format is wrong. When you are dealing with educational materials, when you are dealing with public programs, format [and] presentation have to evolve, but if the substance of what is there remains coherent and basically speaks to the questions or the issues, then it would be too bad, that would just be too bad. I was actually at Bismarck [North Dakota] a couple of years ago, doing a consulting project, and the man who was at the museum at Turtle Mountain [Indian Reservation] was there. Maybe I told you this story?

LK: I think you mentioned it to me, but I don't know the person.

VS: He was there—they brought in the site managers of different sites also—to talk about Indian history, presentation, materials. It was so funny. Because he had brought the guidebook, and he had brought some of the materials, and I said, “Do you use that?” Because he didn't know who I was at that point, and he said, “Oh yes. It's good.” At one point in the meeting as this is going on, he opened up the cover and he said, “Are you that person?” [Laughter]

But I think in terms of process, the Society used a committee in a real way. I am not suggesting that academic historians and people that the Society had worked with for a very long time... and so there was a real close interaction... This was a formal committee, with real power and authority, which was affecting the Society—at that point, a major program of the Society—and having a critical role to play.

RG: It couldn't have been done without that committee.

VS: Yes. I think that that was the first time that that had happened in quite that way, and that it worked successfully. We would all hear the jokes about “You can't do anything by committee” and da-de-da-de-da. Well, you can't do anything by committee if the committee doesn't know what it is supposed to do. That was important.

RG: The committee in this case had a lot of good solid staff work. We were asking the committee to write the damn thing.

VS: Exactly. But I think, I have come to believe, that what had to happen in that project is actually the way it should work. These are people, these are advisors, they are out there, they have other lives, other business, they have whatever, so why should they put in the same kind of time that you are being paid to do? So the whole idea of being able to have that be more of a review process—that's how the politics unit was done, and that's how the immigration history unit was done. All, I think, benefited tremendously from the process. Because no institution can hire all of the best people

it needs to do all of the work.

There were a couple of places where the Indian unit, I thought, could have gone off the track—where Russell, I think, was critical to the process. One was internal and one was external. We had come a long way, and I don't know which came first, honestly, because finally as it all moved aground, as everybody was confident that Rhoda was doing it—Viki may be crazy, but Rhoda's there, so we know it will be all right. [Laughter]

One [instance] was I got a call from Paul Schultz one night. As I said, I don't remember quite... I could reconstruct it, maybe, but [it was a] Sunday night. He said, "Viki, they're digging the Grand Mound." And I said, "What are you talking about?" "I am telling you that Elden Johnson is up here with archaeologists and they are digging in the Grand Mound and you're going to lose this." And I said, "Oh, yikes."

And so, I called—I don't think I talked to Russell late Sunday night—but I called him Monday morning, at some time, and he was going somewhere, and I got him the message. I think Ardene [Flynn] transmitted the message, I don't think I talked with Russell. And I said, "Russell has to stop whatever is going on up there. He just has to stop it." I said, "He needs to call the sheriff. Somehow they've got to get a message up there."

And he did it. Just based on the extraordinary trust in the relationship at that point, he just said it. Somewhere in the file I have the note that he sent back. "Cease and desist. Russell Fridley." That was the message that was transmitted. I got in the car and drove up there. What in fact had happened was that it wasn't the Grand Mound exactly. It was down the way.

Then what happened was... Who is the guy who was the chairman of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe at the time, from Leech Lake? I'll never forget there were a series of meetings, and everybody came together, and there was a discussion about it. And Elden, who I thought was a very sophisticated man about this—I wish I could remember the name of the tribal chairman at Leech Lake, or Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, they're from Leech Lake—and I remember Elden doing this drawing on the board, and the layers, and how archaeologists work and what you find.

And he stopped at a certain point of where the Grand Mound is from, and I remember this guy, this tribal chairman, saying, "Well, what's below that?" Elden had him. There is that wonderful ambivalence. I mean, the question was not about the Grand Mound. That was something else. But it was that, in a sense, when it's about human curiosity in education, and there's also the religious, spiritual side of that that's in conflict. But Elden, frankly, in his presentation and his ability to engage in an honest way what the educational value and historical value of what that work was, saved the day, absolutely saved the day. And Russell just stopping it, shutting it down on a message that went through Ardene.

The second one was internal, which was that we had gone through this whole process and we were coming near the end of the manuscript material, and Russell sent out a memo saying that everything

had to go through Publications—everything that came out of the Society. I think because Historic Sites—I don't mean to pick on them—but they had published some dumb thing, and June went crazy and said, “What's going on here?”

