



Oral History of Mark Bertelsen

Interviewed by:
Chuck House

Recorded May 8, 2018
Mountain View, CA

CHM Reference number: X8591.2018

© 2018 Computer History Museum

House: Well, I'm Chuck House. We're here at the Computer History Museum, and I have Mark Bertelsen here, and I'm excited to have your story. So let me begin by asking you to do name, rank and serial number, kind of where were you born and raised and what was your family like and what was your education, and, you know, kind of the what led up to you becoming who you are.

Bertelsen: Well, I was born in Los Angeles, in April 1944. My parents had moved out from St. Paul, Minnesota, in the late '30s, when the Los Angeles area was a utopia, so to speak. Orange County was full of orange groves and lemon groves.

House: Where did you move in L.A? What area?

Bertelsen: You know, I don't know exactly, because I don't remember it. We moved from there when I was two.

House: Okay, okay.

Bertelsen: But it was apparently somewhere near the La Brea Tar Pits.

House: Okay.

Bertelsen: It was a little bungalow, stucco house. My dad was what was called a traveling salesman. In any event, we moved to San Francisco briefly. I don't remember that either, and then either in late '46 or early '47, we moved to Palo Alto. So I was brought up in Palo Alto, attended the schools there. Actually, one of the last old schools that was a multi-story-- Lytton Elementary School that was on Lytton, between University and Middlefield. But graduated from Palo Alto High School in 1962. So I was born and raised, I mean, I was raised in Palo Alto.

House: Local boy, we would say.

Bertelsen: A local boy definitely. Palo Alto's a very different place at the time. After high school I originally was going to, for some reason that I can't recall, the University of Washington with my closest friend, who at the last minute decided to go to Berkeley to play football, at which time I wound up going to UC Santa Barbara with another Palo Alto by the name of Reece Duca, who's been a very successful venture capitalist in Santa Barbara. After four years at Santa Barbara, at the recommendation of my faculty adviser, I applied to law school and was accepted at Berkeley. I was in ROTC, so I was actually planning on going into service right out of college. My faculty advisor) was a West Point graduate that had been wounded pretty severely, lost an eye in Korea, and he highly recommended that I go to law school first, and that's what I did.

House: Okay. Neat. So you're still in touch with Reece, I take it, because we saw you down at UC Santa Barbara with him.

Bertelsen: Very much in touch with Reece, and Reece grew up in Palo Alto, as well, and went to UC Santa Barbara, then came up, went to Stanford Business School. As we say, we both grew up within, as the crow flies, probably five miles of Shockley Semiconductor that was started in '54, '55, Shockley was a co-inventor of the transistor and had received the Nobel Prize, and then Fairchild Semiconductor that spun out of there with the infamous or famous Traitorous eight. But both Reece and I grew up within five, six miles of ground zero where all that was happening, although I don't think we were aware of it at the time.

<laughter>

House: You know, hindsight's pretty good on some of this.

Bertelsen: Yeah, exactly.

House: So Boalt Law School, was that what it was?

Bertelsen: Went to law school at Boalt. They've "renamed" it now to, they refer to it as Boalt, but it's officially now called Berkeley Law.

House: Oh, it is? Okay. I didn't know that.

Bertelsen: Yes

House: Okay. And then what? Then you...

Bertelsen: Then I had my two years of service commitment in the Army. My orders-- I graduated in June of '69. Had a deferment to take the bar exam, which in those years was, I think, in August, I believe, and then got my orders to report to Fort Knox in April of 1970, so I had this period of time where my wife and I went to Washington, D.C. Since I was already working for the government, being in the Army, I was able to get a job at a regulatory agency, the Federal Power Commission, and essentially, being West Coast kids, we spent our time traveling around the whole Washington, D.C., Mount Vernon--

House: Oh, yeah, lots to do. <laughs>

Bertelsen: Yeah. All the--

House: From here [ph?].

Bertelsen: Monticello and all the museums, et cetera, et cetera, so...

House: Where'd you meet your wife?

Bertelsen: I met her in my senior year at UC Santa Barbara.

House: So she's a Santa Barbara person then?

