



---

**Arch W. Troelstrup**

---

**Charter Member**  
**President - 1959-60**  
**Distinguished Fellow - 1973**

Interview with Arch Troelstrup (Norman Silber)  
Kansas City, Missouri  
March 16, 1983

**Prof. Silber:** This is an interview with Prof. Arch Troelstrup. Present also is his wife, Ann. The interview is taking place at the Hyatt Regency Hotel on March 16, 1983. The interviewer is Norman Silber.

Mr. Troelstrup, could we begin by talking about how you became involved in the consumer movement, and then how you became involved with ACCI?

**Prof. Troelstrup:** I suppose my first serious interest in the consumer education area came as an observer of the Sloan Foundation consumer education experiment at Stephens College, Columbia, Missouri, in 1936-1942. In 1942, the Sloan grant in consumer education at Stephens College was terminated, and I was invited to teach consumer education or consumer problems in the Home and Family Division, to carry on the work started by the Sloan Foundation.

Because there was no textbook suitable for that teaching, I subsequently wrote my own textbook. And then I met Colston Warne quite early in the movement. In fact, it was Colston Warne who called me to invite me to attend that initial meeting at the Ray Price home in Minneapolis which resulted in the "birth" of ACCI. I don't have a list of the people who were there, but some of them were: Gladys Bahr; Gene Beem; Howard Bigelow; Marguerite Burk; Persia Campbell; Helen Canoyer, who was then at the University of Minnesota, though; Willard Cochrane, who was at the University of Minnesota; Jesse Coles, University of Chicago, I believe; Damon was in Washington, DC; Leland Gordon, Dennison; Henry Harap; Hazel Kyrk; Gordon McCloskey; Ruby Turner Morris; Warren Nelson; Ray Price; Margaret Reid; Edward Reich, New York City high school teacher; Colston Warne; and Fred T. Wilhelms. Wilhelms couldn't come. The rest of us were there, but Wilhelms got ill in Washington, DC and couldn't be there.

We had a very interesting group. Most of them were economists. We had one home economist at that first meeting, three at the second meeting. I remember that first session. Who was our home economist? Well, anyhow she said, "We should have more than one home economist here." She was very bitter that we didn't call in more home economists because they taught so many aspects of consumer economics in their programs, which of course, was true.

This group was a very independent group and good people. They came from coast to coast—University of California, the East coast, even the University of Chicago was represented—and all in between, small colleges, medium size universities, very large universities.

Look at the kinds of training that was assembled in that one basement at Ray Price's home in Minneapolis. I think it would be interesting to know some of the things that probably won't get in this history. We came from so many different philosophies and major interests that there were wide variations.

We were trying to pull things together—not summarizing yet, just pulling things together. Henry Harap took prolific notes, and I guess, that's on record now. Those notes should be very interesting to anyone in the early history of the organization, because it must play on the different philosophies there, and how we hated to move too far away from what we were committed to.

**Ann:** But they were all for a better deal for the consumer.

**AT:** As critical as they were, we were able to pull some of these ends together and three or four of us had gone through quite a few experiences at this point. Here is the chance to have something happen so we can have a professional organization, because there was no national

professional organization in this area.

NS: Was there some thought that you should be part of the home economists?

AT: Oh, sure! Not only that, but business education. Those two in particular.

NS: You mean they said, why not be part of our group?

AT: Yes, yes, yes, but we learned something. We worked so darn hard during that first two days. Early after the first day, before evening started, we finally decided (because we were all worked up), look, can we agree that when we have dinner here (at the Ray Price home), let's have the night and have fun and no one can talk business. This was more important than you realize, because we had been working very, very hard. We still weren't getting too close together at the end of the first day and there was some bitterness. Hazel Kyrk, the only home economist there, was the one who thought there should be more relaxing from the work pressure.

NS: There had been no intention of excluding home economists, had there?

AT: Oh, no!

NS: Did you decide at that time who you were primarily going to ask to join or invite into the organization?