So Russell came out with a memo saying nothing would be published. I got the memo—it was about four o'clock in the afternoon—and just went crazy, both because I was probably twenty-five or twenty-seven and arrogant and we had been working on this for two years. But also because if we had to go back, if we had to go the committee and say we now have another review process, well, you just want to throw up your hands at a certain point. It's not like this process hadn't been painful to begin with and I think that everybody was generous-spirited about it. When you are working on manuscripts, doing the research and doing the material, and you sit there, [hearing] the most picayune sort of comments about everything, the notion, then, that all of this would have to go through [a review], for what I perceived was not my fault, is bad.

I called John Wood, and he knew I was crazed and was concerned about what I would say, and so he said, “I'm going to come over.” He left his office, drove over. He said, “I'm going to be outside of the Society in ten minutes and I want you to come down. I don't want you to talk to anybody and I want you to come down and get in my car.”

And I did. As I say, we had worked so hard on the process—we were almost done. I didn't agree with the history in most of *Minnesota History*, or most of what was being published. I thought it was essentially the narrative. I didn't think it was about interpretive themes in history. I didn't think it was—I always respected the scholarship—but I didn't think that it represented the kind of history [that was] my point of view. I didn't believe for a broad public audience that it was the kind of historical material that was inclusive. And that for schools, what I perceived, rightly or wrongly, it never came to a question.

I did not perceive that some of the ways that we approached the questions would get through the Publications Department without one royal fight after another. Now, I say this, on tape, with the most extraordinary respect for June Holmquist, one of my closest friends. That's what it was all about. The next day I confronted Russell. It was one of the times he just got red. We rarely had a set-to, we almost never did—that was the only one I ever remember having. I just said, “We can't do this” in the most strident way that I knew how. That probably wasn't so smart. But he said, “All right.”

I think in the long run I probably paid for that, but at least the project didn't get off on another track. As I say, June was a wonderful friend, great supporter, always extraordinarily helpful in a lot of ways, [had a] similar personality of my grandmother, in terms of that edge. I always understood it. It didn't matter, I knew she loved me. [Laughter]

I remember because I then got this incredible note from June. It was really serious. I remember walking into her [office] about three or four days later, and I said, “You know, this is never personal. This has never been personal.” She and I then went to lunch, and there were John and Russell sitting

there having lunch, and I noticed that they saw the two of us walk in and I thought that was a good signal. It was one of those great moments.

That was in terms of the institution and those issues about who does what, and sort of sorting out what happens where. I think the kind of history we were doing, I think the quality of what we were doing, I think how we were presenting it to a broad public audience, I think [it] worked.

LK: How did John help you? He picked you up. You were in a rage. How did he help you?

VS: What I remember is that he said, “It’s already come so far. Don’t be dumb.” I think he gave me some context. I think he said, “Russell is not going to....” What I remember is that he sort of helped me frame it in a way that said, “Don’t worry about it.” The implication of it was that it would happen—even if the policy stood, the project would still go ahead. Now I don’t know how he knew that that would happen, either.

John’s great help in all this, frankly, was the packaging and merchandising of it. His skill was—how does the Society—which essentially had had books and some other things—package multimedia curriculum resource kits? How do you order it? We didn’t even know how to order the boxes. Irv Kreidberg is another hero. It was all about everybody feeding their piece into it and making it work. But I think the quality of history, I think the committee, the graphics, I think the look of the stuff, was different than what the Society had published before. I think those were good things about it.

RG: To get back again to the funding of it, my impression is that it was all state funds.

VS: Yes, the money was. We had this \$30,000, which was state funds, absolutely. I don’t honestly remember what it was for. I am sure that it’s obvious and easy if you look at the figures. But the other thing was that the position we had is that there was an assistant educational supervisor’s position, and it was in the name of the woman whose name I cannot remember, but who helped with the Capitol Guide program. It was the first person who was hired as the department began to grow. She had left to have a baby, so we had the line. We certainly didn’t have the salary, but we had the line, so that was the position we were able to do. It was a refocusing of the staff salaries, which were there. So it wasn’t new. There were no new lines. It was just what the job would be.

The second thing was that we divided... Because of how it was produced on \$30,000, we printed in sequence. We established a number—I think we said 2,000 or 3,000. I don’t remember what the number was—but then we printed in blocks, so that we could do a set number of curriculum kits and then reprint the booklets. And Charles [Chet Kozlak?] was always very smart about how to design things in such a way so that they were the most economical and yet looked great. I think he really did help with that. So the money was essentially that nugget of \$30,000. Once we got that, then we began to sell them, and the strategy was if the Minneapolis, Anoka and Duluth school systems bought the project, if we could get it into those districts, it would pay. The whole idea was to set up a revolving fund that would then both be available to reprint and then be able to go onto the new thing.