Bertelsen: Well, she actually was born in Fargo. Her dad-- well, her dad actually worked for one of the co-inventors of the television, Philo Farnsworth.

House: Oh, really?

Bertelsen: Most people don't remember him.

House: Yeah. He was a San Francisco-- well, actually, he was a Utah kid that went to San Francisco.

Bertelsen: Yeah, and then that didn't work out, so he went to work for Sandia. He was an engineer, nuclear engineer. So she grew up, she was born in Fargo, but grew up in Albuquerque, and then he was transferred from Sandia to Livermore, where Sandia had a big operation, and so her, from like age 12 to high school years, were in Livermore and then she was at UC Santa Barbara, and that's where I met her.

House: Still married, and you've got--

Bertelsen: Still married. This is 50th anniversary this year, actually.

House: Fiftieth anni-- well, congratulations.

Bertelsen: Yeah, yeah, in August, yeah.

<laughter>

House: That's terrific.

Bertelsen: Well, she's put up with me for a long time

<laughter>

House: There you go. So here you are, out of the service, or about to be out of the service.

Bertelsen: Yes. So in-- I was a bit of a complex thing for the service. I had my law degree, but I wasn't a JAG. I was actually what they called an armor officer- tanks. So I went to Fort Knox to do my officer, what they call armor officer basic training, and did that. I had orders overseas, but through a series of events that were totally serendipitous, I wound up staying at Fort Knox, and then Vietnam was winding down tremendously during that period of time. So I actually got let out four months early in December of 1971. I'm pretty sure it was December 10th. I don't know why I remember that day.

<laughter>

Bertelsen: But between December 10th and I started work at Wilson in January of '72. So you're only talking about three weeks' period of time. It took us a week to drive back. So it all happened very quickly in the sense I was interviewing at various places in Southern California and San Francisco and then a local attorney in Palo Alto said, "Well, you ought to go talk to John Wilson," which is one of the-- the best professional advice I ever got.

<laughter>

House: Yeah. So you were-- when did Wilson's Sonsini start?

Bertelsen: Well--

House: Or had it even started?

Bertelsen: No. It had started with Pete-- I don't know if you remember Pete McCloskey.

House: Yeah. Oh, yeah.

Bertelsen: Pete McCloskey, John Wilson, and a fellow by the name of Roger Mosher. So it officially started in 1961, although in those years, like a lot of suburban firms, you had groups of attorneys that essentially had their individual practices and shared expenses but not revenue. But they actually formed the firm in '61, and which was relatively-- I don't know-- unusual. But so it was Pete McCloskey, John Wilson, Roger Mosher, and then in 1966, they hired Larry Sonsini right out of law school in Berkeley, which is a whole separate story of why Larry would do that, and there was a professor Jennings there at Berkeley that taught Securities Law that knew, was aware, of what was happening in the Valley and--

House: That early?

Bertelsen: That early.

House: Wow.

Bertelsen: And that this, the McCloskey Wilson firm was involved with that. Because there were some early companies then, company called Tymshare, that, you know, was in timesharing. An early version of the cloud really. <laughs> A data storage firm called Pertec, and then a defense firm--

House: Oh, I'd forgotten Pertec, yeah.

Bertelsen: A defense firm called ESL that Bill Perry, who became Secretary of Defense, was CEO of and--

House: Right. And building a bunch of tanks and stuff.

Bertelsen: --so Larry started there right out of law school in-- as opposed to going to one of the major--

House: Did you know him during law school?

Bertelsen: No, no. He--

House: You got there after he--

Bertelsen: He graduated the year I started. He graduated in '66 and that was the year I started.

House: He was my wife's hasher at her sorority house.

Bertelsen: Yeah, well, yeah, yeah.

<laughter>

Bertelsen: So-- and then in '67, McCloskey left and was elected to Congress, and then when I started, , the firm was actually called Wilson Mosher and Martin, and then couple of months after that, the firm changed its name to Wilson, Mosher & Sonsini, and then in 1978, when Roger left, it became the current name, Wilson, Sonsini, Goodrich & Rosati. But I started in January of '72 as green as my Army uniform.

<laughter>

House: Ah, that had to be a, I mean, talk about being on the ground floor. Not only were you born and-- or not born, but raised in Palo Alto from ground zero, you were here for all of the legal work.

