

Minnesota Unraveled

EP102 - Life Underground: Fallout Shelters in Minnesota

Publish Date: 11/21/2024

Chantel Rodríguez:

When I was a student at the University of Minnesota, I used to walk by the Old Bell Museum on the Minneapolis campus. Maybe you've seen it. It was this ivy-covered building with a bison relief over the double doors. I was always rushing past this building to get to class. It was just some nondescript, unremarkable building that I never really looked at or gave a second glance. But then one day when my class was canceled and I was leisurely strolling about with the time to actually take in my surroundings, something on the side of the building caught my eye. It was some sort of sign, but why was it there? How long had it been there? It was dilapidated and looked like it had been long forgotten.

Dave Kenney:

It has like three black triangles within the circle, and that was the sign that this is a place that you can come for safety in the event of a crisis.

Chantel Rodríguez:

Hanging on the side of the building was the same black and yellow sign. In yellow capital letters, it says, "fallout shelter." What was this sign doing here, and why did Minnesota even need fallout shelters in the first place? So I started doing some research and spoke with two historians with expertise in this topic. It turns out the story of fallout shelters is about so much more than the threat of nuclear war. It is also about family and the American way of life.

Welcome to Minnesota Unraveled. I'm your host, Chantel Rodríguez. This is Episode Two, Life Underground: Fallout Shelters in Minnesota. After Germany invaded Poland in September of 1939, the United States watched with unease as war erupted in Europe. The US knew it was really only a matter of time before they be drawn into the conflict. So in preparation, President Franklin Roosevelt created the Office of Civil Defense in May 1941 to coordinate state and federal responses to emergencies. The threat of being attacked on their own soil became very real for Americans when Pearl Harbor was attacked in December of that year.

FDR:

Yesterday, December 7th, 1941, a date which will live in infamy, the United States of America was suddenly and deliberately attacked by naval and air forces of the empire of Japan.

Chantel Rodríguez:

With that, the US entered World War II. To understand the civil defense efforts more thoroughly and why it was created, I talked with Dave Kenney.

Dave Kenney:

I'm a freelance writer, and for the past couple of decades, I've been specializing in Minnesota history in its various forms. That's what I do most of my days, writing in some form about things that happened in the state's past.

I tend to be most interested, I think, in mid-20th Century, maybe even a little after that. So a little more recent probably than some people who call themselves historians, but I think that's probably the time period that gets me most jazzed.

Chantel Rodríguez:

This is perfect because this is exactly the time period we are interested in. I like to first start though with our context for the fallout shelters, which is of course the Civil Defense Department. Can you tell me a little bit about what that is? Is it a state thing? Is it national?

Dave Kenney:

The Civil Defense Department, basically it grew out of World War II in a way. So during the Second World War, you probably have often heard stories about people hearing these sirens going off as basically tests, the idea that the Twin Cities metro area or other parts of the state could come under attack by the German or Japanese forces somehow during the war. Obviously, nothing ever came close to happening like that, but this was the beginning of this idea of civil defense.

Chantel Rodríguez:

So after World War II came to an end, Dave says worries about more war and bombings impacting Minnesota didn't go away. The threat was still present, but it was no longer from the Germans or Japanese.

Dave Kenney:

Then after World War II, that started to change quite a bit, and that had to do with the development of atomic weapons. There was that period right after the war where the United States basically was the only atomic power at that point. Then the Soviets developed bombs of their own and at that point, the beginnings of the Cold War,

Chantel Rodríguez:

The United States and the Soviet Union had become allies during World War II in order to defeat Germany and Japan. At the end of the war, the US and Soviet Union were increasingly at odds. They were basically frenemies, as they disagreed over the future of Eastern Europe. These two countries were vying for global influence. It was an ideological and geopolitical struggle. There was an opposition between the US way of life and how America saw the Soviets.

To the US, it was a very binary world; democracy and capitalism versus communism, the individual versus the collective. The United States was the only country with knowledge of how to create an atomic bomb in 1945. This changed in 1949 when the Soviet Union detonated its own atomic bomb. The nuclear arms race was underway and with it, a growing anxiety of nuclear apocalypse. To deal with these concerns, the US government created the Federal Civil Defense Administration in 1950. Minnesota followed suit with their own civil defense department in 1951.