RG: This was after the pattern of the Publications fund books.

VS: Sure. Yes, absolutely after that. So we spent a lot of time with the librarians and Chris Shirvhold in the Minneapolis Public Schools, and from the Anoka people we learned about capital budgets and that anything designed to last over five years could come out of that money as opposed to other money, and so we set that up. And because Ruth was on the board, was so involved in Duluth, we had Duluth locked up. And all the Indian schools were going to buy it, so that's really how it worked.

Is that how you remember the story?

RG: I had no idea about the funding or budgeting of it, at the time. Do you want to go on and say something more about the succeeding units? The political unit?

VS: As I think about them—"all history for all people"—we took care of the three that I care about. [Laughter]

LK: Was the revolution in the annual meeting a part of this whole way of thinking?

VS: What was wonderful about the annual meeting, I think, was... Help me with this—who was the state auditor who stood up at this banquet? This head table had to have a hundred people at it, it seemed to me at the time—it extends with time. And the state auditor stood up, and it was boring and dull and terrible, and read from a brochure that we all had at our table place, and [he] didn't read it well.

We were so full of ourselves, Lila and I, everybody. June had been complaining, nobody liked it. So what we did was—I can't remember some of the sequence. I knew Rhoda would be for it, because I am sure that we talked about it, and I knew June would be [for it]. But when we got Lucy to sign on, [Laughter] we said, "This is this great institution," and all of what was going on at the time just seemed to prove that we were the best, the brightest, all of that, and let us just try the old 'Let's don't decide now, just let us try' trick.

The terrible thing was that we wrote this letter that outlined all of this, and I was responsible for this, and ended up leaving it at the photocopier. I think Ardene got it. If it hadn't gotten out of that context—it was mostly to have everybody to have a copy. It wasn't a particularly aggressive note. It just said that we wanted to do this. And that it happened in that sort of more confrontational way was what I always thought was unfortunate about it. But what we did was... I remember that we were looking for a major speaker, a major prime-time historian. Catherine Drinker Bowen was one of the first names we suggested, because we thought a woman would be nice, but she couldn't do it. So we then sent out... We would have sent to anybody—Arnold Toynbee—I think we probably did. [Laughter] So we sent letters to Henry Steele Commager and Studs Turkel. And we just sent them out because we figured they'll just say no, right? And maybe one of them will say yes. Well, they both said yes.

RG: I remember that.

VS: They both said yes. So, all of a sudden... [Laughter] So we had Henry Steele Commager at lunch—the serious history part about it—and then we had Studs Turkel in the evening.

[Arrangements at previous annual meetings had been] just terrible—that head table which just offended all of our populist sympathies. So we had round tables and no head tables. We had a podium.

RG: You eliminated the invitation-only cocktail party, too.

VS: Yes. We hated that. That people always “came out of,” you know.

LK: The previous revolution wasn’t really a revolution. Bob Wheeler said he was going to change the annual meeting and he changed the menu. [Laughter] That is, “We’ll specialize in a special food,”—like the buffalo dinner. It just attracted hordes of people.

VS: Oh right, I remember that.

LK: And the man sitting next to me said, “Oh, this is wonderful to be able to have buffalo meat. What organization is this?” [Laughter] So we needed identity of program.

VS: We were so proud of ourselves. When I say “we,” I mean everybody. I mean we were doing good, across the board. So it just seemed fun, you just pick something you want to do and invite the best people. There’s never any reason not to do that.

RG: Well, I think that that was one of the things I always associate with you. What the heck, invite the best. They couldn’t do any more than say, “No.” It was a revolution in thinking.

VS: Well, it seemed that it was always speaking to the best. What I would like to suggest is that it always spoke to the best of the Historical Society’s tradition. That, in fact, it was not about changing that tradition or diminishing it. It was always to move that tradition into a new arena for more people, who might enjoy it.

RG: One of the significant things, changes, in the annual meeting also was opening it up for a day-long history conference that was affordable to graduate students, University [of Minnesota] people, which we had never attracted before. That attracted a limited number over the years, which was a result of that. But before that...

VS: ...we just wouldn’t have gone. Why would you go? You only went because you had to.

LK: And then a related benefit, I always felt, is when you were putting on the history conference,

etc., we drew more and more staff into the program. So the annual meeting wasn't something like Mary Wheelhouse Berthel used to say, "Annual meeting's coming, I'll buy a new hat." Okay, you go off, everything is prepared before you sit and hear the report and make your bows to the Council members and...

RG: ...it was a social event.

