

Jeanmarie Turner
HIS650 – Oral History
Formal Interview
Interviewer: Jeanmarie Turner
Interviewee (Narrator): Dr. Fred Foley, Jr.
March 22, 2019
Session 2

0:02

Turner: Good morning Dr. Foley.

Foley: Good morning Jeanmarie.

Turner: Thank you for helping me with my Oral History project. We are interviewing today for Session 2. This will be our second and final session.

Foley: Looking forward to it.

Turner: Dr. Foley is our narrator and Jeanmarie Turner, I am the interviewer. This interview is being conducted on Friday, March 22, 2019 in Dr. Foley's office, Olney Hall, Room 360 at LaSalle University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. After our pre-meeting, Dr. Foley agreed that we can close and place the do not disturb sign on the office door and we have turned our phones on airplane mode to avoid any interruptions.

Turner: Dr. Foley, do I have permission to record this interview?

Foley: Yes, you do.

Turner: We are going to pick up where we left off on Wednesday. We went through a lot of your early life and education and your family information and we were talking about the students at LaSalle in 2019, how the campus has changed and how the students may have changed. My first question today is, do students today have a different understanding of politics and government than your students of thirty, forty years ago?

Foley: Wow, that's a terrific question. I think in terms of their basic understanding of how American government works, it really depends on the students and their sense of what are the critical issues. That part has changed dramatically. What I'm driving at in terms of the students is thirty or forty years ago, there were very few, one every once in a while, students here who were not born in the United States. You would occasionally get a student who was a first-generation immigrant either as an adult student in the evening or as a regular 18 to 22-year-old undergrad who would come to the United States with his or her parents. For them they had not had any of the typical courses that folks in the U.S. had in Social Studies or in Civics or American History or American Government. These days, the percentage of students who are immigrants, either again first-generation immigrants or the children of first-

generation immigrants, is much higher. For those students, they come in to, particularly the introductory class that I teach in American Government with less of a foundation than the students did thirty or forty years ago. Which is probably a good thing because it makes them more open to actually listening to what we're talking about in class and they don't come in with as many preconceptions as they may have had having gone through 12 years of high school, or elementary and high school before that. The other aspect that I would say, depending on how far back you want to go, when I first started teaching here in the seventies, and spilled into the eighties, there was a much higher degree of student activism politically. In the 1970's the Vietnam War was still going strong, the protests against the Vietnam War were still going strong, primarily on college campuses around the United States, including this one. The Civil Rights Movement was still very active although its primary activity had been a hand full of years earlier than that in the mid-sixties. I don't think you find the same, at least up until 2016, degree of political activism on the part of students today that you found back then. Twenty Sixteen and the Trump election changed some of that, especially among women students. I think there is more of a level of political interest and political activity than there had been prior to 2016. I think the openness to learning about American government and the willingness to participate in discussions about American government, that is pretty much the same. But it is interesting because of the more diverse background of the students, it's just a very different political culture than it used to be. I found back in the seventies and in the 2000's and teens, students are all over the map politically. There're liberals, there's conservatives, there's democrats, there's republicans and that hasn't changed. The balance may have changed a little bit, but diversity is still typical here.

Turner: Do they have any clubs or associations here that deal with either a conservative club or a liberal club or a democratic or republican club?

Foley: I think there's still, this tends to happen more often in years when there are presidential elections going on, but I think there are still Young Democrat and Young Republican clubs. You'll see signs. I'm not involved in any of them. I don't know to what extent students are involved in any of them. But you'll see occasionally during presidential years that there are signs up for meetings or guest lecturers. There's a pretty active, I think conservative, more philosophically conservative, group within the History department's students. But I don't know that there's any extensive student clubs that are politically focused.

Turner: I remember when I was much younger, the presidential election lasted a certain period of time. It seems like we are quite a ways out from the 2020 presidential election, but already, things are moving very quickly. A lot of people have already declared their intent to run. Do you think this very long, almost a year and a half

6:08

to two years of a process to elect a president, do you think that that's more positive for the process or more negative?

Foley: I think it's more positive for the process because it gives an opportunity for more people to try to get involved in running for the presidency. Some of its driven by who are the candidates and is there an overwhelming favorite to be nominated by one party or the other? For example, in 2016 for the Democrats, there were really only two candidates at the beginning, we saw Hillary Clinton, and then Bernie Sanders came along as a candidate and attracted a lot more interest and did a lot better than I think a lot of folks expected him to. On the Republican side in 2016, there were upwards of a dozen people running at the beginning before it narrowed down to Donald Trump and Ted Cruz. And then ultimately Donald Trump as the nominee. This year is the reverse of that. Donald Trump, assuming good health, he's going to be the Republican nominee in 2020. It's always possible there may be a challenger or two but I don't think that's going to be very substantial or very productive. On the Democratic side there is well over a dozen people who have already announced. There're still a couple folks out there that everybody expects is going to announce. I think it's good for the respective political parties to have that many people pursuing the presidency because it gives the folks who are going to vote in the primaries or who are going to go to the caucuses in those states who have them, it gives them an opportunity to have a say in who gets nominated to run. We've never had a situation where both parties have had such large numbers at the same time. I'm not quite sure how that would work out. It might get to be a 6-ring circus instead of a three-ring circus. I think it's healthy and I think the extended campaign, part of that is just because it takes that long to mobilize volunteers, to put your staff together, to raise the money, to campaign in all these states that are having primaries and caucuses, but I think it engenders more student interest as well because they are already talking about who they like or who they don't like. I think that's just good political discourse.

Turner: Bernie Sanders seemed to attract a lot of young people's support.

Foley: He did.

Turner: . . . in the last pre-election, during the Democratic primaries, any thoughts on that? I mean, he's a much older gentleman.

Foley: In terms of 2016 or . . .

Turner: In terms of 2016 first.

Foley: You are absolutely right. He did attract a lot of younger support and a fair amount of middle-aged support too. But he had a special appeal to younger voters I think because Hillary Clinton was representative of the traditional leadership, traditional age group that had dominated the Democratic Party off and on for several decades.

9:16

Barack Obama was a lot younger when he was elected president, he obviously was a minority gentleman. He attracted lots of people into the political process that had not been actively involved because of his candidacy. But when it then came to Hillary Clinton as the candidate in 2016, it was a revision back to the traditional leadership of the Democratic Party which is frankly, getting older. I think Sanders, despite the fact that he was older than she is, or was, he struck a chord with not only the younger part of the Democratic Party, but the more progressive and liberal leaning members of the Democratic Party. In a lot of respects, the leadership of the Democratic Party, this really started with President Clinton, had become much more moderate and moved more to the center ideologically and was not out on the liberal ideological side of the spectrum. Sanders, he bought in to that, he clearly is representative of the progressive wing of the party. A lot of young folks really took to that and got actively involved with him. A lot of people gave a lot of money, a lot of small donations that added up to a tremendous amount of money for his candidacy. He got a lot of votes, a lot of delegates, but not enough to get nominated. It will be interesting to see this time around if he is able to sustain that because he is not the only very progressive liberal Democrat running. There are at least 6 or 8 others with equally liberal and equally progressive credentials, probably not yet as well-known as Bernie Sanders, but also, a good deal younger, folks in their forties, fifties and sixties. Whether he can hold on to the base that he created in 2016 will be his real challenge to pull off. And he's four years older. That is, running for president is an extraordinarily, energy draining experience. It just takes a lot of energy. He's got good health, he's got lots of energy, but he's older. Conducting the campaign, and then if he were to win, serving in office for four years would put him into his early eighties. I think that's something voters need to think about.