Dave Kenney:

In the late 40s and early 1950s, we're talking about a period where people probably heard the term duck and cover, that type of thing. Kids going to school and doing these drills where they would hide underneath their desks, and the idea at that point was that if there was an attack, it would come by way of long range bombers. That would take time, so there would be time for the kids, for anybody basically, to get into a position where they could protect themselves from a blast.

Chantel Rodríguez:

These duck and cover drills were the strategy for this time period. The government tried to make these lessons appealing to kids using cartoons and friendly characters to convey the serious message. One character from the time was Bert the Turtle.

Bert the Turtle:

There was a turtle by the name of Bert, and Bert the Turtle was very alert.

When danger threatened him, he never got hurt.

He knew just what to do.

He ducked and covered, ducked and covered.

Chantel Rodríguez:

The weapons kept evolving and civil defense efforts, both at the federal level and in Minnesota now had to deal with a more serious threat.

Dave Kenney:

Early to mid-1950s with development of thermonuclear weapons, which were thousands of times more powerful than bombs that were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. So at that point, the idea that you could just survive by hiding under a desk changed. The focus at that point of the Minnesota Civil Defense Department and similar departments across the country was that let's start planning for evacuations to get people away from the bombs that were coming, and theoretically would be dropped on the Twin Cities.

But if you got enough people out of the Twin cities, they'd be able to survive it, so there was that evacuation period. This was all being driven by the federal government with policies that were being developed, plus monies that were being sent to the states, including Minnesota and the Civil Defense Department.

Chantel Rodríguez:

So, what did the department expect citizens to do?

Dave Kenney:

During the 1950s, there were these observer networks where people volunteered to put a certain amount of time into basically keeping their eyes on the skies, looking for those bombers that might be coming. Minnesota, more than any other state, as I understand it, had the largest network of these volunteer observers that were out there at various times, often at night, going into their perches, wherever they might be. I remember I was up a number of years ago, there's a school I think in Cyrus, Minnesota that I was able to go up into some sort of perch that was on top of the building, and I went up there and there were still these books that allowed the observers to identify various Soviet aircraft that might be coming up just by looking up in the sky and seeing what they saw.

There definitely was that citizenry that was involved, along with the more bureaucratic top-down organization that was happening. Then in the late 1950s, things changed again with the development of intercontinental ballistic missiles. In 1957, you had the Soviets sending up Sputnik, so the idea became the Soviet Union could attack us in a matter of minutes. There wouldn't be time to evacuate people. So at that point, the Minnesota Civil Defense Department, like other departments across the country, started advocating for people to think in terms of protecting themselves from the fallout of a nuclear attack by building fallout shelters. There was a potential, at least for the Soviet Union, to attack the United States, including Minnesota, and that we better be prepared for that.

Chantel Rodríguez:

At this point, the US government knew that the duck and cover drills weren't going to cut it. But as they learned more about the effects of nuclear arms on the human body and the environmental landscape, officials realized just how serious a threat it was. The greatest threat to survival of nuclear attack was fallout. A nuclear blast, especially one that detonates on or near the ground, can produce what is known as fallout. The explosion creates debris and dust that combine with radioactive fission particles. It is visible as it falls to the ground, and is often the size of fine table salt. Fallout contaminates the environmental landscape and causes radiation exposure, which can have wide-ranging effects on the human body from skin burns to cancer.

So people had hope that if they could get to a fallout shelter, it would protect them from the blast and the radioactive fallout. Then after one or two weeks, they could safely emerge from the shelter, avoiding the most harmful fallout particles. Besides recruiting and coordinating volunteers, the Minnesota Civil Defense Department had a list of jobs and priorities. They planned evacuation routes for the Twin Cities. I found a pamphlet with a map that shows the best way to evacuate the city.

It says, "Please become familiar with these routes. Plan on going 50 miles. Civil defense authorities will direct you to emergency lodging, food, clothing, and medical supplies." The department also had to identify and mark buildings, like the Old Bell Museum, that could withstand an attack. Once they were identified, they attached fallout shelter signs to the buildings.

What makes a good building that they were looking for in the 1960s that we could say, "That is the one that can survive and protect people in fallout?"

Dave Kenney:

Well, I think what it looks like what happened was there was a survey that started, I think it was probably around 1962, around the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis. This was at the prodding of the Kennedy administration. So we've been told as the Minnesota Civil Defense Department that we need to start thinking of having these

large public shelters that can protect a maximum number of people in the case of that thermonuclear attack that is going to be coming now by ICBMs.