VS: Again, I don't remember the timing here so much. But it seems to me what fed into the whole milieu was... I don't know exactly when the history centers were happening and the timing of that, but somehow very soon it just seemed like you had this day-long history conference. There were more graduate and academic people coming. There were people who were interested in history and the regional history—I mean the regional research centers at the state colleges and sort of bringing those folks into it. Again, I don't remember the timing exactly.

LK: Timing is good, it is the late 1960s.

VS: Yes. Exactly. So it was all coming together, that's what I mean. It was not exclusive—none of what I think I'm talking about, or that sort of environment, was. It was all about that sort of shared goal, shared vision of what the organization was about, and its purpose. That didn't take any memo for anybody to write. There was no confusion about it, I would argue. There may have been different interpretations of it, but all within a pretty narrow framework.

That may be the function of the size of the place at the time. But I also think it was about, frankly, the values of the people, the fifteen people basically who were doing it. The current in-vogue, fashionable term is "total quality management." Sort of how that all works from the top and how it works. It is about leadership, and it seems to me that's what it was.

But it was every part of it. While June and I had our disagreements, there was always pride in the quality of the [Minnesota Historical Society] Press, the Historical Society, within its definition was doing great stuff, and *Minnesota History* always looked the best of what those journals looked like. And Lila doing the oral history, starting the Oral History Association, or getting into that very early, and doing that. I was involved with AASLH a lot. I think that that fed into the kind of environment that gave people confidence in the kind of change that took place. Now I am not suggesting that everybody enjoyed that, or that everybody viewed it uncritically.

LK: It was rather remarkably seamless, as I think in terms of the transmission of the old traditions, the laying down of new transitions. There were so many people involved in, say, planning the annual meeting.

VS: Because that was the whole idea.

LK: Yes. And the [Regional] Centers were going. I know that some people had jolts, etc., but when you think of the changes that were made, did you feel that there was much abrasiveness among the

older members of the staff saying, “I don’t like the direction that we are moving in?”

RG: No. I think there was a lot of shoving and hauling as to who was going to control the direction we were moving.

LK: Yes. Indeed.

RG: But I think everybody shared the feeling. After all, it was a time of expansion. If you wanted to do something, there were funds for it. It is much easier to control internal friction when that’s the case, and I think that was one of the magical things about that period, too.

We’ve talked about the curriculum units and about the potential conflict with Publications. How about the museum and your relationship with Donn Coddington, Historic Sites and so on?

VS: It was all pretty easy, just because it wasn’t an issue.

RG: It was really a vacuum that you moved into there.

VS: Yes. I actually wrote this down. [Laughter] I don’t want you to think that I didn’t think about this—no, I am teasing—but it’s amazing for me to think that it’s been fifteen years.

RG: Details of the exact sequence of events do blur.

VS: This is just the reference, because I wanted to be clear about what the media were. From my point of view, the Education Department used different media, and that’s how I defined exhibitions. Three-dimensional objects are like photographs, or like manuscripts, or like books. So it doesn’t matter to me, in that sense. It was, “Here is the story line. What kind of media do you want to use?”

As I defined the programs—I am saying this just because it is how it worked. Clearly supporting curriculum materials, resource materials for schools, I would argue, is a fundamental purpose of the Minnesota Historical Society. I would argue that because as a public institution, and without an environment for [to market] large textbooks—whether it’s California or Texas or New York, not that they’re doing such great things—but the point is, I would argue, that the private sector is not going to find a big enough market here to produce the kind of quality materials that are required by the state. This is an absolute and perfect role and a responsibility of the Historical Society. So how you cast those tools, it seems to me, is a fundamental purpose.

I think the teachers’ institutes and the teacher training part of that is a natural corollary. Another Russell story just about that, in terms of the relationship and how it worked and how respectful I think it was, was that when we had a political history institute in St. Paul, I had said to Russell—loving, like most other people at the Historical Society, the Farmer Labor Party and that wonderful tradition [including] Elmer Benson... Elmer at that point had been out of the public eye for twenty years, basically, because he was very ill and then seemed to recover. And I said “Why don’t we get

Elmer Benson to come to this thing?”

Russell thought that that was a great idea, so he called Elmer, the Governor, and he agreed. So, here these teachers’ institutes were going to have Elmer Benson! You know, the first public presentation or public time he had had in twenty years. So on the radio, one of these talk radio stations, literally two or three nights before the workshop on Saturday, some guy went off—I don’t know if it was the moderator or somebody who had called in—about the Historical Society bringing this old communist back. Just went, just the worst kind of diatribe.