Turner: Recently we've heard Joe Biden will probably throw his hat in the ring also.

Foley: Yes.

Turner: He has positives and negatives. His age will definitely affect . . .

Foley: He is the same age as, I think . . .

Turner: They're very close.

Foley: . . . Bernie Sanders. Joe Biden has a terrific record as a senator, most of the time, and as Vice-President. He's got scads of experience, more experience than the whole rest of the field combined, has solid credentials to be President of the United States. But he is again a throw-back to the traditional leadership of the Democratic Party. I think more liberal than Bill Clinton or Hillary Clinton. But certainly not as far out on the progressive and liberal side of the spectrum as Bernie Sanders or Kamala Harris or a number of the other candidates who are running for president. He has never attracted a national audience. He was a strong running mate with

12:50

Barack Obama but the vice-president is not really the main focus of a presidential campaign. I think he was a strong vice-president but the times he's run before for presidential nomination, he hasn't done very well. Whether he can, he's going, I think, tap into a tremendous amount of money, from, again from the traditional sources of money for Democratic candidates. Whether he can tap into enough voter sentiment to do well in the early caucuses and the early primaries, I think is questionable. And he is the same age, he's got the same age issues. Again, health is good, energy level high but he's several years older than I am and that's a consideration. The president happens to be the same age range, age is going to be an interesting dynamic in this campaign.

Turner: It may either become a huge factor, or it may be diminished as a factor.

Foley: It's not going to be a factor at all if either Biden or Sanders gets nominated, because those two plus Trump are all in the same age bracket. If the Democrats nominate a significantly younger person, then age will become an interesting part of the campaign.

Turner: If Vice-President Biden was to run, and get the Democratic nomination, do you think that would help, do you think he would be someone who would have more widespread appeal in a general election then say, someone who is very progressive or very left leaning?

Foley: Yes, short answer, yes. I think in terms of the campaign to be elected president in the fall of 2020, at this point, and that can change dramatically between now and then. But at this point, he's the strongest Democratic candidate to run against Donald Trump, because of his appeal to more moderate Democrats and because of his appeal to independent voters. That is not to say that he's going to get the nomination because often in the nominating process, it is the people, and it doesn't matter whether it is Democrats or Republicans, the people who are more fervent in their ideological beliefs tend to be the ones who show up at caucus meetings, they tend to show up on primary election day and they tend to nominate their candidates. I think for Joe Biden; the issue is getting nominated. If he gets nominated, he would be a very strong candidate against the President. I think some of the more progressive folks, Elizabeth Warren for example, have a significant opportunity to get nominated because of their appeal, Bernie Sanders even, to the progressive liberal Democrats who got really fired up in 2018. And are going to be fired up in 2020. But, they're not enough of the voters to win a general election. And they are more, potentially, more vulnerable to the types of attacks that the President makes on his opponents than Joe Biden would be.

Turner: Do you think the candidates who are proposing many socialist programs, do you think if they won the nomination, would hurt them in a general election because you would have so many people who would after living in a country where

16:16

capitalism has ruled, and I feel we have been very successful as a country up to now from an economic standpoint, to introduce even more socialist programs into our government, do you think it would be hard for them to appeal to the masses in the general election based on who's, as an accounting person my first thing is, who is going to pay for all these programs? Although I do think helping people who truly need help is very important. And how much more power do we want the Federal Government to have? Do you think that could be a turn off to a wide range of people in a general election?

Foley: I think there's a couple of aspects to that. First of all, I completely disagree with the use of the word socialism because that's not what any of these candidates that are running right now for the Democratic nomination are talking about. Socialism is the antithesis of capitalism. Socialism in the European context means the government either owns or predominately controls the major economic enterprises throughout a country, communication networks, railroads, business enterprises and so forth. Nobody's talking about that. What they're talking about is more appropriately called social welfarism, and that is a much more activist role for the federal government in particular in terms of health care or education, or housing, programs that have been supported over the years at different periods pretty extensively, whether it's the Roosevelt era of the thirties, or the Kennedy-Johnson era of the sixties or even some of the programs during the Clinton or Obama years, although not as much as back in the thirties or sixties. There's a couple of things that I think would come into play. The Democratic candidate, whoever it is, is going to be very vulnerable to the President accusing them of being a socialist. And that's a misuse of the word, it's a factual distortion, but that's common with this President. They're going to have to be prepared to defend themselves pretty aggressively against that, even in fact, Elizabeth Warren did last weekend saying that she's fundamentally a capitalist. That's true, she's a capitalist with a much stronger commitment to social welfarism than the President has. I think that is true of all of her Democratic colleagues seeking the nomination. It will be interesting to see how the voters react. You are absolutely right, the ticket is always, who's going to pay, and it's going to be the taxpayers and there will be a lot of discussions over who's going to pay. The tax cut that happened in 2017 did not benefit most people in this country. It benefitted corporate entities and wealthy people in this country and no matter who the Democratic candidate is, they're going to say, we're going to change that. We're going to increase taxes on the corporate structure and on wealthy people and that will be a very strong economic debate between that person and the President about what those implications are for the economy. Like him or not, the economy under Donald Trump is doing well in terms of job creation and business growth and stock market and all the different facets of the economy. It's doing well. And there will be an argument about it. If you go back to a previous tax structure corporately and on people with higher incomes, what does that do to

19:52 the overall economy? The other side of it is, there will be people that just don't want the federal government to take on that much power. And there will be people who want the federal government to take on that much power because of using federal resources to benefit whether it's the poor, or it's people without health insurance or the people looking to go to college. That's an important debate for this country to have. I don't know how it's going to get settled by the voters, which side is going to dominate on that debate.

Turner: So, the sound bites and the semantics are going to be very important?

Foley: They always are, these days. The sound bites and the semantics are much more important every election than they were the one before. It used to be, a couple of decades back, because of television, it still has a little bit of impact on TV, but now it's because of social media. That will be an important part of it. The President has managed Twitter in a way that no other president has ever used that platform. The Democratic candidate, whoever he or she may be, has got to be prepared to fight back with social media. It will be a sound bite campaign. I hope it's a campaign about the issues. But it will probably not be, it will be a campaign about character. That will go both ways. I think you can count on the President to focus his attacks on the character of whoever he is running against because that's his style of insult and name calling and ad hominem attacks. You can bet the house the Democrats are going to go after the President on character issues. Because they did in 2016. It didn't work. They would be much better advised to do what Michelle Obama said, "When they go low, we go high". It is much more advised to go after the President on issues. Let's see how it flies for the American people, if it flies or not.