AT: Yes, but that was almost taken for granted, because everybody that was there assumed we could play a role in it. Ed Reich said, "Look, we've got to ask sociologists in here, we have to get some psychologists in here," and he mentioned a third profession I don't remember offhand. He mentioned three, and that was towards the end of the second day. So you see what was happening there? We began this venture by getting an umbrella over it.

NS: One of the issues that later came up was whether you would serve the ultimate consumer or the professional consumer. At that time, did you have an idea?

AT: What's your definition of the professional consumer?

NS: In this context, strictly academic, strictly those interested in the theoretical aspects of consumer research.

AT: Oh, that came later. I think the interest was maintained and that was good. A little later on, we had some people who specialized in this area, as you know well now, in ACCI, who were from these other professions. They played a role and we saw that that could evolve into something in all probability. I think what you are getting at is, did we have blinders? No, not at all. I think most of us, who were the early leaders of the thing, saw some great possibilities here because the consumer area had to go into different professional areas.

NS: What were your dreams about that organization at the first meeting?

AT: The first thing was that some of us who were the beginners of it said, "Well, now we are getting closer together, there's hope." At the end of the second day, more, because then we had some committees organized and we also set down things to be done by those committees, so you see the beginnings of a more serious organization. There was talk about what name to propose eventually and all these other things that came up. They were quite detailed suggestions that came up.

Most of these suggestions came out of your own experience, experiences of the people. They were varied again, which was anticipated, but at least, we had hopes on the second day that we might even open the umbrella a little more and still keep most of us together to move toward a

real organization, which of course, didn't come until later. The first two years, there were no conferences, just these organizational meetings.

**NS:** What was going on those first two years? Did you get together often?

**AT:** No, this was it, this first day or two days.

**NS:** Two days, only in 1953?

**AT:** Yes, that was in 1953.

**Ann:** But the consumer had to be represented in the marketplace, to be considered fairly.

**AT:** The curriculum came into the picture, because everybody had a curriculum in different areas, and research came in there. And we knew we had to get more facts, to do more research on many of these issues. That's how the word "research" came up. We heard phrases like "consumption economics," and "consumer demand," "consumer education curriculum." We even divided, the first day, into three committees so that shows we were ready to move in the right direction. And we had summaries from those committees at the end of the first day. We heard such things as, "We want to think about a bulletin, and a conference, and programs for the public," and radio and TV got into the picture toward the end of the first day.

**NS:** What about radio and TV?

**AT:** Well, the possibilities, that's all. I have taken some notes. We didn't waste time. We thought about things like who could get on a radio program and raise hell with the things that needed to be raised hell with about advertising, or lack of information about interest rates. Now, not everybody agreed. Of course, we had our fun.

But the first thing on the agenda was to think about a permanent organization, with an annual or regional meeting.

Maybe we ought to think about preparing a budget. It's no use about selling memberships yet. We need money because a lot of us cannot get money from our colleges and universities to go to meetings in those days, just wasn't in the budget, except for a very few people. We need some money because we have to buy paper, and the like, and have to pay somebody \$600 to be executive secretary. They were selecting an executive secretary and defining its functions.

We had lots of interesting remarks from Marguerite Burk, who was a very sharp woman, and Ray Price. Gene Beem, from Kalamazoo College in Michigan, was an economist. Damon, Harap, oh, we had some sharp views here.

Before we left that second day, Gene Beem was elected our executive secretary. We had a hard time selling him on it. It was interesting to me because he talked economics and not consumer economics. That was a pretty wise choice and maybe we didn't realize how wise a choice that was because nobody felt they had the time to be executive secretary, no money. What can we use for money when you need to communicate with us? It is kind of interesting that that came up in the second period of 1953. I don't know whether there was anything else.

I think the term (I don't remember who suggested it), the Council on Consumer Information, came into the picture. I have a note on that. There were discussions around this, too. "Information," because it has a rather interesting connotation. Probably a non-professional connotation, organization-wise. It came into our early discussions.

At the same time, there were discussions about why can't we develop the consumer interest more in our organization, so that's why the question of whether we should be non-political or

take more stands on issues came into the picture rather seriously then.