Chantel Rodríguez:

ICBMs, those are intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Soviets developed them in 1957. Previously, nuclear bombs would have been delivered by plane, which is how the US government could issue advanced warning of a strike. The ICBM was not delivered by plane. It was simply a missile that could be fired for long ranges. This meant there would be little warning before a strike, making evacuation impossible and civil defense observer networks obsolete.

Dave Kenney:

The places that were identified seemed to be mostly large public buildings. I take that back, they weren't all public buildings. They were often actually owned by private entities, but they were places that people were used to coming in and out of. So there would be examples, I know for instance, I've seen mentions of the Radisson Hotel and the Sears Building on Lake Street, and even places like Charlie's Cafe Exceptionale, and the Grain Belt Brewery, and Dayton's and Donaldson's and all sorts of banks and things like that.

Chantel Rodríguez:

So Dave just listed large, well-constructed places that were identified as good options for public fallout shelters. We learned that the signs posted on buildings identified them as a place to seek refuge. But there's another question. How did people know which fallout shelter was their fallout shelter? When they heard the siren, how did they know where to go? In this next clip, a fellow Minnesotan recounts how she knew which shelter to go to.

News Clip:

So we have these stickers that designate which fallout shelter we're assigned to go to, and it probably dates back to probably around 1960. It reads, "Occupants of this residence are assigned to shelter at Dayton's Department Store at 7th Street and Cedar Street."

Chantel Rodríguez:

She found a sticker on the inside of her doorframe with the same fallout shelter symbol, and the address of where to go. Once people got there, supplies were ready for their life in a bunker.

Dave Kenney:

And then the idea was once we've identified those places, then we have to set them up as being ready for that. So that would mean provisioning them with food and water and sanitary supplies and medical supplies and radiation detection equipment, that type of thing.

Chantel Rodríguez:

This clip is from a 1950s civil defense fallout shelter supplies film. It describes how a public fallout shelter was prepared.

Video:

These people are occupying a shelter which contains those supplies which are furnished by the federal government. This is an austerity type shelter. It has a capacity of 50 people. It is safe. The food is nutritious, the water is pure.

Chantel Rodríguez:

The space in the video resembles a fortified basement or a large panic room, lots of concrete, obviously no windows. It looks cold and empty.

Video:

Each occupant has room enough to sleep. The medical supplies are sufficient to cope with most common ailments, and the sanitary facilities are adequate. This shelter can be made a more livable place to spend a week or 10 days.

Chantel Rodríguez:

So, we know you can't evacuate. There just wouldn't be enough time. If you were working downtown, you'd go to public shelter. But if you were at home, then what would you do? Enter the family fallout shelter.

Tell me more about those private fallout shelters. So, maybe we can call them family fallout shelters.

Dave Kenney:

I saw some numbers from late 1950s, probably '59 or so, that there was an estimated 100, I think, what they called survival shelters in Minnesota at that point. This was just at the beginning of this period where people were starting to realize that, "Oh, we could be attacked in a manner of minutes by the Soviets if that happened." So, there's this movement to get people to accept the idea of fallout shelters.

Chantel Rodríguez:

The Federal Civil Defense Administration published countless manuals and booklets with family fallout shelter blueprints that explained in detail how to do it yourself. The estimated cost for a DIY shelter was between one and \$2,000 in the early 1960s. That's between 10 and \$20,000 in today's money.

Dave Kenney:

The second level of it were the private or home shelters, so slowly over into 1960, '61, '62, this idea does become more common and more accepted. I think in many cases when people during this period, we're talking about personal fallout shelters, that it would be something that would be in the backyard or maybe on the side, but connect either to the first floor of your home or more likely from a basement, that you would have an entrance door from your basement, and going into this new thing that had been built into the ground.

Chantel Rodríguez:

I'm thinking about these fallout shelters and what it would mean for families to live in this space for upwards of two weeks, to live off limited supplies. I mean, this was supposed to be an era of abundance, and yet the family fallout shelter had people cooped up in an underground bunker with supplies that must be rationed in order to ensure survival. I spoke to Elaine Tyler May, Professor Emerita of American Studies and History at the University of Minnesota. She's a 20th Century US historian with expertise in how families experienced the Cold War.

You clearly wrote a book called *Homeward Bound* about American families in the Cold War. Is that something you always thought you were going to be interested in doing and writing about, or how did you come to this topic?