Turner: Thank you for clarifying socialism and social welfarism. I think especially for people of my generation who grew up through the cold war, we think of socialism and communism, and automatically there's a very negative association.

Foley: Socialism is just very different than what we have in this country. If we were talking about this in Sweden or Norway, or at different points in time, some of the European continental countries, yes, it's an issue. It's not an issue in this country. It's a different issue, but it gets portrayed as socialism. Then all the red flags go up among lots and lots of voters. And that's something the Democrats have got to worry about. If they talk about universal healthcare, Medicare for all, that seems to be a buzz word right now, they'll be attacked as it being socialized medicine, it will be the attack. And who's going to pay for that type of healthcare? One of the things I've said to some of my colleagues when we've talked about it, I've said I'd love to have somebody at some point try to figure out the economics of you and me as two individuals. Would we be better off or worse off if we had to pay higher taxes because the government is now paying for all of our healthcare, but we no longer have to pay for health premiums and insurance co-pays because that stuff has been eliminated? Now there's millions of jobs for people in the insurance industry who would not particularly like to see that happen. What happens if you

23:14

blow up the private health insurance business and the government takes it all over? Most Americans wouldn't want to do that. I think they would be opposed to doing that. But I would like to see somebody look at that economically. Would that cost more, or would it cost less? I don't know. I have no idea what the answer would be.

Turner: That's a good question, because . . .

Foley: Nobody knows how to answer it.

Turner: . . . health insurance costs are staggering.

Foley: Yeah.

Turner: Health costs are staggering in the United States. So, trying to figure out a way to make it the most efficient and economical, a huge task?

Foley: Right.

Turner: Absolutely.

Turner: When students are asking you questions, when they're in class asking you questions, in a discussion, what kind of questions do they ask about politics, political science, the government?

Foley: Sometimes they ask just basic factual questions about things that we're talking about in class to make sure they understand whatever the concept is or whatever the idea is. They like to talk about current issues. They like to talk about whatever is going on. Questions about for example when there was the shutdown of the government. Questions about what's involved in that, how does that work? What do we need to do to solve that issue? They like to talk about immigration. They like to talk about, not so much health care, immigration. They like to talk about gun control. Right now, there has been a number of questions about why can New Zealand deal with automatic and semi-automatic weapons and the United States can't. Questions that are more related to current issues that are in the news, immigration, gun control, shut downs, the wall, immigration policy, that kind of stuff are the questions that I think they ask that are not necessarily related to the subject matter of today's class that happens to be.

Turner: So current events are very important to them?

Foley: Yep.

Turner: Those two words, that phrase does not turn them off anymore?

Foley: No, no.

25:09

Turner: It seemed to be, as soon as you brought up current events, before, years ago, a long time ago, but they are very interested?

Foley: Current events a long time ago were nowhere near as controversial or as interest generating as they are today.

Turner: How has technology changed their exposure to politics, political and government institutions?

Foley: One hundred percent. That's probably extreme, 75 percent. Because beyond what everybody historically would have been exposed to through a class you might have taken in elementary school or middle school or high school, or even in college, and then what you would see on the news or at night on TV, the radio or the newspaper, that was pretty much it. Now with the technology of social media, students are much more exposed to all of the controversies and ideas, some of which is true, some of which is not true. But all the stuff that's going on about the world of politics is out there whether it's Facebook or it's Twitter, whatever the social media platform happens to be. Technology has had a huge impact. I don't know if they read newspapers anymore. I suspect not, not many people do anymore. I don't know that they read either semi-professional or professional types of publications. Semi-professional like Time and Newsweek and U.S. News and World Report or the ones that are more professionally rooted like The Economist for example. I don't know that they read any of that stuff, or at least not very extensively. I think most of their information comes from social media, comes from technology and that opens up a world of opportunities but it also opens up a world of falsehoods and manipulations. That's the biggest challenge I think, not just for students, but for everyone who is trying to sort out what is or is not actually true. But they're exposed to a lot more and they like that exposure and they communicate through social media. That's the way they're getting information and so information because of technology, is instantaneous, comprehensive, world-wide, immediate. It never used to be that way and it is now.

Turner: Do you think it's fair to say that their awareness has just been raised exponentially?

Foley: Sure, sure.

Turner: Over previous generations?

Foley: Yeah it has, no question about it.

Turner: Depending on the student, there are opportunities to go on-line and read newspapers and podcasts and some very good things, they do have other outlets that we didn't have.

27:49

Foley: Enormous other outlets, whether it's a podcast that's out there or it's the reading of something that's been published you can access through the internet. Whether it's even something as simplistic as Wikipedia. You can't trust that to be one hundred percent accurate, but it's probably 75 percent accurate in a lot of the stuff it does. There're just opportunities to find information quickly that just didn't exist before.

Turner: Does the 24-hour news cycle make things more difficult to understand, to weed out what's true and what's not true?

Foley: I think the 24-hour news cycle does and also the biases that are built into the 24-hour news cycle. Biases, I mean there are certain networks, there are certain commentators, there are certain information outlets that are biased for and against particular parties, particular ideologies, particular candidates, individuals. That makes it very hard to sort out what is true. It also makes it virtually impossible to ignore stuff. I mean you're going to be bombarded, if you turn your computer on, turn your phone on, you're going to be bombarded with stuff and almost compelled to try and sort out what's true or not true. But there's so much, so instantaneously, so overwhelming, especially when you get into a presidential election year. You would have to deliberately lock yourself in a dark room and turn everything off to avoid the stuff and that makes it hard to try and sort out the true and the not true.

Turner: Do you think children in grade school and high school are being taught history, current events and geography the same way they were taught decades ago and is it being taught sufficiently covering the full curriculum that needs to be taught so that when they get to college or they go out into the working world they're prepared to understand these things?

Foley: I can't say if it's being taught sufficiently because I've never taught at any of those levels. I think it's certainly being taught differently. The types of classes that I would have had in social studies back in the fifties and sixties, those are not the classes that you have today.

Turner: Excuse me, this would be based on your impression on when they get to your classes.

