TEMPE HISTORICAL MUSEUM

ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW #: OH-273

NARRATOR: Dr. Lattie F. Coor

INTERVIEWER: Aaron Monson

DATE: July 15, 2008

LC = Lattie Coor
INT = Interviewer
_____ = Unintelligible
(Italics) = Transcriber's notes

Side A

INT: Today is July 15, 2008. This is the Tempe Historical Museum's ASU renovation interview with Dr. Lattie Coor. Let's begin.

Can you tell me, please, when you first came to ASU, and what made you choose ASU as an employer?

LC: I actually first came to ASU in the 1940s as a grade-school music student, at a summer music camp at the then Arizona State College, Tempe. I also, in the 1950s, though an undergraduate at Northern Arizona University, took summer school here. So that's when I first came to the campus, and knew it well.

I came as President in January of 1990. I had been appointed in May of 1989, but felt I could not leave my duties as President of the University of Vermont without a transition semester.

I came here because I was captivated by the extraordinary opportunity ASU had to become one of the great new public universities in America. I had, by the time the Regents asked if I would be interested, served as a university president thirteen-and-a-half years, and before that as a senior officer, university vice chancellor, at Washington University in St. Louis. And I really was not seriously interested in being a President at another university. As a result of that, I told the Regents I wasn't interested. It was a process that took five or six months, where I, without being coy or reluctant, I simply wasn't interested, and had planned to do some other things in New England where I lived at the time. When I agreed to come for a very brief visit, it was not the ASU I had known in the 1950s when I left Arizona. It represented, I believed, as I said at the outset, one of the most promising opportunities for a good university to become a truly great university,

setting a course that President *(Michael)* Crow has now quite correctly tagged as "the new American university." That's what drew me here.

INT: Since you arrived at ASU, serving as President, what are some of the changes that you've seen happen at the university?

LC: I think three things mostly characterize the university that I know now as opposed to eighteen years ago when I came.

First, it has established itself as a major American research university, with a very strong reputation and a recognition nationally that it is, as Clark Kerr, the great student of American higher education, had said, one of the few in a setting of a major metropolitan area in the Sun Belt and an emerging society that could become a great university. I believe it has moved well down that path.

Secondly, it has become a new model of a multi-campus university, now serving in multiple sites in the greater Phoenix area. There is an earlier model, and ASU has paid some attention to that, and it was the University of London a century ago, when a number of individual campuses became part of a larger university. When I came, ASU West was just emerging. The campus was operating, it had mostly temporary buildings; the first major new buildings of the campus came along later. And there was a very small Downtown Phoenix activity, mostly in continuing education. It is today a university serving in these multiple sites in a very distinctive way, and I think a way that's very different than even when I came—it was more a main campus and a branch campus configuration. Now it's a university that is metropolitan-area-wide.

And third, I think it has established its place as a major instrument for the evolution of greater Phoenix in a way that is not only indicative of major research universities fueling the economy, working with the major instruments of government and business to create a more competitive environment, but also connecting with the larger social fabric and being a leader in defining how the whole of this society is able to take advantage of the qualities of opportunity and improvement that the university provides.

INT: In keeping with the description of the growth and the change that's happened at the university, how would you describe the effects of that?

LC: I think it's been profound for the university. The university was already much better than it itself realized; it was substantially better than this community realized. And I think it has come to have a clearer understanding of itself, but probably most significantly, the leadership, particularly the leadership, but citizens in general in the greater Phoenix area, have come to realize that they have a major, significant university in their midst, and that it has great importance to them and to the metropolitan area's future.

INT: What was the biggest challenge that you faced as the President of the university?

LC: It was two-fold. The first few years I was here, the Arizona economy really took a dive. It began in the late 1980s, and it continued to slide. And even as we were growing in numbers of students rapidly, our support from the State dwindled significantly. And that's always a problem for a university, but it's particularly difficult with a new era, a new administration, and a major set of new initiatives. That was, I thought, clearly a major challenge.