Bertelsen: Yes. And as I think about that, whether you want to call it luck or serendipity, I mean, I'd never heard of the firm. Had no intention of practicing in Palo Alto. Didn't think there would be, you know, the kind of firm that I wanted to practice law with. But a local attorney who had gone to Stanford and who actually I had clerked with for a summer, Skip Crist, said, "Well, you ought to go talk to John Wilson," and I did and so very fortunate to have that opportunity and, you know, of course the firm grew as the clients grew and as the Valley grew.

House: So Larry had been with him five or six years by that time?

Bertelsen: Larry had been with them since 1966.. So he was, had been with them, five and a half years when I started.

House: Did he outline to you any thoughts of what might happen?

Bertelsen: Well--

House: The job interview. I mean, I'm just thinking, you know, what was the sales pitch? <laughs>

Bertelsen: Well, the sales pitch was, maybe generalized, was, "You're not going to be in the library doing research. You're going to be working with clients from day one," which given my inexperience was a bit of a risk on their part, but I did have, you know, I did have two years of experience of being in the Army and commanding and etc.. So the difference was, the thing that was very attractive, is that I knew that I would have an opportunity to start doing substantive things right away. I didn't appreciate what that meant in a sense, but it appealed to me having, you know, spent a couple years in the Army, that I wouldn't just be doing gopher work for somebody, so to speak, and of course, it turned out to exceed my expectations by factor of 10. <laughs>

House: Oh, yeah. Absolutely.

Bertelsen: Yeah.

House: So describe the first year or so, because that had to be a little bit of a baptism under fire.

Bertelsen: Yes. <laughs> Well, you know, I'm not sure this would be possible today, but we were given responsibility early on. Mario Rosati, who had started right out of law school, about three or four months ahead of me, and the introductory period was very short, and once a comfort level was established, you were given more responsibility and more responsibility and more responsibility, and that was an opportunity, obviously, to get up to speed even though you were catching up on the fly, so to speak. I remember one transaction where I was sent down to-- we represented this company called Pertec, which was a public company, and they were on Wilshire Boulevard in Los Angeles, and they were buying a smaller company and I went down there to negotiate. Larry sent me down there to <laughs> negotiate the acquisition agreement, and the company being sold, which was smaller than our client, was represented by a very large L.A. law firm called Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher. But I had no idea who they were, and they were represented by a partner, and once we got into negotiating the transaction, the partner disappeared, I think because he was offended by having to deal with somebody like me, <laughs> and all of a sudden one of their senior associates came on the deal, and he was ecstatic because he was getting to do something he normally wouldn't get to do.

House: Yeah, right.

Bertelsen: So we actually got along quite well, but there were things there that, you know, topics would come up and there would be jargon or vernacular that day that I didn't understand, one of which was something called piggyback registration rights, which is this thing having to do with stockholders having their shares, having a right to have their shares registered if the company ever registered shares. Well, I had no idea what piggyback registration was <laughs> referring to, so I would have to sort of bluff my way through it and then if there was a break I'd call Larry and ask him, "What the heck are piggyback registration rights?"

<laughter>

Bertelsen: And then after that first meeting, the CEO of the company, I don't know why I remember his name, a fellow by name of Hal Kurth [ph?], called up Larry and I think somewhat jokingly asked Larry if he was mad at him, and Larry said, "No, why?" He said, "Well, this guy you sent down to negotiate the deal, <laughs> was as green as could be."

<laughter>

Bertelsen: But, I mean, the point there is you got opportunities to do things well in advance, and another example of that is, this was a year later, in 1973, and Tymshare was negotiating a joint venture with an English company that was a subsidiary of Unilever, which was obviously a huge company, and 18 months into the practice of law I was sent to London to negotiate this joint venture and just another example of being, having the opportunity, to do things well in advance of when you would normally have that opportunity. So it was all-- it was all great. It was all great stuff.

House: Did it feel good at the time or was it nervous or, I mean, what was--

Bertelsen: Well--

House: What were your emotions? Lawyers don't have emotions.