Foley: Yeah, by the time they get to my class. In previous generations, what they were taught was overwhelmingly just about the United States or if it extended more comprehensively, it was Western Europe. Now there's a much greater emphasis on global types of geography, global types of social studies, populations, demographics, exposure to non-western cultures, non-western history, whether that's Latin America, Africa, Asia. And that's all very good. I think there's more of an emphasis on what the Higher-Ed folks call experiential learning, students doing group projects, students doing research into certain topics that we never had in the past. Some of that was just because of the outrageous number of students in

31:05

class years ago when I was a student. I don't know whether the fundamentals of this how this particular political system works are being taught as thoroughly as they might have been in high school, they were never taught particularly in elementary school. I went to traditional Catholic school so I didn't go to Middle School. I went to Parish School from one to eight and high school for nine to twelve. We had courses in American History in high school, we had courses in, we used to call it Problems of Democracy, the old civics classes, as a Senior in high school. But again, because it was more narrowly focused than what they do today, I think we learned more of the fundamentals about how this political system works, but nothing at all about how anywhere else in the world works. We just listened to what the teacher told us, we weren't involved in doing projects or learning on our own or researching or working in groups or any of that stuff. So that's very different these days.

Turner: I think we had to memorize a lot, and now the need for memorization doesn't exist, or at least I don't think it exists as much as it did back then.

Foley: Because you have your phone with you.

Turner: You have such exposure to information.

Foley: I'm not sure that's good, but I think it's true.

Turner: It's true, it's definitely true.

Turner: How popular is Political Science as a major at LaSalle University?

Foley: I think it's reasonably popular. I think Political Science, because it covers a couple of different areas, Political Science tends to have somewhere between 30 and 35 majors per class. Your freshman, sophomore, junior and senior, and so as a rough number I think there is about 125 students around the school, undergrad day school majoring in Political Science. That number has been increasing in recent years. I think a decade or two ago, it was going through a slump. The majors, the traditional majors, the ones that used to exist a long time ago are I suspect, not as popular as they were back in the seventies and eighties because you have so many other majors. Whether that's in communication, or technology, healthcare or whatever the field might be that are obviously more career oriented and they're more in tune with the kind of interest students have in the twenty-first century. But it's come back. I think at one point it was about 80 majors and now it's about 125 over the last decade or dozen years or so. A lot of the students now, there's a program within the Political Science major that is an International Relations concentration. That seems to be pretty popular. There are a lot of students around campus who interested in going to law school. There is no pre-law major per se here, but there are certain courses that a pre-law advisor who's in the Poly-Sci Department and I think a number of the students gravitate toward Political Science because they're

34:08

interested in going into law. I think what's changed since thirty, forty years ago, there were some pretty significant number of students in Political Science that wanted to go work for the government. They were interested in careers, not as lawyers, but as folks working for local, state or federal government and that number I think is significantly lower than it used to be.

Turner: That was one of my questions, what do they use Political Science as a stepping stone for other careers, and you mentioned law.

Foley: The main one is law.

Turner: The main one is law.

Foley: I couldn't tell you numerically how they rank after that. There always is a number of folks who are taking Political Science as their second major because they're secondary education majors and their intention is to teach secondary school once they graduate with their certification. And their content or discipline major is Political Science. We always seem to have a handful of those students in any particular class. There are those who want to pursue careers related to International Relations. That generally means working for the federal government. There are also historically, I don't know think they come in wanting to this but there will be by the time they graduate, an identifiable number of students who have used Political Science as a stepping stone for going to work in business. Going to work in some type of business capacity and it was a good preparation for them because so many businesses are involved either with the domestic government or with international governments so it's kind of a stepping stone into business related careers.

Turner: Is the retention rate good in the Political Science Department for freshmen coming in and graduating?

Foley: I cannot answer that. I don't know.

Turner: You're not sure, okay.

Foley: That's a question that would have to be addressed to the Chair of the department. I know there are students that I have had as freshmen in the introductory class to disappear from the major, hopefully not because of me, but perhaps. They changed their minds and decided to major in something else. Conversely, I know there are students who are in my introductory class majoring in whatever else, who decide to become Political Science majors. The first group I disavow any responsibility for but that group I take 100% of the responsibility for. The net effect I think is that the numbers stay pretty constant over the four years. So, there's students coming and going, but I think that's typical of a lot of majors, especially for those students who come in here, here being the University, not just the department, who

36:43

come in here without a clear career path. They're kind of exploring what they want to do. They may start as a Political Science major and decide something else is more interesting for them professionally or they may start in something else and decide Political Science is more interesting.

Turner: So, it may very well be common with the normal campus population?

Foley: Especially those folks who are majoring in traditional Liberal Arts, Social Science departments, even in the traditional businesses. I don't think that's atypical at all in terms of higher ed these days.

Turner: I did have a question, do a large percentage of them seek or find work in government and you think that's probably a very small percentage?

Foley: I think it's smaller than it used to be.

Turner: Smaller than it used to be.

Foley: I think, well, I think if you ask the question, do they find careers working in government that are not based on being lawyers, I would say, it's lower than it used to be. I think, my hunch is that most, the largest number, I can't say it's the majority, the largest number of Poli Science majors, my sense is they end up being lawyers. They end up going to law school. They may work private sector, they may work non-profit, they may work for a big law firm, they may work for the government as an attorney. The number that work in non-legal government offices, I mean there are still some every year, but my sense is it's not as big as it used to be.

Turner: Do you think any of them are seriously considering a career as a politician possibly?

Foley: Oh, there's always a couple. I had one student that I had last year as a freshman, I'm going to have him again next year. His aspirations are to be President of the United States. That's fine. I think there are some that want to go on to careers. I had one student multiple times; she's going to be a Senior next year. We had one of the State Legislators from the Pennsylvania House of Representatives in to speak to the class back in September who is a LaSalle grad and I know this young lady hooked up with her afterwards because she wants to pursue a career in State politics. But I don't think that's again a large number of people. The folks that are looking to work for government are looking to do that through a legal path, the law school path. Or even the non-law school, administrative or governmental job path. And a bunch of them are interested in getting involved in electoral politics working on campaigns. Not necessarily being the candidate, but working for candidates in fundraising, or public relations or volunteer organization, all the campaign related activities. I think that's something a lot of students have at least potentially, an interest in.

39:32

Turner: Maybe not necessarily as a career because they'll be ebbs and flows with elections, but something to get them exposed to the process.

Foley: But you could end up working for a consulting firm of some kind that has different candidates as clients one year and then the next and then the year after that. There are a lot of different options. I think that is one of the good things about Political Science. It has a lot of opportunities for what you can do with it for after you get out of school. There used to be a more sizable dimension, usual, a good half dozen or more, somewhere between five and ten students graduating each year who were planning to go on to law school, go on to graduate school (excuse me) in Political Science because they want to teach at the collegiate level and get involved in Higher-Ed teaching and research. That number is much smaller now. Largely because there are not as many jobs available. It's just not as open or as viable a career path as it used to be.

Turner: Here at LaSalle, is there a Masters' program in Political Science?

Foley: No.

Turner: No Ph.D. either?

Foley: No. There is not.

Turner: So, it would just be for undergrads?

Turner: But it may lead them to a Masters in maybe History or something else if they were to stay.