NS: Was it something you really seriously considered at that point? You're talking about the early days, right?

AT: Yes.

NS: That did come up then?

AT: It came in through our discussion. I think maybe a word more on that. If we organized, if we can settle on CCI (Council of Consumer Information), should it be strictly professional or should we also get into activist ways, because you had some bombshells with that, in terms of advertising and all the rest; interest rates, monopolies, and so forth? The consumer was really being hoodwinked in so many ways! So this whole question came up, of how professional should we be?

We finally tentatively decided, at least more than tentatively at that point, we decided that we should be non-political and take no stand on issues of public policy. The sole purpose was to contribute to more effective fact finding and dissemination of consumer information. That's the quotation.

NS: You weren't drawing any boundaries as to whom you wanted to disseminate it to?

AT: Not yet, that I can recall, nor in the notes that I have read. You see, we had a beginning here. We were going to meet again, and hopefully, at the next meeting we'd have some rather interesting things in terms of some more information on getting some money. That follows logically.

NS: Mr. Troelstrup, you were talking about this problem of political grasp.

AT: Yes. We had the name, Council on Consumer Information on our minds here and we also agreed that our organization, if we can get it going, should be non-political and take no stand on issues of public policy. Henry Harap has a note to the effect, that by July 1955, this quotation never appeared, that's in '55 and we'd had at least one pamphlet at that time. This quotation never appeared on the earliest publications.

NS: The words Council on Consumer Information never appeared?

AT: I don't know any more history about it or how it came about. That would be interesting, if you can dig out from someone else who was there because I can't honestly think, who suggested that we just don't put it there, see what happens. I don't know, but it didn't appear in April, 1955.

NS: Was the idea of putting out these pamphlets there from the beginning?

AT: Very early, yes. Not only pamphlets, but monographs.

NS: Do you know how that first pamphlet came about, or am I jumping ahead of the story here?

AT: Yes, a little ahead, but that's all right. I believe our first pamphlet was, *Consumers Look at Farm Price Policies*. Marguerite Burk, who is a thorough scholar if there ever was one, wrote this first pamphlet. Well, this pamphlet was discussed very heavily. This led up to finally defining our limitations, and getting this on our pamphlets.

Really, we were pretty much divided on that issue, almost half and half, of whether we shouldn't become more a part of an activist group and put that in writing. Because this

statement, of course, we'll just write as a scholar writes. Maybe we need more of that in our kind of an area than that.

I wish we had had verbatim transcribing of that, because it was a hot issue. We were divided about half and half on that issue. As you can imagine, some thought we should be beyond this.

**NS:** You were one of those?

**AT:** Yes, you can name them from that first list. Marguerite, of course, was a real scholar. It was a scholarly piece of work. It wasn't exactly what we wanted to activate, and when we discussed it, from the notes I have, we were about equally divided on that. So you know what happened, the organization puts it in the hands of a committee to study it a little more carefully. This committee reported later that the objective treatment of issues of public policy was the essence of what is important at that time, but it didn't get on that publication. An interesting bit of history there, I think.

**NS:** You mean the first pamphlet didn't even contain the words, Council on Consumer Information?

**AT:** Why? I don't know. I wish you would try to dig that one up a little. I'm wondering about that particular meeting. I can't suggest, but this was interesting, it just didn't appear. Of course, some of us were pretty happy about it, because we felt we could have a broader philosophy.

**NS:** I see. So you are referring not just to the title, but to the statement of purpose?

**AT:** Of course this was just a sidelight, but it is an interesting historical sidelight, I think.

**NS:** Can I ask you if you drafted an alternative statement of policy which was a little more broadly framed?

**AT:** Not that I know about, in writing. Maybe some discussions that CU or ACCI may be collecting might throw some light on it, but I don't recall that. Something else happened here at this '53 meeting that is rather interesting. We had an executive committee, and this executive committee agreed to assume certain responsibility in preparation for the possible formation of a permanent organization. Some of the ideas that came out were: let's build a list of potential members in the country; let's organize a publications committee and hopefully, get a first pamphlet out as soon as we can; thirdly, let's get some money somewhere so that our executive secretary will have something to work on.