<laughter>

Bertelsen: Well, I think it was a combination of being very exhilarating, because you knew intuitively and maybe actually that you were on the forefront of things that were getting done. I mean, why else would a company like Unilever, which was even then I'm sure in the billions of dollars, be doing a deal with the company Tymshare, which was maybe 15 or 20 million dollars, even though it was public? And-- but there was also an-- there was an anxiety associated with it, which was <laughs> "I better not screw this up."

<laughter>

House: Yeah, yeah. I'm on the line here.

Bertelsen: Yeah, and so there was kind of equal doses of that and then as time went on, you'd become more comfortable. But one of the things that would happen is certainly for the first 10 years you were continually jumping into the deeper end of the pool doing more complex things and like any profession or career you're establishing your base. You're building your building blocks along the way and one of the things that you come to understand is that you need that because when you begin to manage other people and do transactions with other people where you're the lead of the team, you need to know what questions you have to ask because you've done all that. So, you know, you need to know what all that stuff is that forms the basis of what you're doing. But it was, especially beginning in the late '80s, excuse me, the late '70s, after the microprocessor had been commercially developed, and you saw the first, well, Apple and then the first personal computer companies and then the first PC software companies and if

you take-- well, if you just round it off. If you take 1980 to 2000, there was just this tremendous rocket ship. There were some dips along the way, but fundamentally there was this tremendous rocket ship of all that technology that came together , and you knew that you were riding a rocket ship, and that was-- it was a great professional fulfillment and was just a heck of a lot of fun.

House: Oh, had to be. It had to.

Bertelsen: And, I mean, the things you got to do, the people you met along the way, and then dealing with lawyers from other big city firms, you know, Wall Street firms, you knew you were playing in a league that oftentimes, those attorneys on the other side were kind of surprised that you were even around doing these things. <laughs>

House: Is that right? Yeah. Just--

Bertelsen: Well, I mean--

House: --for your age and experience.

Bertelsen: Yeah. I mean, for example, the Apple IPO in 1980. Well, Apple could've hired any firm in the country to do that. We were maybe 20, 25 lawyers in 1980, and of course the main investment bank, was Morgan Stanley. They were represented by one of the old-line Wall Street firms, Davis Polk. So yes, I mean, it was unusual for a Palo Alto firm to be in that position, and that was basically true through the '80s and by the '90s it became more common and, you know, there were other firms emerging, et cetera.

House: So you kind of co-emerged with the VC world in the Valley too.

Bertelsen: Very much so.

House: Is that right?

Bertelsen: Our founder, John Wilson, actually put together or helped to put together, Mayfield Fund.

House: Okay.

Bertelsen: With Walley Davis and Tommy Davis, not related. But Tommy Davis had been a partner of Arthur Rock at Davis & Rock, and they had invested in Max Palevsky's company, Scientific Data Systems, which was a computer company that Xerox bought in 1967 for close to a billion dollars. I think it was 900--

House: Yeah, just shy of a billion.

Bertelsen: A billion dollars, and Davis & Rock were major investors in that, and that was sort of his major investment that he used and I presume helped to start Mayfield Fund. Of course, Art Rock went on to do

what he did. The reason I know a little bit about that is in, it might've been 1972, Xerox had been unsuccessful and essentially the company went into the ground, to zero.

House: Really?

Bertelsen: And-- right.

House: Oh, had run SDS. Yeah.

Bertelsen: SDS into the ground.

House: Right.

Bertelsen: And Tymshare was down there buying 24 of their mainframe computers, which Xerox had renamed XDS. They were mainframe computers, which Tymshare bought for I think 12 million dollars, to run their timesharing business, and this huge parking lot in El Segundo, which was basically empty, and the story I was told, I don't know whether it's apocryphal or not, but the story I was told was that at the time they bought SDS, the SDS founder Max Palevsky, basically gave them the minicomputer business plan, what DEC and Data General did. But IBM had recently introduced a copier, so Xerox decided to go head to head with IBM in the mainframe business and got killed.

House: Oh, yeah. <laughs>

Bertelsen: And five years later, I mean, basically, what they had spent almost a billion dollars for, was they got, they were just disposing of the assets.

House: So was Xerox PARC related to that in any way or was that--

Bertelsen: I don't know that. I don't know whether Xerox PARC was related to that or not.