Foley: It could if it were here at LaSalle. There are lots of Masters programs in Political Science and also in Public Administration which is the track more directly related to working for the government. And there are doctoral programs in both of those fields offered by other colleges and universities in the Philadelphia area, obviously around the country. But not here.

Turner: So, there is a lot of opportunity when they get done here and graduate with their Political Science . . .

Foley: (Coughs) Excuse me.

Foley: There are, there are a lot of opportunities out there. I don't think folks coming in as Freshmen Political Science majors realize those opportunities. I think they get exposed to them as they go along. It's one of the reasons why departments like Political Science emphasis things like internships and co-ops to go out and get experience in a particular type of organization, a particular type of position to see if you like it or not. To see if you want to do it or not.

41:35

Turner: How has the faculty in the Political Science department specifically changed over the years? Are they mostly people with their Masters', people with their Ph.D.'s?

Foley: Full-time faculty are all with their doctoral degrees. There are three full-time tenure track faculty. There's one full-time visiting faculty person who's not yet in a tenure track, but hopefully will be. And then there are three of us who teach part-time as adjuncts. The four full-time all have their doctoral degrees. I have my doctoral degree. One of the other adjuncts has a law degree. The other adjunct has a Masters' degree, but I'm not sure in what field.

Turner: What is it like teaching at a Catholic University? I'm going to switch gears a little bit here. Now, all of your education has been in Catholic schools.

Foley: Except for graduate school.

Turner: Except for graduate school, so you can make a little comparison from a Catholic University to a non-Catholic University?

Foley: Probably not, make a comparison very effectively. Because graduate school is and certainly was back in the late 60's and early 70's (excuse me – blows nose). It is such a different phenomenon than under-graduate school that it would be hard to make a comparison. There was nothing overtly religious about going to Princeton for a graduate school. I mean, it was a completely secular institution although its roots are as an Evangelical institution within one of the denominations of the Protestant faith. My experience in the classroom, it kind of jumps from the seventies now to the last several years. I think the Catholicity of LaSalle, I'm not sure how that effects what goes on in the classroom anymore. I think in the classes that I teach; would I teach them any differently if I was teaching in a non-Catholic school, and the answer's no. I don't think that at the classroom level, I don't see in a discipline like Political Science, that the fact that this is a Catholic school, effects what teachers do in the classroom or what they ask students to do. And I'm not sure they ever had a real substantial in the classroom impact within a discipline like Political Science. Now what was different back when I was a college student in the sixties and when I was a faculty member here in the seventies was the number of classes students would take in Religion or in Philosophy that were very clearly oriented toward Catholicism. Not all of them, but the majority of them, more diversity these days in both of those disciplines. The campus is a Catholic campus. You can see that in terms of the liturgical program, guest speakers, other student related activities that go on, but in terms of the actual classroom, I don't know that that has an actual impact.

Turner: My next question is do you feel that LaSalle remains steadfast in its Catholic identity as an institution?

44:44

Foley: Yes, I think it does. It's had some challenges as all Catholic schools have had challenges over the years in terms of Catholic identity. The school, this school, I'm sure St. Joe's would say the same thing out there, the schools were more overtly Catholic in the backgrounds of the people who were here back in the sixties and seventies, the students, the faculty, the administrators. There's more religious diversity here than there used to be. The visibility and the prominence of simply the numbers of Christian Brothers in the sixties and seventies was much greater than it is today. But in terms of the institutional mission of the place, I think it's still as Catholic as it ever was.

Turner: How did you come to stop teaching and move into fundraising?

Foley: Ah, an interesting one. In the fall of 1975, I was a junior member of what was then a 7-person department, all full-time. The other 6 faculty members were all tenured. I was up for tenure in the fall of 1975 and it was one of those periodic roller coaster periods in the, then it was the college, history where the enrollment was shrinking at LaSalle. The decision was made not to tenure me or not to tenure another person in the department because of long term financial projections. The end result of that process, and I went through a variety of appeals and different stages or reconsideration, but the end result of all of that was that I ended up being offered what was a new position being created in the Development office at the time as an assistant. At the time there was only one full-time person in Development, a Director, a Christian Brother, Brother Patrick Ellis, and there was a part-time Director of the Annual Fund, another Christian Brother named Francis McCormick. The Development office was creating a new Assistant Director position, full-time, to begin to organize a process related to getting grants for the university. I ended up being offered that position. So, for a couple of years, two years, two or three years, I held that job while also still teaching a class or two within the Political Science Department. Then, I guess it was three years later, three or four years later, moved up to being Director of Development. At that point I stopped teaching during the day school because there just wasn't enough time to do it with all the other responsibilities. So, it was a result of not being tenured in the department back in 1975. Not something, the fund raising, not something I ever thought about until that particular moment occurred.

Turner: So, there was a program in place, but very, very small?

Foley: In fund raising?

Turner: Yes.

Foley: Yeah, there was. Back in those days the structure of the school was all different than it is today. One of the major, I think there were four of them, administrative areas of the University was called Public Affairs. The Public Affairs areas included

48:02

the Development Office, the Alumni Office, Public Relations Office, which was called the News Bureau, and also Career Planning and Placement, the Career Services Office. The Development Office was small. It had actually at one point, it had two full-time people but one of them had left in the very, I don't know, somewhere in the early seventies, had left and the position hadn't been filled. So, there was one full-time director and again the half-time director of the Annual Fund and a couple of clerical support staff people. That was it.

Turner: So, you were involved in really building up the program?

Foley: Yes, the person who was Director of Development, Brother Patrick Ellis, he was the one who hired me into the Assistant Director job in, I don't remember if it was 1978 or 1979, he became President of the school. He served as President from then until '92 or '93, something like that. He served 14 years as President. He was the one that moved me up to Director of Development to fill his job when he moved up to be President.

Turner: Does government bureaucracy, at all levels, local, state, federal, create extra challenges when trying to secure grants and awards?

Foley: Sure. There are any number of grant programs that are federal, state or locally funded, depending on what the program happens to be. And of course, there is a whole batch of private foundations and private corporations that do grant related stuff too. If you are going to direct a grants program, you have to be able to figure out and find out, you have to research, you have to do a lot of research to find out what programs are out there being offered by what agencies or what organizations, what departments. And what would a place like LaSalle have to do, not only to be eligible, because there are scads of programs for which an undergraduate school is not eligible because of whatever the focus of the program happens to be. To figure out what LaSalle would be eligible for and then what we would have to do to be competitive because government grant process, much like the private grant foundation or corporate grant process is, is highly competitive. So, a lot of research stuff, admittedly a lot easier to do today than it was in the 1980's, when everything was manual, lots of research books, directories, and compendium of information, a lot of stuff in hard copy. It's a big part of trying to sort out the applications, programs, deadlines, guidelines, that sort of stuff.

Turner: Were there any specific development projects that you instituted while you were involved in the Development Department?