The second goes back to the observations I made just a moment ago. It was a place that didn't quite believe that it could be a truly significant national and international university. And it took some time for the university itself, its faculty and staff and leadership, for the community, and most importantly, I think, for the prospective students, to understand that this was an absolutely first-rate place.

INT: What one accomplishment from your tenure at ASU are you most proud of?

LC: Achieving Research One status, when it meant something. The Carnegie Corporation had established the hierarchy of types of universities. It's since moved into a different direction, but in the 1990s, to be a major research university was a very substantial accomplishment. And even though we had all of those attributes, to go back to my earlier observation, getting that designation in the mid-'90s, early- to mid-'90s, and having it trumpeted to the nation and to the community, major editorials and headlines, was an affirmation, a confirmation, in a very public way, that was very significant.

INT: What was the biggest innovation that came out of your tenure at ASU?

LC: Conceptualizing a university where there are no second-tier locations or programs. Conceptualizing the university as a university in its totality, where there were different choices—depending on, for example, a campus a student went to—but not lesser choices. And to do that in a way that defied convention. There is a tendency to think—and there are many universities like this in the country—of the home campus, the main campus, and then the branch campuses, with the inference that the latter are lesser. To create the reality of that—and it's still not completed, it has to be continually strengthened with every iteration—but to do it in a way that was believed and valid for all parties.

INT: Tell me about one thing you wish you could have accomplished at ASU but, for some reason or another, couldn't?

LC: I wish we could have more substantially increased the proportion of our undergraduate students to more fully mirror the ethnic diversity of the state. I'm proud of what we did accomplish, and I know we'll be talking later in this interview about the steps that were accomplished. I'm proud of what we accomplished, but it is so significant for a state like ours that has—historically through time, before we became a part of the United States, before we became a state, even after we were a territory—that has been built by, shaped by, formed by a multi-cultural origin, that we reflect it; not just to ensure that our identity contains that, but ever more importantly, to ensure that we're providing opportunities for the next generation and generations beyond that, that we reach as substantially into all of

the populations that make up our state—particularly Native American, Latino, African American, Pacific American of course, but those three populations—more fully. That's incomplete work, and I wish we had been able to move further.

INT: Looking at the university today, what would you say they excel at most?

LC: Defining an aspiration and mobilizing substantial numbers of people, within the university and in the larger community, around multi-disciplinary, problem-oriented issues as they relate to the future.

Let's take the School of Sustainability. Not only is it the first in the nation, but it's symptomatic of the multi-disciplinary, trans-disciplinary, nature of its origin. And it has been created and exists as a full academic citizen in the university. Historically, disciplinary boundaries have, for a variety of reasons, and some valid reasons, been ways of judging the true rigor, methodological and academic rigor, for example, by people who are not in that discipline, as somebody moves into a multi-disciplinary endeavor. But those constraints have inhibited universities from truly organizing themselves around issues of significance for the future. It's been true from time immemorial. It was true when Engineering was first introduced, for example, into the land grant colleges. It was actually even true when Science was first introduced in the colonial colleges with real reluctance. It was even true when English and English Literature were introduced into the colonial colleges, where the classics and the classical way of teaching were there.

I think ASU today excels at defining itself, defining its programs, in contemporary ways, and doing so at the same time that it assures the academic and intellectual rigor of those programs.

Probably it's no more true anywhere than in the Life Sciences. The Biodesign Institute is already one of the more significant Life Sciences research enterprises in America, and it's uncommon that it gets built in a university, or even in a community, that doesn't have a major allopathic medical center. MIT is an example, a very good example, a long historical example, but even it was able to develop what it's done and continues in an allopathic-health-center-dense environment. And I just think ASU has, in a sense, charted a course that is exceptional for a university.

INT: Can you tell me then, conversely, what some of ASU's major weaknesses are today?