House: Because I think Don Massaro and some of those came up from SDS¹.

Bertelsen: Well, those names ring a bell.

House: Yeah. I think he was at SDS and then came to PARC.

Bertelsen: Could've been. Yeah. Well, Max Palevsky sort of became the godfather of the Democratic party in California for many, many years.

House: Oh, is that right? I didn't realize that.

¹ [Interviewer's note] Actually, Massaro led "the office of the future" for PARC, joining XEROX via the Shugart acquisition rather than through SDS.

Bertelsen: I think so, yeah.

House: Okay.

Bertelsen: Big donor.

House: Okay. So somewhere in this period you guys, and I'll say you guys, at Wilson Sonsini, started doing a number of IPOs. Like ROLM was in that early area.

Bertelsen: Well, the-- yes. There weren't a lot of IPOs in the mid to late-'70s. <laughs> Those were very difficult years, as you may recall. Inflation was very high. I don't know if you remember President Ford, the WIN buttons, Whip Inflation Now. But, I mean, at one point in time there, capital gains rates were 50 percent, and you could get close to 20 percent on a CD. So the--

House: Oh, yeah, so the incentive was--

Bertelsen: low to zero

House: Yeah. <laughs>

Bertelsen: The incentive to invest. Well, inflation got under control, the microprocessor was commercialized, capital gains rates were reduced to 28 percent, and there's probably some other factors, but essentially, you started to see some IPOs emerge in the later part of the '70s. ROLM actually did their IPO I think in '76, but that was done as MIL-SPEC computer company. Their first product--

House: Oh, that's right.

Bertelsen: --was a MIL-SPEC computer.

House: That is right. I'd forgotten.

Bertelsen: But then there were some-- I think Electronic Arrays might've gone out late, but--

House: When did Apple IPO, '80?

Bertelsen: 1980.

House: '80, okay.

Bertelsen: So the two--

House: That's sort of the break--

Bertelsen: If you want to say the real breakout would be 1980. There was the Apple IPO and then there was ROLM's-- it wasn't their IPO, but in a way it was because it was their first offering after they had gone in to make the digital PBX, to make the ROLM phone.

House: Okay.

Bertelsen: Whenever, you know, and--

House: Did they do a secondary on that or...

Bertelsen: No, they did it-- it was all sold by the company.

House: Oh. You're just saying as a product launch. Right?

Bertelsen: No. No, no, no, no, no.

House: <Inaudible 00:24:38>.

Bertelsen: I mean, they did an offering of selling stock but the offering was really done not so much-- the offering was really driven by the fact that they were now competing with AT&T and built the first digital switch.

House: Yeah, okay.

Bertelsen: ROLM phone.

House: Got it.

Bertelsen: And the MIL-SPEC computer while they still did that, that was-- that wasn't the sexy part of the business, and again, ROLM, with Ken Oshman, you know, ROLM was for those next five years, from '80 to '85 before IBM acquiring them, I mean, ROLM and Ken Oshman was, they were one of the top companies in the Valley, and so those two offerings that we did in 1980, where either of those companies could've hired any major firm in the country, those were a real kind of watershed events.

House: How close to those were you? Were you involved in those IPOs?

Bertelsen: I was briefly involved in the Apple IPO, not very much at all, but I was deeply involved in the ROLM offering.

House: Why did they pick you guys? Relationships that got built or...

Bertelsen: I think there were relationships. The-- Apple had a new general counsel by the name of Al Eisenstadt, and Al had been at a company that Tymeshare had acquired back in the mid-'70s, and I think-

- well, obviously, Larry's a big part of that, and the practice he had built, and so people like Art Rock, who I'm pretty sure was on the Apple board, would've been part of that decision. In the case of ROLM, ROLM had been a client that John Wilson had started and so we had worked with ROLM from day one and then Larry had sort of, when they went public, had taken over that account, so there was a lot of--

House: Lot of history.

Bertelsen: --trust and relationship. I think the other thing, although this would be hard to document, I think those companies wanted to be represented by one of their own.

House: Okay.

Bertelsen: If you know what I mean.

House: Yeah, sure.