Elaine May:

Well, it was really funny. No, it was not at all what I thought I was going to do. Way, way back in the 1980s when I started discovering this topic, my first book had been about the Progressive Era, and especially about family and gender and sexuality. I

was curious why after the Progressive Era and the decline in the birth rate during the 1930s and the impact of World War II, why did the birth rate suddenly shoot up right after World War II. The explanations that I found when I was looking to find out how had historians explained this, they said, "Well, after all the disruptions of depression and then war, Americans were eager to kind of get back to "normal" family life." The thing is, there was nothing at all normal about the Baby Boom. There was no precedent. There was nothing that would signal why this kind of moment in time would generate this rush into marriage and younger marriages, and higher percentages of people getting married.

Why was that happening? There really was no historical explanation for it. So I just started poking around. I realized my sources, which weren't even my sources yet, that they were trying to tell me something. I learned so much from that. I've always told my students, "Listen to your sources. They may be telling you something you didn't even know to ask." So then I began to think, well, maybe there is something here. Maybe there is a connection between social history and political history. Maybe there's a connection between public life and private life. Who knew, right?

Chantel Rodríguez:

There was a real push to combat communism at home. There was this underlying fear of Soviets invading the United States and subverting the American way of life. The way of thinking was that we can contain the threat of communism at home through mass consumption and traditional family values. The US government encouraged its citizens to buy things for the good of the nation. It was your civic responsibility to buy appliances and cars, et cetera, because it helped the American economy, culture, and social landscape. Many of these consumer goods were tied directly to the family and the home. Consumerism became a symbol of freedom in direct opposition to communism. But what did the ideal family look like during the Cold War?

Elaine May:

The nuclear family as the quote American way of life, it was presented as universal, but it was the white picket fence, the nuclear family in a single family home and only really white people of middle class or above means were able to have access to that way of life. I learned as I went along that there were certainly African-American suburbs with single-family homes that were pretty much segregated.

Chantel Rodríguez:

This vision of the nuclear family with traditional gender roles living in a suburban home filled with consumer goods captured the American way of life. The family and the home were seen as bastions of security. Failure to promote the American way of life in the context of Cold War politics would result in communism.

So this idea of the American family that's being conceptualized in the Cold War, in the context of the Cold War politics, how is that different than before the Cold War begins?

Elaine May:

Well, the 30s was the Great Depression. So, family life was constrained. The marriage rate went down, the marriage age went up. Women had to try as best they could to get jobs to supplement the income that their husbands or fathers or brothers or whose ever household they lived in were able to earn. So you go from the Depression to World War II, and suddenly the economy roars open with all of the wartime production.

So after the war, those Americans who had money saved during the war, they were just on a spending spree, and they started having more children because they could now afford them. So the economy growing fostered this expansion of consumer life and family life. But it wouldn't have necessarily been that way had it not been for the fact that this was also a celebration of the "American way of life." Basically, the model for that was the white, middle class, consumer-oriented family living in a single family home.

Chantel Rodríguez:

How does that connect, the American way of life trying to motivate or convince American people across all of course races, genders, get them to embrace or aspire to the idea of the American way of life? How does that connect to Cold War stuff?

Elaine May:

Well, in the first place, people were eager for the lifestyle that was not available during the Depression and war, and it was promoted as a fundamental symbol of the American lifestyle. Even though the American lifestyle had never looked like that before, it was really promoted as a way to "return" to the good life that America always had to offer. But this good life was different than say, the 1920s or the 30s. It was a new kind of consumer-oriented, nuclear family-oriented lifestyle. People did respond.

The marriage rate went up, the divorce rate went down. Gay people started to get married, to present themselves as heterosexual couples, and go into the closet rather than promote their own way of life as gay and lesbian couples and families. So, this was a time when gay people were considered to be un-American and dangerous. It's kind of ironic. Why were gay people considered to be un-American and dangerous? Because the idea was that they could be blackmailed, and if they could be blackmailed to tell American secrets, then they were a danger.

But of course if they weren't stigmatized, then there'd be no way to blackmail them because who cares? So it was a self-fulfilling loop that caught gay people and single people, women who were divorced, men who were divorced, men who were single, they were all suspect, that there was something un-American about them. If you weren't in a heterosexual relationship, if you weren't part of a nuclear family, there was something suspicious about you.

Chantel Rodríguez:

Let's transition just a little bit to another layer, which is the nuclear anxiety and how maybe nuclear anxiety played out within nuclear families themselves. I'd like to hear what that looked like really, in the 1950s and 1960s.