LV: Handling size. It's so easy to say that size alone is a negative. It needn't be. Among the most memorable courses at Harvard are David Riesman's SOCRL1, Social Relations One, six to eight hundred students, but it was David Riesman. And there lots of TAs and lots of others, and the critics can say, "Well, gee, you don't get real professors." Ken Galbraith's ECON1.

So size alone, both in the way the organization works and in the degree of personal engagement that students have with the institution, size alone does not preclude those things. But finding the most effective way to give voice to them, to make them a reality,

to reduce the bureaucratic annoyances, just the sheer inefficiency of having to go through lots of hoops and lines and the rest of that, and providing ways for every student to have a truly effective set of personal connections, is, I think, the biggest challenge. I think we've approximated it in some areas.

In its own way, a university naturally does that, so that a Theatre student, for example, lives in a universe that is a very rich personally-connected universe. But students enter this large endeavor, and if we do our things right, they're not absolutely sure where they want to be within it. They may even declare a major and stay with it, although more than half will shift that major. And finding ways for them to enter and be early attached, I think remains one of our major challenges.

INT: How did ASU change as an organization during your tenure?

LC: Its belief about itself. Its view of itself. Its confidence in the faculty we were recruiting and could recruit. Its respect for the students we were able to attract.

You know, there are multiple values to having, for example, committed ourselves so fully to recruiting National Merit scholars. One of them is, frankly, the bragging rights that comes from that. And even that phrase may sound a little trivial, but it's not. It is an expression that these talented students come. But far and away, the more important part of it is the density of these very bright, able young people, who themselves bring other bright, able young people to the institution. And the institution's confidence that that's a natural, that's a natural thing for the institution itself to have.

So I guess I would say attitude. Attitude which leads to then aspiration, and the belief that we can be very good. And that's to be the key of the new American university, that we can be very good without having to narrow the opportunity to attend.

The most common mechanism for being highly-regarded is to be very selective in the students who come, and the fewer you take, the more you turn away, the more highly-regarded you are. I understand that. That's human nature; I think it's true in anything we do. But it is a very poor way of judging the value of the university, particularly the value of a public university. And what we are striving to do, and I think have found ways of accomplishing major elements of it, is to say you must be qualified to attend this university, you must demonstrate your abilities. We will hold you to rigorous standards, but we're not going to define ourselves by simply excluding you because there aren't enough spaces.

But we're also not going to just say "sink or swim, come in." Many land grant universities, in the early part of the last century through the middle part of the last century, had no admission standards at all. It was simply if you graduated from a high school in that state, you were admitted. And it was often a "sink or swim" environment that, in my own view, is not the best way to do it. But I think there is, and we have searched for and, I think, found a way, a common ground, in which we can keep our arms open wide in what was one of the basic premises of the public universities when they

were first created through the Land Grant Act—and that's to educate the sons and daughters of farmers and mechanics in the 1800s, not just the elite—that we can do that at the same time we can be a highly-rigorous and qualitative institution.

INT: Let's look ahead a little bit to the year 2071, it's the bicentennial of the city of Tempe. Where do you see ASU at that point in time?

LC: What year did you say?

INT: 2071, Tempe's bicentennial, a little over sixty years from now.

LC: It's always difficult to predict, especially beyond a ten- or twenty-year period, so let me just offer that caveat.

I believe that the following characteristics will obtain. Let me start first with the metropolitan area. I believe, sixty years out, it will be one of the most important metropolitan areas in the Americas—not just North America, but in the Americas—in its size, in its diversity of people, and its diversity of economy and sets of activities that go on here, taking advantage of our proximity to Mexico, Central and Latin America, taking advantage of being in a region of the nation that will still be one of the younger, more evolving regions even sixty years from now.

I believe within that Tempe will continue to emerge as the innovation center, as the place that draws young people and organizations and entities that are, in contemporary terms, viewed as innovative people and innovative organizations.