Bertelsen: I mean, we were one of their own. We-- and I think that's true. I mean, our added, a lot of our added value, was we knew how these companies worked, we knew what motivation factors were. You know, we knew what the key legal issues were, and so they felt, I think they felt comfortable with us- now, of course, you had to do the work. You had to do the job. But I think they felt comfortable with that, and I think that gained momentum throughout the '80s, but those two, in terms of IPOs, those two were--

House: Kind of set the bar, yeah.

Bertelsen: Those two were big deals.

House: So let me kind of go back for a minute.

Bertelsen: Yeah.

House: What was your degree at UCSB?

Bertelsen: I had a, my major, was in Political Science.

House: Okay. So you're here in the Valley. You're working on all these high-tech--

Bertelsen: Yeah. See, I wasn't a technology guy. I thought--

House: Yeah. So did you feel like you had to learn technology or was that-- you didn't need that?

Bertelsen: No. You--

House: You had to learn some _____.

Bertelsen: You had to learn-- I had some pretty quick courses in software technology-- at Tymshare and then, although we didn't represent intel, we represented a load of semiconductor companies. You know, I did, one of the IPOs I did in '83 was the LSI Logic IPOs, and their big product at the time was something called ASIC, application specific integrated circuits. So yes. You had to become familiar with the jargon and then you had to become at least passingly familiar with what was important about that technology. For example, in a semiconductor business, especially from the standpoint of writing a prospectus, you had to understand the concept of yield and what happens if yield went down.

House: Yeah, right. You're writing a prospectus, this is the whole game. <laughs>

Bertelsen: Right. And when I worked at Tymshare, you know, I got lessons on the difference between object code and source code, how important source code was, and while you may disclose your object code to somebody, you'd never disclose your source code. Now, nobody was going to put me in the semiconductor lab and have me design integrated circuits, but yes. You had to become, you had to have some familiarity, with the technology. The other thing is, and this is one of the really wise things that John Wilson said, which was, "The facts are as important as the law and maybe more important than the law," and what he meant by that was, and this was especially true of technology companies, you needed to understand what the company's business was and what they were trying to achieve, and then how did the law equate to that, as opposed to you being some priest that would come in and throw holy water on something and say, "Well, the law says this," and those clients didn't, they didn't relate to that. I mean, they related to someone who was like them and who understood what they were trying to achieve, and so you'd-- now, that didn't mean you could ignore the law, but there was a synergy there that you had to figure out and put the pieces together.

House: So what you're describing is a whole complex set of reasons. It wasn't relationships in the sense of who knew who. It was that you had learned all this, and an East Coast firm wouldn't know that.

Bertelsen: Well, I mean--

House: I mean--

Bertelsen: --to take--

House: --much harder to know it.

Bertelsen: Yeah, and to take a simplistic example is, you know, a startup company with no revenues, and a quote, "theoretical antitrust question" comes up, they don't need you to do a \$10,000 memo or today a \$50,000 memo about the esoteric of the antitrust law. It's totally irrelevant to them.

House: <laughs> Right.

Bertelsen: One of the first things I did at Tymshare is they asked me to write the sales contract that they would present to the buyer. So I did the typical lawyer thing. I had this contract, was 10 pages long,

covered every possible thing, and they had a marketing and sales executive, Ron Braniff, and he says, "No, no, no, no, no. I want something that I can present to the customer--"

House: Over coffee and have him sign it. <laughs>

Bertelsen: "And hope that the customer signs it without sending it to the legal division." He said, "Now, sometimes they'll send it to the legal division," and so what we came up with was a one-page contract but it was printed on both sides, and the first page had the business stuff on it and the back page had the terms and conditions, which was in <laughs> much smaller print, and then he said, "Now, what of this stuff is important?" and I said, "Well, there are these two provisions," you know. "This provision is important because if you don't limit your liability, you know, you're so small, they have damages, they can put you out of business." The point being is that that's this issue about the facts and the law of help the client achieve its business, its business objectives. Now, that doesn't mean you ignore it, but, you know, anyway, I think you get the idea.

House: Yeah, that's a beautiful illustration. I love it.

Bertelsen: Yeah. Yeah.

House: Do you remember your first IPO?