Foley: I spent a long time in Development. I started in Development in 1976, the spring of '76 as an Assistant Director of Development and then a couple of years later moved up to being Director. Then in '86 I moved up to being Vice-President for Development, so I headed up the whole area until 1999 when there was another one

of the periodic reorganizations and a new Vice-President came in and they changed the whole name of the place from Development to University Advancement. Along the way we had changed Public Affairs to Development and then to University Advancement. At that point I moved into the job of Director of Grants for the University and I held that from 1999 until 2015 when I accepted a buy-out and retired from that position. So there's a lot of programs, I'm not sure if there were a lot of programs that I would have started, but I found and helped to find a lot of money for all kinds of programs around the University in every one of the school, whether it was Arts and Sciences or Nursing and Health Sciences, or Business. A lot of the new initiatives, one of the things in the grants world, in terms of programs, getting money to support an academic program, is that funding sources, both governmental and private, they don't want to just fund what you have been doing, they want to fund new stuff that you're starting up. Get it off the ground, and then if it works, then you're responsible for continuing it so many of the new programs that came along in the 80's and in the 90's, and the early 2000's received grant funding. We tried grant funding for almost all, some worked, some didn't work. It's the nature of the beast. We did a lot of work on fund-raising, this tended to be both private sector and government, to generate financial aid for students. That was a major area of concern. I think the two areas that got the most funding over the years, besides financial aid, would have been the Neighborhood Nursing Center which is the Community Outreach Division of the School of Nursing and Health Sciences. And then a program that now, and for a long time now, has been an independent entity out in Conshohocken, but it was an area that was devoted to improving Science and Math teaching throughout the schools in Eastern Pennsylvania, that went through a whole batch of different names but it was a multibillion dollar effort that was located here at LaSalle. But it was all over the map in terms of the different school and different academic departments, the different programs. From a financial aid standpoint, I'm sure there were a couple of those programs, I know there were some of those programs that I founded and I was primarily responsible for bringing that money to LaSalle. With the academic programs, I found a lot of grant programs, but the programs themselves were created by other people. They were created by the people in the different schools, the different departments, and I just kind of hitched a ride and helped them find some money to get those things off the ground.

Turner: So, a couple of big successes with the financial aid and the nursing program.

Foley: There were a lot of successes. There were a lot of failures too. As a parallel, and this really goes back to the days that I was Director and the days I was Vice-President for Development and I continued doing it, although it had nothing to do with my job description as Director of Grants. I also had a major responsibility for Alumni fundraising around the country, a portfolio of graduates from whom we

54:24

were trying to extract money for the annual fund, for capital campaigns, for all kinds of special projects. So beyond working with faculty and staff on grants, I spent a lot of time running around the country trying to shake down people for money for LaSalle.

Turner: I know from personal experience, fund raising, especially federal governmental, it can be erratic, depending on . . .

Foley: Oh, God yes.

Turner: So, erratic.

Foley: Sure, sure.

Turner: And I don't know if you were still in that department during any Federal Shut Downs, but they can really make it a challenge.

Foley: The shut downs can just be, I have a fairly jaundice sense of humor, a sarcastic sense of humor. The Shut Downs did not have, and I lived through three or four of them. They did not have a serious, sustenance effect on the money that came to LaSalle. They had some temporary interruptions, they were more frankly to me, amusing from a grants' perspective, to watch how people in Washington were dealing with the Shut Downs. Everybody loves it when you're an employee and all of a sudden you get an extra couple of days off, because you know you are going to get paid eventually, but when it starts to drag on and you're not getting paid as in this last Shut Down, and I wasn't a grants officer through anything approaching the length of the very recent shutdown. But after several days, you have people who are shut down and they're furloughed, they're told, don't come to work, and then there are other people who are not furloughed, they're told to come to work and we are not going to pay you because you're an essential employee. After three or four days nobody wants to be considered non-essential, that gets to be a little weird. I don't think any of the shut downs over the years had a significant, adverse effect on the money that came to LaSalle. What had an adverse effect, is change in administrations. When you would go from one President to another, one Congressional majority to another . . .

Turner: In the government, not here?

Foley: No, no, no, a change in administrations in the government. Because every new President, every new Secretary of Education, every new Governor or every new Mayor, state or local, have different priorities. We had had some very healthy, very lucrative funding streams that got cut off in mid-stream because there was a new Administration coming in. We had participated for several very, very profitable years in a Pennsylvania based program called Linked to Learn which was money to hire and to buy technology, create computer labs and technology labs. We had

three or four of them going around campus and then Ed Rendell became Governor and in January of whatever year that was back in the nineties, the state was facing a huge budget deficit and he simply cut out money for that program, so it stopped and we got no more money out of it. We had had a pretty substantial program in the Neighborhood Nursing Center and the School of Nursing and Health Sciences called Community Based Abstinence Education which was federally funded from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. It was supposed to have been a 5-year grant and it was a couple of million dollars spread out over 5 years, two and a half million, I think something like that. Three years in Barrack Obama replaced George Bush as President and cut off funding for the program. So, it ended. That kind of stuff, much more serious implications than the periodic several day or couple weeks shut down of the government.

Turner: How does someone become a successful fundraiser, are they born to it or are they self-made?

Foley: No, no, I think self-made. I was on a panel a long time ago and I got involved with some people in a really fun discussion about what's the proper background for people who are going to become fundraisers. Up until the middle, I think these days, the last decade or two, there are people actually coming out of college who want to go into fundraising, they want to work for non-profits, and they've taken maybe courses, or there are schools, LaSalle has a graduate program, I don't know if it has it in the undergraduate Business School or not, programs to learn the ropes of non-profit management, non-profit fundraising, non-profit accounting or whatever it might be. People who really start their professional careers looking to be fundraisers, now they don't do it, I'm sure there are some people out there who just want to be a fundraiser, I don't know why, it makes no sense to me, without a consideration of who they are going to work for. I think most fundraisers from previous generations, certainly my generation, and probably a couple good generations after me, wanted to work for a particular type of agency, maybe it was Higher-Ed, maybe it was Religious based, maybe it was health related, maybe it was social service related, but they wanted to work for a particular kind of service area and a lot of that is non-profit of course, because it's non-profit, they are all based on fundraising. They got involved in fundraising not because they aspired to be fundraisers but they aspired to want to do something to benefit the people who were benefitting from different kinds of organizations and agencies, social services, the arts, the list is endless. They kind of fell into fundraising, so fundraisers, if you look at them are an extraordinarily eclectic group of people in terms of their academic background. They come from everywhere. Some are born into it, it's not, it ain't rocket science. It's not hard to learn how to be a fundraiser, but you've got to have the personality to do it. There's a persistence factor, there's a doggedness factor, you just can't take no for an answer. Whether that's grant

1:00:00

related or its alumni fundraising related. I went to a conference the first, I guess I had been in this business a year or two, and I went to a conference in the summer up in Dartmouth and somebody was talking about, the only way you can view grant related activity, is that every time you're turned down, you're just one step closer to the next grant. I thought, that's kind of a weird view. But it turned out, to be absolutely right. You can't quit, you can't stop, you can't give up in that business. There is probably some peculiarly genetic defect that makes a person comfortable asking other people to give away the money they've spent their whole lives trying to accumulate for themselves and their family. I happen to have that genetic defect and other people don't. There are people that have all of the right skill set but they just can't bring themselves to ask somebody to give money away. And that's reasonable. It's not the simplest thing. I could not have ever imagined myself doing that when I teaching full-time but I actually got to be fairly good at it.