So, I get a call to come into Russell’s office and he said, “We have a problem. I got a call from Elmer Anderson last night.” And he said, “You know, I was really surprised at Elmer. Because Elmer was concerned about it, that this was exposing the Society to a kind a criticism that would be difficult.” Well, I think that all of us sitting at this table know that that was exactly the kind of situation that Russell loved!

RG: It was where he shone.

VS: Exactly. So he said, “The question, of course, is not whether or not we disinvite Elmer Benson,”—that never crossed his mind—“it’s how can we fix this?” So he called Val Bjornson and got Val Bjornson—because Benson was the only living politician that was on the program. The others were academic historians. And so he got Val Bjornson, and Val Bjornson and Elmer Benson just had the best time [Laughter] talking and chatting and telling the story. But it was absolutely Russell at his best. As I say, it was never a question that that wouldn’t happen.

The institutes were a natural. If you are going to do curriculum materials, you’ve got to help people use them. The Capitol Tour lesson programs—that really was the vehicle, in lesson programs, into the museum doing exhibitions, because clearly the Society didn’t have space.

RG: Their audience was continuous from the Capitol over to our building.

VS: Yes. It wasn’t a big risk, there were only four galleries on the top floor. It’s not like you are talking about a million feet of space. But it was also that when we had done the lesson programs and created the Chautauqua Room, it was just what the idea was. And Russell and Chet Kozlak did those, and Paul Waller?

LK: Yes. Paul Waller.

VS: Yes, a name from the past—pulled that right out. Anyway, they did these, and we created this thing that was all for kids and it was all for schools, and Russell loved it. I mean he just thought it was [great]. We got a beaver. We wrote to some buffalo ranch in Nebraska to get buffalo skins that the kids could sit on and a beaver’s [skin] from someplace else that they could feel. And it was before the historic sites program started in the Interpretive Center, so I think that he [Russell] just loved it, he just thought it was good. It wasn’t that it was so sophisticated or that it did whatever, but

it just moved [him]. It was sympathetic with what he wanted, whether he would have articulated it or not. But it was that that really got us into the exhibition spaces.

I would argue that the Education Department should not be a part of the Museum. It is not a function of the Museum. I don't know what the intellectual rationale for it is, any more than having it as part of the Manuscripts Department. And I would argue that it might better fit with the Manuscripts Department than with exhibitions.

RG: Well, you and I would agree on that.

VS: I understand what I have just said. I need to take a shot just to prove that I am paying attention, [Laughter] that I haven't lost it, sort of, in the process. But I just don't think you can make the argument.

RG: One of the unique things that you started here was that it was an education division that was independent of the medium, the other divisions.

VS: I think that what we tried to do in terms of exhibitions was unsophisticated. Unsophisticated is the best you can say about them, I think. I mean when we first started.

RG: Remember some of those things?

VS: Well yes, but the good news was that we were always trying to do the themes. We were trying to tell the story line. It wasn't about decorative arts. And frankly, I have to tell you, I don't know a collection—this may be different now—but I didn't know at the time, a collection, a three-dimensional object collection, that anyone would bother to come and see if you just put them on display. I remember thinking that. What would you put out that people would just break their necks to come and see? Nothing.

So then you had to work the story line again, then you had try to deal with the themes and to think about them. I have really come to love doing exhibitions. I really love the form. I now work at a place that has great objects, and I love doing the intellectual idea in three-dimensional space with those objects. But at the time I think it was not such a very sophisticated effort. I think that hiring Nick Westbrook was an effort. Barnes Risnick—who was at Sturbridge and now Hawaii, who was a wonderful friend of mine—I think is a genius in this business, and Nick had worked for him.

We didn't just need a designer. We also needed somebody who was a historian, and so we were trying to find somebody who could synthesize. As I said before, I think the programs when I left were the same as when we started, in what I mentioned as adult programming, that whole area of adult programs. I think what changed was the circle. I don't know what this theorem is in geometry, but the angle is the same out here as it is here [gestures with hands]. It's just that you are dealing with the questions on a somewhat more sophisticated level or in a different context. Nick came, and I think there was a difficult time for the Education Department. I don't have so many thoughts about

what the exhibitions were, because it was sort of the end of my time, and at that point I was really focused on finishing the immigration curriculum. That was really the project that I did not want to leave in place.

LK: The clothing exhibit [unclear].

VS: Yes, I think it was. I think that it was then that that next level of sophistication of exhibition was going to happen, and that happened after I left. Not that exhibition, but sort of how the Society conceived of exhibitions changed at that point.

RG: Well, I think a key person in that was Nina Archabal. The two key people were Nick Westbrook and Nina.

VS: Yes. One story is that I hired Nina.

RG: You hired both of them.