Bertelsen: My first IPO? Yes, I do. Well, it wasn't an IPO. My first public offering was from Tymshare, which was that first year, 1972, and I don't know if you remember George Quist of Hambrecht & Quist.

House: Yeah.

Bertelsen: Well, he had started out at something called SBEC at the Bank of America, Small Business Enterprise Company, and they had helped fund-- anyway, they had a warrant and they wanted to sell the warrant, so they had to register the warrant. So the first public offering I did was for Tymshare. The first IPO I did, it was probably-- it was, must've been in the late-- I didn't do the ROLM MIL-SPEC IPO. That was '76. It must've been either Electronic Arrays or Monolithic Memories, which I think was in the late '78 timeframe. I think that was probably the first, quote, "initial public offering." Then beginning in 1980, of course, there was tons of them.

House: So give me three that you did that stand out.

Bertelsen: Well, ROLM, which wasn't an IPO, but the ROLM offering, 1980. I would say the LSI Logic IPO in 1983, because the valuation was over, as I recall, was something like 750 million dollars, and they were at a 20-million-dollar annual run rate in revenues.

House: Is that--

Bertelsen: I mean, this was--

House: --37 times while--

Bertelsen: This was a very hot offering in 1983, and, well, I mean, the Silicon Graphics IPO was, that was the mid-'80s. The Cisco IPO, where we represented the underwriters, was 1990, and the Amazon IPO, where we represented the underwriters, which was 1995-ish kind of thing.

House: You were a principle in each of those?

Bertelsen: Yes. I mean, in the LSI Logic, Larry was there, but I really had the laboring oar there. I mean, Larry and Wilf Corrigan had a very close relationship, but the rest of them I was the principle guy on, yeah.

House: Yeah. Cisco, it certainly has your name on the <laughs> masthead.

Bertelsen: Well, we represented the underwriters, Morgan Stanley, but yes. That was-- John Morgridge was there and, as CEO, and of course, that was, you know, when all this, you know, client server technology was getting hooked together. The PCs and et cetera, and that drove the 1990s with-- where minicomputers went out of business and et cetera.

House: So you sent a note to I think it was somebody in your firm where you went back and did some analysis of how many IPOs the firm had done, and it was like 1500 firms.

Bertelsen: Well, not-- distinction--

House: Am I misstating that?

Bertelsen: No. Well, I did a rough calculation from the beginning to through 2015. I think it's pretty accurate, give or take five percent. I think we've done 1500 public offerings, of which over 800 were IPOs, and that raised 150 billion dollars.

House: <laughs> Round numbers.

Bertelsen: Round numbers. Round numbers. Right.

House: Big numbers.

Bertelsen: Round numbers. Right.

House: There's no other firm even remotely in that league, is there?

Bertelsen: Well, it depends upon--

House: I suppose how you count some of the fortune--

Bertelsen: Is how you count some of it. I mean, if you're doing an insurance company that's raising five billion- but in terms of technology, and in covering that time span, I think the closest would be Cooley. If Brobeck [ph?] had stayed on, you know, Brobeck would've been there. But in covering that, that length of time, we're probably right up there².

House: Had to be fun, so...

Bertelsen: Well, yeah. I mean, and it got crazy in the 1990s, of course. I mean--

House: So let me just kind of take one apart. So you were the lead underwriter for Cisco. So you got to know the principals pretty well, I would imagine.

Bertelsen: Yes.

House: Would that be true in general, first of all, is kind of the question.

Bertelsen: Well, one of your jobs as underwriters counsel is due diligence and making a proper investigation. So yes. You are involved in all these interviews with the principals of the company. You don't have the same very close relationship you do when you represent the company. When I would represent the company or we would represent the company with ROLM, I mean, you were spending lots of time with Ken Oshman, lots of time with Bob Maxfield, lots of time with the CFO. The same thing with Silicon Graphics. You're spending lots of time--

House: So you got to know Clark and McCracken pretty closely.