Elaine May:

Well, the Civil Defense Department that emerged during the Atomic Age really focused on families protecting themselves. This was a time when as we know, families were considered the institution that held up society. So if you were going to try to protect people who might be vulnerable to an atomic attack, you would start there.

Chantel Rodríguez:

With the threat of an attack coming at any time and when faced with real fear and panic, Elaine says people would go where they felt the safest.

Elaine May:

So, where do you go for safety? Well, you go home and if your home had a basement, then you went in the basement. The big thing at the time that was in the public eye was fallout shelters. Not very many fallout shelters were actually built. The number I heard was maybe 60,000, but I don't know if there's any reliable information about that.

But it was certainly something everybody knew about, that if you had a backyard or if you had a basement, you could supply it with canned goods and food and games for the children and things like that, and then you could be safe until the all clear sounded. People did build them, and people did supply them.

Chantel Rodríguez:

Luckily, a nuclear attack never took place, and we never had to test out a shelter. But would they have worked? Dave Kenney again.

Dave Kenney:

If there had been an actual attack, would they have been enough to help a family survive? They might have, but then what would they have encountered when they came out into the light? I think that's the scariest picture I have in my mind. If I had been in a family that had taken shelter in one of these places and there had been that nuclear holocaust above ground, the moment that you emerged from that place of supposed safety, would you have felt that it was a success? I'm not sure you would.

Chantel Rodríguez:

Elaine agrees with Dave, the basement shelter was not going to be as safe as Americans were led to believe.

Elaine May:

I think people recognized pretty early on that if there really was an atomic attack, a basement shelter wasn't going to do much for you, so that fell out of favor. Even though there were thousands of them built, it was more symbolic than anything else because especially after the hydrogen bomb, there was just no way that you could go down into your shelter, put a first aid box on the shelf, and survive an attack. It just wasn't going to happen. So I think there was a shift in emphasis, and I think the Kennedy era had both of these things going on.

Kennedy as a cold warrior, a very rhetorically aggressive cold warrior, but at the same time working towards peaceful resolution of the Cold War, and reducing the nuclear stockpiles and all of that kind of thing. So, I think you begin to see a shift when there's more of a recognition that this is just really not productive.

Chantel Rodríguez:

Hindsight is 20/20. At the time, the US government believed fallout shelters with a best option for improving chances of survival. However, several changes in the 1960s led the US government to phase out fallout shelters by the end of the decade. Civil

defense spending fell as the US began to focus greater attention on the Vietnam War. This meant there was less funds to promote the fallout shelter program.

Nuclear technology evolved alongside our knowledge of how blasts would impact humans. In 1961, the Soviet Union tested the 50-megaton Tsar Bomba. It was 3,800 times more powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. It remains to this day the most powerful manmade explosion in history and the largest ever detonated nuclear device. New studies by scientists and technology experts argue that fallout was no longer the primary threat to survival; rather, it would be the firestorm caused by the massively powerful bomb. Shelters would become a firetrap.

Was there a sense of that kind of impending apocalyptic ending, or is there optimism in this story or hope, even?

Elaine May:

I think it was an optimistic time, more than a fearful time, and the fact of emerging out of World War II with prosperity, there was no war on American soil even during World War II, with the exception of Pearl Harbor. People really felt that they'd come out of the war, that the country had come out of the war more or less unscathed.

Of course, thousands of soldiers died, of course. But nonetheless, the war did not arrive on the mainland of the United States, and in spite of all of the death and destruction and loss, it was still a time of hopefulness, moving forward, and trying to get beyond the losses. I think a prevailing feeling, it's time to move forward and put all of the agony and loss behind. I think that spirit generated the Baby Boom, in part, we can start replacing the population loss. We can start enjoying the peacetime and the prosperity, and facing a new set of possibilities.

Chantel Rodríguez:

I love the way that you wove those two threads together, the thread of the anxiety that everyone thinks of when they think of the nuclear age, but you can't tell that one thread without the woven one over it, of this optimism and hope and prosperity that exists at the same time. So it feels like there's a tension, but they're both there. You can't tell one without the other.

Elaine May:

Yeah. That's not unique, I think, to the Atomic Age, but to times of crisis. Even the pandemic, we can look at that as a time when a lot of people were really, really horribly affected and a lot of people died. At the same time, people came together to try to help each other, and crises generate a lot of different sorts of things, including suffering, but also including hopefulness and community.

Chantel Rodríguez:

My conversations with Dave and Elaine left me wondering. Is there anything we learned from this period of history that we could apply to our lives today? Here's Dave.