VS: Yes, I did. [Laughter] I am teasing. The story about that is that when I was... Let's see, I had been at the Society seven years, I was twenty-eight years old, had never gotten out of the Midwest, and I was offered a job to head the education program—or some aspect of the education program—at the National Archives. I had given a talk somewhere. I was on some program. I think a very good instinct about the person who actually had done it, but I don't have any doubt that, had I said yes, I would have gone there.

My attention span was pretty short, and no one ever hired me to keep things the same. That's not why I get hired. I love the process of thinking through, I love the process of figuring out how to build the steps. I love thinking about "How do we fill in that blank" and "How do we do that?" From when an idea starts in a brain, then you give it language and then you organize the pieces. You bring it along, you give it form, and it's fabulous—or not.

I had been here awhile and I didn't go. I applied for a Bush Fellowship one year. I was really working at it, and I was down to one of the twenty-four finalists or something like that. I went out to Stillwater and did their whole deal. John and I both thought I was a clear shot, and it didn't happen. I still don't know why it didn't happen. It seemed like the craziest deal. I don't mean that arrogantly, particularly, it just seemed like it was so logical. I was twenty-seven years old, I had responsibility.

RG: A lot of us felt that. What on earth? Why didn't Viki get that?

VS: Yes. Anyway, that was sort of going on. One of the things that was true, after the curriculum units, it would have been important. The exhibitions would have been okay, and that deal with the building—that discussion, that first history/government center—that was a very interesting piece of what was happening. It would have meant going back to the Capitol, because that needed it. You don't need it to be worked on again and thought through. I think in terms of exhibitions, it would

have been about traveling exhibitions and doing that. Without the space, then we would travel.

But the passion was the curriculum. We did it. I remember sitting with June, on a million occasions, saying, "I've just got to get out!" It was about the same time we were also talking about how bored Russell seemed. [Laughter] If we didn't talk about how bored Russell seemed, we talked about how bored I seemed. I think that at the Society at the time, it was also clear that Bob Wheeler was going to be retiring at a certain point, and there was Donn Coddington, Viki Sand and Lila Goff who all would have loved that job and all thought that they were eminently qualified for it without batting an eye. That seemed politically, probably... Telling Russell what I thought about his publication policy, in the terms I did, might not have been the smartest. But, you know, there were a few bridges that had been burned along the way.

Also, the general climate. This was before Nick came, before sort of the car wreck. There was a process... But the issue was that you [Rhoda Gilman] had gone on sabbatical, and this is the true story and I am sure that Nina would tell the same—no, she wouldn't know this part. The point is there was just nobody in the department to be the head of the Education Division as it was intellectually framed within the Society, that none of the individual players [could have taken the position]. Nick hadn't even been there at that point—[he] may have been there shortly.

RG: Not while I was on sabbatical.

VS: He came later?

RG: Yes. He came after that.

VS: It all sort of blurs a little bit, but the point is that it was about feeling needing to get out. [There was] no one in the department who could move into... Frankly what happened is that Nordis Heyerdahl was not going to be the head of the Education Division, nor was Dallas Chrislock, nor was Mary Ann Nord or any of those people. It was just not going to happen. And so the question was hiring an assistant educational supervisor.

June was working on the book *Women in Minnesota*, or she had just finished the book. I remember her sitting there and she said, "Well, what about Nina Archabal," or "Do you know Nina..." or something—anyway, Nina Archabal's name came up. I said, "I don't know her." I don't think we had met, but it didn't matter to me on some level. It seemed fine, because there was nobody [else]. Do the search and the whole deal, it didn't matter.

I went into Russell and said, "June had this idea" [to ask] Nina Archabal, and I have to tell you his face lit up. It lit up as I rarely had seen it because it seemed for him—in hindsight, I say, in conjecture—the perfect solution. She is clearly a very attractive personality. She is a very sophisticated person. She had written and done the work, with June and all of that. It not only solved the problem of the Education Division at the moment, it also potentially solved the problem of Bob Wheeler's position. And even if I wasn't in the picture, there was still Lila Goff and Donn

Coddington. I just think he thought it was the best idea since sliced bread.

The Education commission at that point, I suppose in terms of management issue, was that for all of the integration of every aspect of every person's life that seemed to exist there, once that became torn, it just blew apart in a lot of different ways. We were all the same age and we all thought we were too smart and we were just... I don't think I read everything particularly well and I certainly don't think others did. So there was a lot of turmoil. What happened was, the chronology here, is that Nina came, and Nina said, "The only person who hasn't talked about the trouble in the Education Division is John Wood." [Laughter]

So Nina came in. I have tremendous respect for her personal skills, because in a very difficult environment—and frankly I believe it's why she and I have mutual respect—that in a very difficult environment, which we could have made very difficult for each other, that didn't happen. Just didn't happen. She and I would have long conversations. I don't believe she set out to become deputy director of the Minnesota Historical Society and/or the director. We just, in an interesting way, for about a year had the most extraordinarily candid, mutually supportive, absolutely free range of conversations. It was not an easy time.