**Ann:** That's when Consumers Union came to our rescue.

**AT:** Yes. We decided we needed at least \$500 to start with. That's where Colston comes into the picture, because he had indicated to us that the Consumers Union Board might be willing to give a little to get us started, possibly as much as \$2000 or \$3000. That was just a generalization, and of course, Colston couldn't pledge that. Having been on the Board of Directors of CU for 18 years, I knew how close they were to bankruptcy in the early years.

**NS:** You had been on that board?

**AT:** Not quite that early, but very shortly thereafter, so I knew it because I was in contact with Colston so much. In fact, we had so little money, even the first year I was on the board, that we couldn't even go to a restaurant. We bought bread and cheese and beer and hard liquor and had a picnic.

**Ann:** No Famous Amos cookies.

**AT:** When Colston mentioned two or three thousand, even before this, that was boasting a little bit.

**Ann:** That was his genius; he had worked them up to that point. We knew that they were going to try to help, but they had to do it.

**NS:** He (Colston) knew they were going to help, but they (the Board) would have to do it?

**AT:** Yes, but of course, they did. The Consumers Union Board, despite financial problems of their own, did see this was an important thing because CU could never get into this kind of an activity at all. It was needed nationally, so why not put a little money into a group that may have the possibility of organizing on a national basis, when we had no national organization.

Colston did then go to the board. We had to have stationery and staff money because we probably had 2000 or 3000 names to write to, telling them how we would like to start this organization.

**NS:** How did you come up with all those names? Did Consumers Union give you its mailing list?

**AT:** That was just out of the air. At that first stage we didn't know that we could get more than \$500. We thought of postage and then maybe we could get volunteer help for the mimeographing and those things. That's where the \$500 came into the picture.

As we discovered, we could get a little more than that, but that wasn't in the early stage that we're talking about at this particular time. As I recall, Colston Warne did submit his \$500 and what it would be used for in a suggestion of making a grant. At that time, we could only think in terms of having the executive committee meet in the future. We had enough grant money to pay for some of that and we would have a chance, probably, to get an executive secretary who would be willing to take the job, too.

The plan was to have only the executive committee meet and it actually did meet in Washington, DC on June 1, 1953. I think this little aid from CU was absolutely necessary to get that executive committee to meet. That was the best place to meet because, again, other people were going to be there, also, but apparently without funds of their own, out of their own pocket.

I know Gene Beem was one. He was from Kalamazoo College, that small struggling college in Michigan, so they needed a little help. I forgot how much help was distributed to him there. Anyhow, the executive committee did meet in Washington, DC, which was probably the most convenient place to meet for that particular committee. That was a pretty important committee in our organization because they made some decisions like drawing up some bylaws.

**NS:** That's where the bylaws got drawn up?

**AT:** Yes, they drew up some bylaws to cover membership, officers, dues.

**Ann:** That was Henry Harap, wasn't it?

**AT:** Yes, and they decided they would send letters only to people who were at the first meeting and to others who desired to join. There would be no financial help available to the others, just to those who needed it or who were at the first meeting. We didn't have too much going for us, there.

This was the beginning and Gene Beem accepted the responsibility of doing the writing and pushing in there, and actually, then we reached this stage of the thing, talking about a

permanent organization. We were talking about bigger money needs, special projects of various kinds, and the possibility of an annual conference.

Marguerite Burk, in particular, held out for publications early. She was a workaholic if there ever was one. We should make plans for a newsletter, she thought, and in the air we heard figures of 2, 3, 4 pamphlets, so we were thinking in bigger terms than ever before.

**NS:** Two or three or four a year?

**AT:** Gene, our executive secretary, said he would be willing to travel around the country soliciting funds if we could get a little more money in the budget from CU or anywhere. He would be willing to go around and see where there might be some funds available with no commitment.

**NS:** Did you think at that time, about any problems related to who you would take money from or who you would let into the organization?