Turner: Of the two, teaching, fundraising, one of them your favorite?

Foley: Sure, teaching.

Turner: Teaching.

Foley: Which one pays me more? Fundraising. Had I had my druthers professionally, I would have been tenured and I would have stayed teaching at LaSalle and I would still be teaching at LaSalle. I would have ending up making about a third of the money that I made from the University that I made going into fundraising. I spent a lot of time doing fundraising at every level, Assistant Director, Director, Vice-President, etc. and the combination of job titles and seniority, I ended up being a fairly high paid individual at the University by the time I accepted the buy-out and retired. I liked fundraising; I wouldn't denigrate it. It's a challenge, it was hard, it was fun balancing the two different jobs because the alumni fundraising is a very personal relationship building thing. Grant related is a very academic research-oriented thing. You had to build relationships with faculty and staff, but the people who are running a federal, state, local, foundation grant source, the personal relationships don't mean a hill of beans. That's all based on the substance and the quality of the application that you submit. It was fun doing two radically different jobs. But, yeah, I like teaching better. But the people, with my family, benefitted from what LaSalle was paying me, presumably liked the fundraising better, although they're teachers too.

Turner: It's funny how things work out in life, a time and a place.

Foley: Yes, it is.

Turner: If it made it helpful raising your family, that's always a good thing.

1:02:42

Foley: It is funny. I don't know very many people, I probably know some, but I don't know very many people who the day they walked into college, knew what they wanted to be and the day they retired, they actually had been it. It was a straight line from what they wanted to do, sure there's some people starting college wanting to be pre-med majors and become doctors and they were doctors for their whole life. But that's not as typical as people might think it is.

Turner: After you retired, why did you return as an adjunct professor?

Foley: Okay, good question. The retirement date, the buy-out date was August 21 of 2015. The university was going through some, that was just a couple of months after Dr. Hanycz became President. She started July 1st. (sneezed) With a new administration in, she was in the process of reorganizing her senior staff team. There were a lot of organizational changes going on. As a result, I ended up staying on as a consultant to the grant related activity of the university for let's see, September, October, November, December, January, for 5, almost 5 months, four and a half months while they were figuring out how to organize what I had done in the future and also hire somebody to do it. I had combined, just because of the way the job grew, I mean I started this business when there wasn't anybody else. I tended to be in some high-ranking positions which gave me the prerogative to decide what I wanted to do and what other people would do. In the grant related area, there is a distinction most places make between the ones who are doing private foundations and corporations and those that are doing government grants. I had somebody who worked with me who helped on both but I was involved in doing both of those and it was very rare to have somebody that would do grants and alumni fundraising. That was just a quirk of the job path I had followed here at LaSalle. When I retired, folks only had about, we only had about 6 weeks to decide whether to accept the buy-out. So those of us who chose to retire, the University was faced with people leaving on a relatively short notice. I stayed on as a consultant to keep the grants stuff going basically, or at least the parts I had been involved in going until they reorganized and hired new people. That would have been around January or February whatever of 2016. I was good friends with the person that I had talked with back in the 70's who was at that point chair of the Political Science Department. He called me up and he said, are you interested in teaching a class in the fall? This was in the spring of 2016. One of the courses that I had developed a long time ago that I had taught periodically is The American Presidency. He asked me if I would be interested in teaching that during the fall of 16 and I knew that was going to be a zoo so I couldn't resist it. I mean, that was just too much fun. I said sure. Then there was a second round of buy-outs in the spring of '16 that was focused on faculty. The 2015 one was focused on administrators. Two of the folks in the Political Science Department accepted buy-outs. All of a sudden, there were a bunch of vacancies. The same chair asked me

1:06:07

if I would be interested in not only teaching the class on the Presidency but also a couple of sections of the Intro course to American Government and I thought that's, yeah, that's what I always wanted to do. So, I jumped on it. I had enough time to get stuff ready during the summer and I've been doing it since. This fell into the right place at the right time.

Turner: Do you enjoy it?

Foley: Oh, yeah. I love it. it's great, it's great fun.

Turner: Sort of the best of both worlds?

Foley: It is. It is. It's what I always wanted to do. Adjunct faculty don't get paid very much so it's not, I mean, extra money always helps, I mean, none of us are going to turn it down if somebody wants to give us some extra money. And I'm not going to let you put on tape that I would do it for nothing because somebody will find that out. So that one's being struck from the record. But, yeah, I do it because I love it, I enjoy it. I can't imagine being retired, being fully retired, and not having something to do. What I had aspired to do. If you had asked me September 1st of 2015, the day after the buy-out was effective, what do you want to do going forward, I would have told you, I wanted to consult in the grant business. I had liked doing that, the various fundraising things that I did, that was the part I liked the best, more so than the alumni fundraising, because that just involved way too much travel, way too much time away from home. I was hoping to be able to sign on, not only at LaSalle, but some other places to help out as a consultant with grant related stuff, and that didn't work out. It wasn't something the other places were interested in doing. Then this teaching opportunity popped up a few months later and I've had a lot of fun with it. We'll see how long it lasts. I have no idea from one semester to the next whether enough students are going to sign up to keep it going or not so we'll see what happens.

Turner: We touched on some outreach that LaSalle does and we talked about their Catholic identity and some of the grants you got for the Nursing Program and things like that, do you think that the LaSalle community is still holding to its patron's mission that education should be available and tenable for all, even the very, very poor?

Foley: Yes, I do, as a mission. It is expensive to do that. Yes, there are government sources of revenue, Pell grants and state grants to help out financially. There are some private sources of money, but I think LaSalle is absolutely committed to that, but it's a private school so you've got tuition, room and board as you know, so making that happen financially is a real challenge for this place. LaSalle, by definition, is not public so we're not getting gobs and gobs of unrestricted money from any level of government and it's not an especially well-endowed school compared to other private schools. It is a real financial challenge.

1:09:09

Turner: Because of the dwindling vocations to the Christian Brothers and all Religious vocations, going from a Christian Brothers' footing to a more lay person footing, do you think the college will be able to keep its Christian Brothers' teaching philosophy and its mission?