LK: For either of one you.

VS: Yes.

LK: Well, that's an extraordinary story, Viki, your impact on the Minnesota Historical Society. And there are still a couple of things we haven't touched. Let's see, yes, the Capitol mall building. What did you feel when you walked into this building [the History Center]? The feeling of underground rivers? [Laughter]

JF: Had you been in this building before today, Viki?

VS: No. This is it. I love that field of flowers.

JF: The wildflower hill. It's lovely this year.

VS: It's wonderful. It actually takes courage, I think, to do that—to put that there. Just because I think you don't see it. It's all real stylized, formal, grand architecture. I think I respond the way I am sure everybody does. I haven't even had a chance to look around, but it's clearly wonderful, just what you see. It's very grand and all. I am anxious to see it.

The issue of a new museum—what everybody always said about Russell was that he didn't like objects, and that the reason the museum didn't have an object collection is that he didn't like them. He didn't care, and if it wasn't associated particularly with us—of course that's a gross exaggeration—but if it wasn't tied specifically to a historic site or something like that... The record, the historical record, was in manuscript material. I don't think Russell was particularly a visual

person. On more than one occasion, Bob Wheeler would bring in somebody to talk about a new building, a new museum. And wasn't there an issue to put it up on the hill back there?

LK: Yes.

VS: And then there was another time to take it out of town and build a complex somewhere.

LK: Fort Snelling.

VS: Fort Snelling, right, and all of that. The issue about that history and government center—and again, I think it's about what we were talking about at the beginning—Nick Coleman, Bob Goff—there was a connection, a free flow back and forth. The Capitol Area Architectural Planning Commission... Is that what it is still called?

LK: Yes.

RG: The CAAPC, yes.

[Tape interruption]

VS: That is totally where it came from.

RG: That's my understanding. It was Nick Coleman's baby.

VS: You bet. There's no more to it than that, I don't think. But in an interesting way, Minnesota and the whole public populace, you know, all that . . . So [unclear] was going to be hearing rooms. If you're going to pass the open meeting law, you've got to have places to put people. [Laughter] Then the Historical Society next to it. Russell had asked me to be the chair of it. The name of the guy, Don somebody from Duluth... What was his name?

RG: Don Shank

VS: Don Shank. He was the board committee. That is sort of was how that worked. And the idea, because it wasn't going to be a full historical society—it was just going underground and have exhibition space. I honestly at this point don't remember how much space it was—forty-thousand square feet strikes me, but it would also have a classroom. But also because of the length between the Capitol programs and the history and government center and all that falderal which was just a front for Gene Mammenga to have a job when he was out of work.

Anyway, it all sort of made sense. There was the Capitol side of it, there was the Historical Society's side of it, there would be exhibition space. It was very exciting to work with the architect and to be part of the competition and the jury—an advisor to the jury about that. It never went any further than that, I think, because it just was Nick's, and I think it wasn't there.

I'd argue that it was most concrete, so to speak, that the discussion had been about a new museum for the Historical Society. And that there was enough credibility in the process and in the kinds of things the institution was doing as a whole, that it actually began to make sense. You started to have people, outside of the staff, talking about it, who were interested in a better space, or some board member because they had been to the museum in British Columbia.

RG: It certainly brought it to public visibility.

VS: Yes. We, at the Shaker Museum, are looking at... That's a collection that needs new facilities, and it was interesting to go back to the documents of that and sort of see how we had framed what this place should be. Sounded pretty good.

LK: I wish we had a video component for this interview. [Laughter]

RG: Viki talks with her hands and eyes so much.

LK: Yes. We will have to think about that.

JF: Some things can only be done with video.

LK: Yes. I think I will leave you now, but I must say, Viki, this has been an extraordinary session. I feel that we have come a long, long way, coming to...

VS: But I didn't get to talk about Bertha Heilbron and [University of Minnesota] Dean [Theodore] Blegen. [Laughter]

LK: Yes. Yes. Of the old guard.

VS: Let me truly just say one thing about that. One of the things that was so extraordinary about the Society, [was] the institutional standard, the institutional ethic, the institutional values. You couldn't walk in here and be half awake, or into the Society, and not understand that tradition. Now if I had not been from the Red River Valley and been somewhat more cynical, I might not have responded quite the way I did. But I was to see that there at the 9:15 [a.m.] coffee. Everybody would come and sit. I don't mean everybody, but June and you [Lucile Kane] and Dean Blegen who was here and you [Rhoda Gilman] would come and...