**AT:** Yes, that was discussed a little bit, but it didn't get priority yet. It hadn't reached that stage of worry. We knew it was going to be a problem; it had to come up and it should come up.

**Ann:** Leland Gordon was so aware of that.

**NS:** Leland Gordon mentioned that early on?

**Ann:** Yes, he had experience at weights and measures.

**AT:** All of us did that. In my little experimentations, I had all that information for five years at Stephens College, that grant from the foundation.

**NS:** The Sloan Foundation?

**AT:** Sloan Foundation. We had enemies in the field; advertisers, all along the line, big business. We were asking for trouble when we were working on getting a conference that had a fairly puristic interest in the consumer welfare.

**NS:** Did you say "puristic?"

**AT:** Puristic interest. That word may not be in the notes that anyone has, but we were going in that direction. There was mixed feelings about that, too. That's when we needed more money, so there was a request. Colston was a very important person there. He was president of the Board of Directors and he had support from quite a few of us. Consumers Union did credit us \$7000, and that was big money in those days. Gene Beem thought, now I have a chance to go around and I don't have to use money or beg from the rest of us. He was doing something else, too, and this \$7000 got in our budget.

We generally agreed we should look around and see who would be potential authors for some of our pamphlets or monographs or whatever it should be. Maybe we should have only leaflets if we can't have a pamphlet. We thought we should send letters out to 2000 or so persons who could be identified and actually something like that was identified: home economists, economists, some sociologists, some psychologists, and the like. It was more a criss-cross, but primarily economists and home economists.

**Ann:** There was a surprising response.

**AT:** Yes. That came into the picture, and of course, we had thought of at least a tentative name for our organization, The Council on Consumer Interests, and we did get interest from at least

10% of our mailing. Isn't that fairly good?

**NS:** I would think that's excellent.

**AT:** We felt that that was quite successful. Here we had hopes and that led us to say, "Look, we've got to have another meeting." We had such a good one in Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, really, in Ray Price's basement. We got rooms at the University of Minnesota at very low cost and the like, so they were involved, too. Let's go back to the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis and invite as many people as possible who might be seriously interested to go there.

**Ann:** Is that the one Ralph Nader gave a talk at?

**AT:** No. Ralph wasn't on the scene yet, but at that particular meeting, remember, this committee I was talking about, executive committee.

**NS:** Were you still in Washington then?

**AT:** Yes. They came out and said, after we analyze the interest, you see there was national interest there, then we should really start promoting CCI. We should think in terms of establishing some possible policies for a permanent organization. I have a feeling that the \$7000 grant from CU was a very important psychological factor there, because most of us couldn't afford to spend too much money to go to those meetings.

**NS:** Did Colston announce that grant at that Washington meeting?

**AT:** No. I can't give you the exact time that announcement came. That surely is in the letter; hence, the second meeting. The executive committee met and drafted the CCI constitution, not merely a name, but drafted a constitution. Ray Price came up and he sent some drafts to some of us. There was a good deal of discussion that needed revision in terms of the committee and needed reviewing, and was reviewed seriously.

One decision that came out was, "Look, let's get one thing in writing, like a newsletter, because we can send a little newsletter out quite cheaply compared to a pamphlet." So, the first newsletter did appear in December of 1953, so it was eventually realized.

We discussed it at that morning meeting. In fact, we divided ourselves--because there was difference of opinion--into two groups depending upon our interests. One group dealt with potential pamphlets and another group, newsletters or clearinghouse functions of consumer research concepts.

These groups met and reported their feelings on this committee. That's where the statement on *Consumers Look at Farm Price Policies* came into the picture--that statement that I gave out of context there. The "Council is strictly non-partisan and takes no stand on any issue or policy," end of quotation. This treatment did have different supporters in our group at that time, of course, continued to have different kinds of support.

**Ann:** Also, you had to be thinking of the growth of national advertising--radio particularly--not long after TV and the power of the advertisers who looked down on the consumer movement.