Foley: It has so far. I think it has been remarkable over the years the extent to which lay people, some of whom went to LaSalle or went to other Christian Brothers' schools, a lot of whom did not, the extent to which lay people have not only bought into but really committed themselves to the values the Christian Brothers have about teaching and working with students. So far, so good on that. I think it's going to; it's certainly going to give it a try and I think; we'll do that because that's a big part of what is distinctive about this school. And I think the Brothers realized that decades ago, that there weren't going to be as many, dwindling vocations, people leaving the order, it happened to every religious order in the 70's and 80's. They really began to bring lay people, not in as simply employees, but to bring them into the culture of the Brothers in terms of higher education, and I think that's worked well.

Turner: Philadelphia is a city sometimes people refer to it, full of Med's and Ed's, medical centers and educational institutions.

Foley: Yes.

Turner: Very big ones, very successful, some of them. LaSalle has been a fixture in the city's landscape for a very, very long time. How does it keep its niche current and viable with so much competition? And it is a very niche school. I feel it has a very important . . .

Foley: Yes, by knowing what its niche is. And knowing what its niche is means two things; one, it means the kind of students that LaSalle serves, and two it means the kind of academic programs it offers for those students. I think schools need to have an identifiable mission regarding both students and programs. I think LaSalle has it. I think it serves students from Philadelphia, from the Philadelphia region better than almost any other competitors around here. Certainly not as much as Temple, and at the first- and second-year levels, not as much as Community College. But beyond that, I think, LaSalle, its mission still is a Philadelphia, yes, we're more regional, yes, we're more residential, etc. but it still has a unique mission in serving students that are from this particular city and this particular southeast Pennsylvania and south Jersey region. Offering the programs that combine what this place has done traditionally as a Liberal Arts school with the preparation with the kinds of careers that students want to pursue in the 21st century.

Turner: I saw on your resume that you were affiliated with Settlement Music School.

Foley: Yes.

1:12:15

Turner: The Kardon-Northeast Branch. Are you a musician?

Foley: No. I am the least musically inclined person you will ever meet in your lifetime. But everybody else is in the family. I got involved in Settlement Music School when my oldest daughter, that's the one for whom I was checking the text message a little earlier, when she started taking Music Workshop when she was three years old. Now's she's 42, about to be 43. No, I'm sorry, she's 43 about to be 44. She became quite an accomplished violinist thanks to the lessons at Settlement. My son went there, my youngest daughter, my son went there for piano and trumpet, an interesting combination. My youngest daughter went there for dance. They all, and my wife was a violinist and pianist through high school and college. I got solicited to be on the board, mostly because I had a parental connection and I was a fully well recognized fundraiser at the time. That was a blending of background and qualifications they were looking for.

Turner: That peaked my interest because my son also studied there from fifth grade to twelfth grade.

Foley: Oh, in what area?

Turner: Clarinet mostly and saxophone and a little piano. But the clarinet was his instrument and he was very successful at it.

Foley: Cool.

Turner: Settlement Music School is a wonderful.

Foley: Oh, it's marvelous, a marvelous organization.

Turner: We went to the same branch, Kardon-Northeast and I was just interested in your connection. You and I have the same kind of connection, driving there, waiting out in the lobby.

Foley: Driving and paying the bills.

Turner: And paying the bills.

Foley: Buying the instruments. That sort of thing.

Turner: Worth every penny, every minute.

Foley: I don't mean to interrupt, but it's about quarter to twelve and I need to get out of her by twelve o'clock.

Turner: Okay, we're . . .

Foley: So, we can stay on schedule to pick up one of the other younger generation musicians in the family.

1:14:04

Turner: Just one last question actually, about to wrap it up. When LaSalle plays St. Joe's in basketball, who do you root for? Are you 100% an Explorer or are you split loyalties? Or 100% St. Joe's fan?

Foley: No, no. At this point, no I wouldn't be 100% St. Joseph's for a lot of reasons. It was fun when I was, primarily, in the 13 years, '86 to '99, when I was Vice-President for Development, because I headed up the Alumni and Development and Public Relations programs here. Was never more than 50/50, always rooted at least 50% for St. Joe's and 50% for LaSalle. My wife was also a St. Joe's grad as I may have shared with you on Wednesday, and she's never had any doubt about that being a 100% commitment on her part. Most of the time I root for St. Joe's because that's where I went to school. It's a little lopsided because I spent four years there and spent almost 50 here but I think you tend to develop a certain appreciation for your undergrad athletic programs. Now, they've done some things that I don't approve of, the recent firing of Phil Martelli is one of them and a long, long time ago, the firing of Jack McKinney, that back in the 70's, that was another one of them. I'm not the enthusiastic supporter that I was when I was a student there but it was never hard to figure out where my loyalties lie. The most fun, I guess this lasted about a half a dozen years, the most fun that ever happened with that is, there was a stretch, five, six years long, where I was Vice-President for Development here as a St. Joe's grad and the Vice-President for Development at St. Joe's was a LaSalle grad. We used to have some great fun. He and I actually graduated the same year from our respective schools. We had a lot of fun with that.

Turner: Well, basketball . . .

Foley: He rooted for LaSalle and I rooted for St. Joe's even though LaSalle paid me and St. Joe's paid him.

Turner: Basketball in Philadelphia in general is fun?

Foley: Absolutely.

Turner: With the five schools and with the Sixers.

Foley: Not as fun as it used to be, but it's fun.

Turner: It being March Madness right now, I had to throw that question in.

Foley: It's never easy for me to root for Villanova, but I think Jay Wright is a class act and the Villanova program has become a class act. They're the only ones in. I was rooting for like crazy for Fran Dunphy and Temple because Fran's a LaSalle grad and a good friend. I would have loved to have seen them continue a little bit farther in.

1:16:48

Turner: I was rooting for Temple because up until last year, I was a Temple Mom, a Temple Alumni Mom now. But now I'm rooting for Michigan State because I'm currently a Michigan State Mom.

Foley: Sure, of course. That's a good team. That's a really good team.

Turner: We'll see how things go.

Foley: They got past the first round yesterday.

Turner: Yes.

Foley: And so did Villanova. It's interesting because you've got teams, in Villanova's case too for the last three years, Michigan State a while ago, who have won national championships, but the worse time for them has always been the first game. Once they get past the first game, things get rolling. Good luck to Michigan State.

Turner: Was there anything else you wanted to say or talk about?

Foley: No, not particularly, we've covered a lot of stuff.

Turner: We've covered a lot. Thank you so much for doing these interviews with me.

Foley: You're welcome. I've enjoyed it. It's been fun.

Turner: I really appreciate it.

Foley: I hope I didn't cut you off. I didn't have to leave immediately.

Turner: No, you didn't. I was just about through my questions. That was the last one to tie it up.

Foley: Good. That's good. If I can help in any way as you complete this project or this course, just let me know.

Turner: I'm going to stop the tape now.

Foley: Okay.

1:17:48 End of Session 2. Taping stopped.