RG: A variety of scholars—Carl Chrislock...

VS: They would just sort of pass through, and you'd sit there, talking about everything. Sometimes just anecdotes, sometimes having to do with the Society, sometimes about whatever anybody was working on. So as a young person in that environment, it was always about—and Hermina—it was always about just wanting to do as well as what had been laid out. What I remember from those

conversations is when you told me—I told you this yesterday—when the Ramsey daughters threw out part of the Ramsey papers, the idea of objective history did take a bit of a little blow.

LK: Censorship of the Sibley, the early Sibley.

VS: Exactly. In terms of historical understanding, historical process, it is the great gift of historical societies to the history profession. You can sit in academic departments for a long time and talk about interpretation, but if the pieces that create it, the building blocks—I mean it is the reason for being. It is the great scholarship.

And I think it was impossible for that not to be transmitted. And I think as someone who wanted very much to be approved, and to be part of it, it was an extraordinary opportunity. I know this sounds romanticized, but you sitting here and sort of nodding tells me that it was true. We are not all fantasizing about a particular environment. Now, how you carry that through into different contexts and different-sized organizations... I am not one to argue that you have to lose that as an organization gets bigger—in the abstract—any more than I'd argue that no person can be president. Do it. That's the sort of defeatism I don't understand. But I think it's about the values. I guess I think it's at that coffee table in the morning, and the lunch table...

LK: I felt that we were all at our most generous in that environment.

VS: Absolutely.

LK: No matter what the political contests were.

VS: Absolutely.

LK: “What are you interested in?” “Oh, why don't you do an article?” “Well, maybe . . .” Or, “What is the possibility for developing your scholarship?” Or whatever.

VS: Absolutely. I think that that happened. I think that it happened in a remarkable way. I think one of the reasons, one of the unfortunate things, one of the tensions, constant tensions I think, when I was at the Society, was about Historic Sites and Historic Sites in relation to the rest of the Society. I don't hear so much about the Society now. I don't talk with people so much about the ins and outs. But it seems to me that the argument right now about this building and what this building means is not fundamentally different from what some of the issues were when people were talking about Historic Sites, relative to the size of the budget and what was happening and just how it all happened. And the isolation of Fort Snelling, and some about the fact that Donn Coddington wasn't able to sit at coffee. That it was a different experience.

LK: Yes.

VS: Donn, in an interesting way, as Russell's minister—that's what I always remember about him—

it's like there's the denomination, and there's Donn with his congregation. [Laughter]

LK: Yes, yes.

VS: I think it makes perfect sense that you would create the unit out there [Fort Snelling], because it is isolated from the rest of it, it doesn't easily intersect. And even when Manuscripts moved out to 1500 [Mississippi Street], because you had had the tradition, and because the friendships and that relationship, because of the need to interact, or the fun of it, I never perceived that that was an issue with Manuscripts.

LK: I think Lydia Lucas mentioned that, and said that if we hadn't had our ties with 690 [Cedar Street], it would have been a different story.

VS: But I think that that never existed for Donn and the Historic Sites people, so there wasn't the tradition, and he was hiring totally new people. So the only ethic, beyond that which might read at the top of a piece of paper, had to do with the Historic Sites framework.

LK: The transmission that was going on in other areas just was not happening there.

VS: Right, right, and I don't know how you do it in a bigger place. Hopefully bringing everybody under this roof...

LK: Time will tell here, will it not, Jim, to what extent we have been brought together.

JF: Indeed. It is a very big building.

LK: It is, yes.

RG: Yes, those on fourth floor really don't see those on level A or B very often.

VS: One of the things I learned when I went to the New York Botanical Garden, which is a very big cultural institution, is that things like personnel departments can have a lot of wonderful functions that really help facilitate. I don't think that the Botanical Garden is as well-run an organization as the Society in many ways, but what I was introduced to there were some features of a bigger organization that actually do help.

The Society is not the biggest organization or institution in the world. So to say that you can't retain what your values are as an organization, it seems to me, fundamentally, first of all you have to restate what those values are and be clear about them and then work at what it is you need to make that work. And I understand that sounds incredibly naive, but I think that's where you have to start, and you can't ever recapture that if you don't believe that that was a value. If you don't believe it's a value, then it's not going to happen.

LK: Yes, and who is going to articulate the values?

VS: Yes.

LK: Viki, I will be writing to you. Thank you for your time today.

Minnesota Historical Society Oral History Project
Minnesota Historical Society