**AT:** The financial support came up quite often too, because, "Are we going to get continued grants from CU and funds from different parts of the country?" The probabilities are that we may not be able to do that, so then we had to be making some decisions regarding financial support from business, possibly. We decided that business support was pretty risky so we had to put some strings on that. The string that was tied to that, was that they had nothing to say about what was in the publications that may come out of our organization, if they are willing

to agree to that.

Also in that same context of financial support, we discussed membership dues. There was a division there, support should be accepted, and secondly, that probably we should charge somewhere between \$2 and \$5 a year membership. Gene Beem said he was then willing to go out and work. He said, "Let's enclose an early newsletter and possibly a pamphlet and report on the progress we are making to the group, and let's decide on where and when to meet again," so we weren't giving up. Again, this \$7000 grant was a basic godsend.

NS: That had come before all of this?

AT: Yes.

NS: I don't know if I understood you. Did you say that you did give thought to getting corporations or commercial interests to sponsor the pamphlets, provided they had nothing to do with the content?

AT: No, we thought we could get some foundations. Some of the big foundations were really business-financed by grants from corporations, so that was in the picture.

NS: For example, were you thinking of the Sloan Foundation, perhaps?

AT: Well, we knew what they had done for Stephens College, the five-year grant. Big business was so hot about what had happened there, because it stepped on certain toes, that the conclusion was almost obvious that the big corporations wouldn't dare give us that kind of support so we couldn't expect another fund.

Gene said, "Let's go after them anyhow." We did, or he did, primarily. It was Gene because he was a good man for that sort of thing. Furthermore, his Ph.D. in economics didn't hurt him, rather than a Doctor of Education degree, you know what I mean. He was perfectly willing to go ahead, so we set up a budget. I don't know whether you want anything on that.

The executive committee met in Chicago. This was June 8, 1954 [laughter]. This budget was rather interesting. We had hoped for a \$9600 budget; \$7500 from CU and \$500 from memberships; \$1000 from the sale of pamphlets; and maybe \$600 was the secretary's stipend for one year. We needed \$600 for summer and we wanted to put that in the budget, so we had a budget of, I believe, \$9600. That was overly optimistic. Actually, CU made a grant of \$5000. We sold only 25 pamphlets. On July 12, 1954, we had only 70 paid memberships, and where could we go budget-wise with those limitations? Of course, that \$7500 that CU finally came through with was very important.

On November 27, 1954, three of us attended the National Council for the Social Studies meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana. That was Nelson, Price, and myself. It was decided, at this particular Chicago meeting, that we ought to go there because they had one section devoted to improving consumer education instruction. We were sounded out if we would be interested in being at that sectional meeting, so if American Home Economics Association is interested, let's take what we can get!

NS: You said the National Council for Social Studies. Are you saying also the AHEA?

AT: No, just the National Council for Social Studies. They had one section in this area. Ray Price, Nelson and myself were in that sectional meeting. That indicates, too, the National Council for Social Studies was overwhelmingly interested in high school and below, teaching in the social studies, of which consumer economics was only a part of that large umbrella. That was very important because we made a report to the National Council for Social Studies, which I believe, was on November 27, 1954 in Indianapolis.

We made a report at this sectional meeting of that group, of the progress we had made in organizing, trying to organize a national teachers professional organization. It was rather interesting, because they knew that the American Economics Association hadn't expressed any professional interest in it. They knew there was more interest in it now, so we thought we had made some progress. We presented a progress report to them on November 27, 1954, that we had 139 members. I put down a little note here, I'm taking it out of sequence here, too. Oh, I wanted to give you a contrast here. By the end of 1956, we had 642 members.

NS: Between when and when?

AT: That was July 12, 1954—642. Of that group, 280 were regular members, 225 were students (graduate students, primarily), and institutionals (libraries), 137, to make up that 642. I put that later statistic to show we were making progress. Who knows how many people at the National Council for Social Studies we might be talking of. You don't know. Of course, Gene Beem was going around and sending a leaflet and letters and the like. We had made considerable progress between those two dates.

NS: You speak of Gene Beem very highly.

AT: Yes. He was a very important person in my book.

Ann: Sparkplug.