I believe that will be driven largely by the continuing emergence of ASU, and a deepening of an historically healthy bond between Tempe and ASU, a synergistic relationship that has existed from the very beginning. And I believe that will grow, and be extended in the way we now see new companies, new types of organizations that are "quasis"—they're quasi-affiliated with the university or with spinoffs of the university and, at the same time, are entities that have international endeavor. Even though SkySong is not technically in Tempe—part of it is, if you look at the boundary, south Scottsdale and north Tempe are more an organic part—SkySong is an example of the growing number of internationally-based companies that will come here and be here and use this.

I believe the transportation corridor will enhance that. I believe we will become a much more substantial international airport in the combination of Sky Harbor and Williams Gateway. And I believe the university's and Tempe's proximity to those resources, but that resource, will play a major role.

So I see Tempe devising at that moment in its history, or reflecting at that moment in its history, a then-contemporary version of the city of ideas and innovation and culture that currently reflect this tie between the city and the university. I believe the fact that Tempe is basically land-locked is one of its greatest assets, because it is already beginning to

create within it the density that will be more common throughout the Valley. There'll be modules of density, and Tempe will be one of those, and it will be much more the kind of innovation module than other parts of the Valley.

INT: Can you relate a funny story from your time in office? Any sort of public address mistake or . . .

LC: I've tried, and I'm gonna tell you a story that is not part of my time in office, because, to me, it's the best story. It's actually at a time when I was a student. I've tried, since I saw your notes, and I'm not sure whether we were so mirthless during my time. (laughter)

But the story is this. It's part of the rivalry with the UofA. For years, I guess going back to early times, the two marching bands take the field at the same time, or following one another. So they both appear, whether it's at the UofA campus or the ASU campus, they both appear. And they do their thing, and then they salute one another. When I was an undergraduate, not at either university, the game was in Tucson, and at the end of their particular performance, the ASU marching band, in cursive, began spelling out "Wild Cats" and playing the UofA Bear Down fight song. They feigned confusion, and it turned into "Mild Rats," and then feigned confusion again and put it back to "Wild Cats." The place went crazy, I mean the place went absolutely crazy, both parties were absolutely wild with either rage or amusement by that.

But I would love to tell, and I'm not shielding any, it's probably just a lack of imagination or recollection right now, of something that would really fit that bill.

INT: That's fine. If something does come to mind over the course of the rest of these questions, shout it out.

ASU has been described as a regional leader in integration. Can you share your thoughts or experiences about that particular topic?

LC: A very significant thing happened just before I arrived. All three universities had come under criticism, under fire, particularly by the Latino community, the larger political community, for the lack of diversity and the lack of a thoughtful response. And it wasn't just Latino; there had been, just before I came, a rather tragic incident of a group of White students in a fraternity, part of a drunken party late at night, that assaulted some Black students. And so there were racial tensions.

But the underlying fact and premise was that we, none of the three universities, were reflecting in our student body the larger population. And the Regents mandated that every one of the three universities, beginning in probably '89 or thereabouts, must increase their entering freshman Arizona minority population by 10% per year, compounded over five years. Mandates of that kind can be dangerous and can end up in litigation often that undercuts them. But this one was profound. We stayed with it for six years. I think the first year was just developing, so I think it went through about '95. We stayed with it for six years, and exceeded the goal. But you compound 10% per year, we

ended up increasing the entering freshman class Arizona minority population by over 80% over that period of time.

And by having such a bold move—for all of the universities, but I know far better about ours—it caused several things to happen. First of all, it meant that we had to develop the capacity internally to ensure these students were given the same opportunities to succeed as the more conventionally-admitted students. Probably nowhere was that more evident than among our Native American students. The lesson we learned is that if a student, a traditional college-age entering undergraduate, makes it into their second year, the chances of their succeeding rise appreciably, and that the greatest loss is in the first year. What we found among our Native Americans, particularly among the Navajo, which are the largest population, was that we had a very substantial loss in the first year. So it caused us to focus on the factors. The factors, more often than anything else, were personal. Tempe and ASU are very different for a reservation-based youngster, just in a whole host of ways, but also separation from family, separation from friends. And as a result of that, we created, I think, some programs, thanks to Peterson Zah, the former President of the Navajo, who I asked to join us as a senior officer in the President's office, we created ways and things to do this.