Dave Kenney:

Lessons, I think they would relate mostly to that topic that we were on a little bit ago, about how to balance the idea of making people understand a legitimate threat and then also getting them to buy into the idea of doing something to address that threat. It's not a parallel, but there are a few similarities that we are dealing with right now with climate change, that I believe that the people who are most invested in doing something about this threat do go back and forth on what's the best and most effective way to encourage citizen involvement in the issue.

There is probably that tipping point of doomsaying versus hope. So if I'm trying to extract some sort of lesson out of what I see happening during this period, during the 1950s and early 1960s, it would have something to do with that, to at the very least be cognizant of the fact that going one way too far or the other way too far has the potential of being counterproductive. I don't know what the answers are, but I think it is just important that we're always trying to keep that in mind.

Chantel Rodríguez:

Elaine is hesitant to offer lessons that connect to our past.

Elaine May:

I don't know anything about the present, I just know about the past. But I do think that for me, the big discovery when I did this work was that there is no difference between public life and private life. We live in this society. We live in the public world. We live in the private world, and you can't just assume that there's a barrier between the two, and that whatever happens in our society affects our lives. Every aspect of it, if it's something serious and meaningful, good or bad. So, I think I came away with that.

Chantel Rodríguez:

Popular culture suggests that Americans fully bought into fallout shelters, but this was not the reality. According to one study, only 0.4% of the US population built shelters. Part of the hesitancy beyond cost and homeownership was the ethical quandary shelters posed. This is something that popular culture got right.

Elaine May:

Well, it's interesting because the popular culture did a number on the fallout shelter. So there were shows like *The Twilight Zone*, that would occasionally have a feature about the fallout shelter. In those cases, a siren goes off and then the people who don't have shelters run to their neighbors to try to get into theirs, and then the neighbors close them off and lock them out, and they're not going to let in their neighbors because it's their shelter, and they don't have room for everybody.

Chantel Rodríguez:

This *Twilight Zone* episode captures the ethical debate happening in homes across the nation. When push came to shove, how could a family decide to close the doors to their bunker and refuse to let their neighbors in? If a family did survive the fallout, how would they live with the guilt of having condemned their neighbors to nuclear death? Ultimately, Americans were not sure fallout shelters would actually work. They also weren't convinced it was worth spending time and money building a shelter, and they weren't ready to save themselves if it meant leaving their community behind.

But what happened to the fallout shelters after the program was phased out? In the early 1970s, the Minnesota Civil Defense Department was charged with taking down fallout shelter signs and removing emergency supplies from public shelters. It was clear that the food rations would not have lasted. Inside the shelters, civil defense workers found the water and food had gone rancid. High-protein wheat crackers were stale and inedible. Many of the shelters fell into disrepair or were just abandoned, left as-is, a time capsule from this period of history. Even today, people are still finding and documenting fallout shelters across the country.

We've been on a journey this episode. We started at the Old Bell Museum at the University of Minnesota with a seemingly simple question, why is this sign here? What started as a look into the fallout shelter quickly became a larger story of the family during the early Cold War. By pulling on the thread of nuclear anxiety, we found that it is deeply woven with the threads of hope and optimism for the survival of the American way of life.

There are still traces of this period of history around Minnesota. Have you spotted any of these fallout shelter signs or other relics of the Atomic Age? Let us know what you



find. Take a photo and share it on social media using the #MNUnraveled. Thank you to Dave Kenney and Elaine Tyler May for taking me through this moment in Minnesota history. You've been listening to Minnesota Unraveled, pulling on the threads of Minnesota history. I'm your host, Dr. Chantel Rodríguez.

You can find more information on this episode, including transcripts, bibliographic resources, and MNopedia articles at our website, mnhs.org/unraveled. Minnesota Unraveled is produced by the Minnesota Historical Society in partnership with Pod People. Special thanks to our production team, Rebecca Chasson, Angela Yee, Buffy Gorilla, and Brett Baldwin, and sound design and editing by Carter Wogan, lead research by me, Dr. Chantel Rodríguez.

Our theme music is Careless Wanderer by Arthur Benson. Funding for Minnesota Unraveled is provided by the State of Minnesota, the Legacy Amendment through the vote of Minnesotans on November 4th, 2008, and our generous donors and members. Thank you for listening. Until next time, stay curious and remember, the tapestries of history are all around you just waiting to be unraveled.