AT: True enough, and this is a later footnote, when he left teaching economics at Kalamazoo College, he got a very fine job with the green stamp boys, Sperry & Hutchinson, was the beginning of parting company.

Ann: He had to make a choice.

AT: He had to make a choice, and did. Gene thought we didn't have to part. It didn't come suddenly, it came and that ended, as you probably know the history. He had signed up to write one of the publications. You know what he decided to write on? *Trading Stamps in the United States* was the title--that was pretty close to it anyhow.

Well, that did not go over with our board at that time at all! It was too bad because Gene had played such an important role up to that time. We probably had lost a very important person who had worked very hard and long in our organization up to then.

Ann: S&H was a supporter of the consumer movement afterward.

AT: Yes, but you see that division in our organization was, "How can we take money from them," because so many of us in the organization had been quite critical on our own campuses or writing or in our teaching because of some things we didn't like about the stamp in our marketing system. There was a great deal of division and disagreement there.

NS: You were saying that there was a great deal of disagreement there?

AT: Yes. Compared to college teaching, Gene was in big money early there. Of course, he was a family man, that was understandable. I think, honestly, he had sold himself into that. It shouldn't be. There doesn't necessarily have to be such division between this group.

Our group was just in the beginning of trying to professionalize on a national basis. Many of us thought, "How can he resist a good salary, and still have a feeling he could be a friend to the consumer?" A blessing, he has been a very, very important person in our organization, at least I felt that way. Maybe I'm getting into other things that you want from other people.

NS: I didn't want to cut you short. Your views were very interesting to me. There were a few things which I wanted to follow up on if I could.

I asked you before about this distinction between the ultimate consumer and the professional consumer activist. Were you happy with the pamphlet series? Did you wish at the time, that it would stir up a little more energy on the part of people? Do you wish they (pamphlets) were less academic?

AT: Yes. There was a division in the group on that and I leaned in that direction. Also, my graduate training was in history, under very fine historians at the University of Minnesota and elsewhere. I had done one of my seminars, pieces of research that you do, so I appreciated the scholarly contributions. For our purpose here, some of us thought there was a role for both in here. Can't we have a merger of interest here? Marguerite Burk, of course, was the author of that first scholarly thing.

NS: Was she on the other side pretty consistently?

AT: Oh, she was always on the scholarly side. She never gave up. That's why she was important. She was so bright, so she challenged everybody.

We were looking at what market we were getting interested in; the scholarship market or really promoting the consumer interest, so we can have more important information before decision making in the marketplace. More of us were interested in that.

Most of us who stayed on, Marguerite stayed on in spite of that spanking—it really hurt her, you know, but she stayed with us for quite a while and understood. We were gunning for another market. We weren't just out for scholarship for scholarship's sake. I think that is a fair way of putting it, historically.

NS: Can I ask you, in retrospect, what you would count as the most important achievements of ACCI and what you would think of as those which are still to be achieved?

AT: It is rather difficult to explain it, but as I see it, you could see a growing philosophical integration and a desire for more teachers in different kinds of departments, in different kinds of colleges and universities, and even on the high school and below levels, but especially up in the college levels.

We found perfectly fine people there who could see that there could be a good merger here in scholarship and information, for information that would be valuable because we don't want to throw out something that really isn't reliable information. Then that takes you into the lack of adequate homework or scholarship as you might call it. We wanted to have that also.

Therefore, we had the beginnings of more department heads, if you will, who were willing to encourage some younger members of the economics departments to take an interest in the new organization. We got quite a few, as you know. We're having one today from Cornell University who started out when we were still in Minneapolis, and psychologists, and even some sociologists and the like.

Well, I think that's really putting it in a few words. It's a difficult concept because so many people who are highly specialized, economists specialize even within the economics area and the like, history and all the disciplines the way most of us were brought up in education till we started thinking beyond that.

How can we integrate these things to make it meaningful in certain areas like the consumer area? Can we call on these people who have specialized professionally, because they would be

good contributors if they had the interest and believed in it and we got the start on that integration?

**NS:** Thank you very much.