Secondly, it meant we had to face the larger issue of recruiting the leadership of those minority communities into joining us in this endeavor and helping us recruit students. That was part of it, but what it really was was recruiting them into understanding and believing us, because they didn't believe us. They didn't believe we were serious about it, they didn't believe we were telling the full story and were probably sugar-coating it, they didn't believe we were telling them the truth about what was happening. And so it caused us, or at least it was our response, to put together a Minority Advisory Committee to me, to the President, that we took very seriously. We put the strongest voices from the community on that committee, those who were most critical. And we invested a substantial amount of resources in generating data—not where I would have thought we should start—but data that we shared with these community leaders almost ad nauseum so they could absolutely see for themselves. And question us—"Well, what do you mean by 'Black' students, are you including your international students from Africa?"—all of those questions we could face. And we did. It took two or three years for this community to come to understand, to be knowledgeable about it, to feel confident in what they were seeing. It never diminished their strong voice saying "But you're not doing this or you're not doing that."

And I think that combination of the Regents mandate, its magnitude, our welcoming of that, and the things it caused us to do is probably what has caused that reputation. I believe it's been augmented by Michael Crow in the new Sun Devil Promise, where now financial circumstance will not stand between a student and entering this university; that's really profound. And so I think it's been the evolution of that that has given us that reality and, therefore, with it, that reputation.

INT: You had mentioned, at the very beginning of your answer to that question, that there had been some racial tension and some drunken fights between the students themselves, and

then you went on in great detail to talk about ASU's, as an organization, response to that. Do you notice a difference today in the relationship between the student body?

LC: You must understand that for the past almost six years now, I reside in downtown Phoenix; I don't live on the Tempe campus. I have great admiration and respect for and support for my successor, I think Michael Crow is an absolutely superb President. But I'm a long-standing believer that when the guard changes, the guard changes. So I am very happily a member of the faculty, functioning from ASU Downtown. So I'm not as close to answer your question in terms of today, as I can up to 2002.

Let me give you an observation, therefore, based on that, and I have no reason to believe it hasn't continued. We took the guaranteed approach—although we didn't go out and say "this is guaranteed"—but by our behavior, any time a problem arose, we went right straight to it and surfaced it, and then caused large-scale discussion of and sorting through a response to the issue. Two examples come to mind. And it led us, by the way, to create an entity called the Campus Environment Team. I don't know whether it continues to exist. It's a rather awkward term, because one thinks of it in terms of natural physical environment, but it was really the cultural environment. It was chaired for many years by Charles Calleros, the Assistant Dean of the Law School, so we really brought some immense talent to bear.

On one occasion, there were swastikas painted on the campus. We had advisors say, "Well, just go paint them over, that's graffiti, just paint them over." That's not how we treated those things. We brought the student leadership together, we brought the State Press leadership together, and we said let's look at this, and look at what this means, and this is not a trivial matter, we can't paper it over, let's really get to the heart of it. And we began a series of . . . . There were students who were quite frightened by that, understandably, as to what that could mean, a deeper anti-Semitism or whatever expression was there.

We had a student from a rural background—who ultimately left the university, so not all elements of these things are happy—who, I think, unfortunately and wrongly, but probably very naively, posted a document on the door of a room that had two or three Black students in it, and they were derogatory statements. They weren't the hate-filled, but they were the racial derogatory statements. "Where do Black children come from? From a watermelon patch." They were those kinds of terrible things. There too, because we had created an environment, the students, who were upset—these young women were freshmen—they had the sense to go to their floor advisor. The floor advisor in turn took it to . . . . We did the same thing. We just said this is unacceptable, and we drew it into the larger arena.

As a result, when the 9/11 calamity happened, and we had, in this Valley, in Mesa, within the first week, a Sikh, not related to the university at all, as Sikhs do, a turban-wearing Sikh, who owned a gasoline station, family had been here for years, was killed, shot, by a redneck, shot, because of all of the stuff, mistakenly, about Arabs or others that were

there. Well, we moved very quickly, because students on the campus were quite alarmed, and got the mosque and got other leadership involved.

So I think that also has contributed to the view of this as a multicultural place. It has to be worked on every day, however.

INT: I'm gonna take this opportunity to stop the tape and turn it over.

(end of recording)

Side B

INT: Side B of the Tempe Historical Museum's ASU renovation interview with Dr. Lattie Coor. Today's date is July 15, 2008.

I'd like to go back a little bit to an earlier statement you had made about being proud of ASU becoming a Research One status university. Just in general, can you tell me a little bit about what the university had to accomplish to achieve that status?

LC: The Carnegie Corporation criteria, at the time that this was such a major feature, had a strict mathematical measure, and it was the number of PhDs across a wide number of fields and the research dollars earned through competitive grants. And it was a very high bar. They re-visited the issue about every seven years, and they raised the bar, not only to reflect just general inflation or other things, but they kept raising the bar even higher. But those were the criteria by which they made those judgments.

INT: I spoke to your predecessor, former President J. Russell Nelson, and he talked in great detail about his role in developing research as a primary goal of the university. How did you carry on his work, or did you approach it from your own standpoint?

LC: It was his work that gave us the foundation to move it on forward. In fact, it's very interesting, if one looks at the evolution of the university, that with the assumption of university status in 1958, quite recently, the foundations were laid for the building of research. There had been only limited amounts. President Nelson, his own background, his own values, very substantially increased that, and we simply built on it, continued to develop the structure, and continued to develop the activity.

I think one of the features that is most worthy of note in terms of the institution itself has been the consistency of the evolution of each era, and President's eras have run about a decade at a time. Each era has built on the last, but done so in a very conscious way, to take the elements of the larger goal of the university and build on that. And that certainly was my intention, and it was evident to me that was the best course for the university. And I see the same thing happening with this era under President Crow.

INT: You had mentioned to me also that toward the beginning of your tenure, there was a bit of an economic downturn within the state and perhaps within the city as well. What did

you have to do, in terms of lobbying the City or the State legislators, to ensure that ASU would continue to receive its support from the City?

LC: Fortunately, our relations with the City were always good, and the City has been a partner in a way different than the kind of fundamental appropriations that come from the State, so our efforts were targeted more fully on the State itself. It was a sustained effort that had two characteristics. First, to do everything we could to have the State, the governor, the legislative leadership, the legislators, understand this is an investment, not an expenditure. And to understand what that meant—that if they failed to invest in the university, not only would they hamper our ability to educate this rapidly-growing number of students, but it would prevent us from creating the larger university research economic development venue that we needed to do.

Secondly, we personalized it in a very substantial way, legislator by legislator. We did it through a very talented professional staff in University Relations. We did it, however, with very substantial involvement of citizens from the community—business leaders and community leaders, but also alumni—in going one-by-one.

We were, at best, marginally successful. The State cut its taxes nine consecutive years in a row, even as the funding for many functions was inadequate. We saw the share for our university coming from the State appropriation continue to diminish over time, and it has continued to diminish. One of the reasons why tuition costs per student have gone up so substantially is that the share coming from the State has continued to decline.

Having said that, I do think we had some major successes over time, but it took some leveraging beyond just the legislature. Proposition 301, which was voted in by the public in 2000-2001, largely for teacher salaries, was a six-tenths-of-a-cent sales tax increase statewide. Twelve percent of that went to research in the universities, all three universities, for economic development. So we got involved in a number of those kinds of things. But it was to be as personal as we could, as energetic as we could, and drawing people into it, but also having a very clear statement about the meaning of all of this for the state's educational and economic health.

INT: I'd like to ask you one more question about cultural diversity at ASU. How would you say that the increased student cultural diversity has enriched both ASU and the city of Tempe?

LC: Without question, there is a healthiness to the numbers and comfort and naturalness of a much more diverse university, and with it, I think, a much more diverse community. The progress this nation has made in my lifetime, and yet the abrasions, the issues, that remain to be treated, we must weigh the latter against the former and not rest. But I think there is a naturalness and healthiness to the diversity in our midst that puts us in a much stronger position than was the case twenty years ago to tackle these problems for the future. I think Tempe is much the better for it; I think ASU is much the better for it.

INT: In keeping with the idea of the relationship between ASU and Tempe, in a general sense, how would you describe it today?

LC: Let me touch it briefly historically and affirm, because I believe the evolution over time is, if anything, affirms that even more strongly today than at any time in its history.

It's an almost perfect relationship. College towns, university towns, often come in one of two flavors. Either the university is so much larger than the community that it dominates it, so if you go to Iowa City or Champagne-Urbana, it dominates it. Or else the city is so large that the university kind of is just one of a number of things the city has to deal with. I don't know that the numbers I'm gonna give you are absolute, but the ratios are. When ASU was 5,000 students, Tempe was 20,000. When ASU was 20,000 students, Tempe was 50,000-60,000-70,000. And so it has been. So the relative size of the two institutions, particularly the Tempe campus of ASU, has been a very healthy one.

Similarly, the location. The decision of the Tempe leadership before I got here, largely in Mayor *(Harry)* Mitchell's period, to revive Mill Avenue, which was getting pretty shabby in the '70s and '80s, to put the City Hall downtown and build all of that, and do it in a way that there would be mutual reinforcement with the university, has strengthened that relationship over time. And while there are inevitably complexities in a town/gown relationship, it is as healthy and has been systematically as healthy as any place I know.

The period I was coming to ASU, the New York Times had a list of the ten best university towns in America, and Tempe was one of those. And as I thought about it, as I looked at the article, and I reflected on what we were doing, the reason it is one of the best is this balance of size, ratio, and attitude between Tempe and ASU. I think the movement of the university down onto Mill Avenue, the Brickyard, continues to reinforce that, so there is not a wall of separation. There are areas of concentration, obviously, but a good deal of fluidity back and forth between them.

INT: I'd like to wrap up the interview just by asking you if there are any final remarks or statements that you'd like to make while we're on the record?

LC: I cannot imagine ASU without Tempe. It was a very shrewd move, by the way, that was made by the Hayden-Armstrong family that kept the Normal School, because more substantial communities, when all of this was done in 1885, were fighting over the state capitol, the state prison, the state insane asylum, and the university. And a rather tiny community chose to bring the Normal School here, which was at the time a much more . . . . ASU was conferring degrees five years before the UofA even got organized to offer classes, because the training of teachers was so important.

And, therefore, it was our good fortune, ten miles away from Phoenix, which in that era was quite a ways, to be in Tempe, to be created by Tempe, to have this umbilical connection right from the beginning, and to have all of that happen in the distinctiveness that Tempe and ASU provide each other. But to do so in this great metropolitan area, it is

one of the most important features of ASU, and I believe also one of the most important features of Tempe.

INT: I want to thank you for your participation and for coming all the way down here to take part in this interview. This will conclude the Tempe Historical Museum's ASU renovation interview with Dr. Lattie Coor on July 15, 2008.

(end of recording)

Transcribed by Susan Jensen
April 2013
U:\CommunityServices\MUSEUM\OH Transcriptions\OH-273 Coor, Lattie.docx