Bertelsen: Clark and McCracken. That's an interesting duo. Mark Perry, who was the CFO at the time. So you get to know those people intimately, because, you know, you're telling a story of the company and then you're also concentrating on the financial story of the company, whereas on the underwriter, it's not quite as interconnected, although in the Cisco IPO, I mean, because that was such a unique thing. I mean, nobody'd ever heard of a router, and there was this foldout <laughs> picture in the middle of the prospectus that folded out to like four pages where they tried to describe <laughs> how all this worked, and it looked like this unbelievable maze. But there I did get to know some of those people pretty well. Mark O'Meara³, who was the head at the time, a sales guy, John Morgridge. So sometimes as underwriter counsel you do get to know some of those people pretty well. But not as when you're representing the company.

House: Okay. So I'm just--

² [Interviewer's note] "The dot-com meltdown has claimed another victim. After failing to merge with a larger law firm, San Francisco's Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison – which employed 900 lawyers just two years ago – announced yesterday that it is folding. Brobeck isn't the typical dot-bomb. It's not a poorly capitalized startup in a silly, profitless industry. It is a 77-year-old blue-chip firm whose clients include the highly solvent Cisco Systems." http://www.slate.com/articles/business/moneybox/2003/01/the_dotfirms_dotbomb.html

³ [Interviewee's note] Mark O'Meara was actually sales head at LSI Logic during their IPO.

Bertelsen: I mean, the Amazon IPO was kind of interesting because as I recall, their projection of profitability was somewhere around 300, 350 million, and of course it was only books at the time.

House: Yeah.

Bertelsen: I think it took them a while longer <laughs> to get to profitability, but boy, what a franchise has been built there, yeah.

House: Turned out pretty good.

Bertelsen: Turned out very good.

House: Yeah, yeah, and you did Tesla?

Bertelsen: Well, we did-- I didn't do Tesla, but yes. Tesla, I think we may have even incorporated Tesla, yeah. Tesla was-- Tesla and Netflix. I mean you get to the mid-90s, you had Netscape was the Internet browser. And then you get to Netflix, although that started out very differently. Somewhere along the line Pixar which is animation. I've always felt that, in a way, Disney had to buy Pixar because Pixar had become the Disney of computer animation. And then Google was around 2004. And Tesla was in there. So yeah, there's sort of the pre-2000 post-2000 drivers of what's driving the economy.

House: So let's take that apart a little bit. So the Disney/Pixar thing you just made a comment about. We're sitting in SGI's old headquarters. SGI and Evans & Sutherland were the two people that enabled computer animation for movies. Judy Estrin at Cisco was intimately involved in that and was on the Disney board. There's a tremendous amount of interconnection.

Bertelsen: Oh, yeah. There's no doubt about it. I remember when we were doing the Silicon Graphics IPO, Jim Clark was explaining or one of his technical people was explaining what was different. And what was different was the algorithms, I forget what they called it, but the algorithms in the technology which was heavy duty math was prior to that time when you rotated an object it would go click, click, click, click. And there have been a ton of studies that have been done to say if the clicks were whatever...

House: Fast enough.

Bertelsen: Fast enough it wouldn't matter. Well, that was total baloney. And what Silicon Graphics enabled you to do was to rotate this stuff in three-dimensional in real time which was a huge step forward. And then you mentioned Evans & Sutherland which actually goes to a different IPO that I should've mentioned which was Autodesk which was in 1984, 85-ish. And one of the founders of Autodesk was John Walker. And I don't know if you remember John, but John-- and these were a bunch of mainframe software engineers. And they saw the personal computer and they said, "Hmm, what's going to come off the mainframe and go on the personal computer?" And they actually developed five things, most of which I forget except one of which was AutoCAD for Autodesk. They went to the computer show in Las Vegas and that's the one that people were excited about. So they dropped the other four and did that one.

House: Talk about market research. Boom. Let's go to CES.

Bertelsen: Now, there's an example of Evans & Sutherland for CAD as opposed to electronic CAD for architects and engineers, part of that time if you got a computerized system you were buying an Evans & Sutherland. It was somewhere between a \$250,000 and a \$500,000 purchase between the software and the hardware. So now you have PCs coming in that are getting more high-powered all the time which, they will. You know, Moore's law, you get more in a high-powered market processor. So you could buy the computer for \$10,000. You could buy AutoCAD for \$5000. And for \$15,000 you got 85 to 90 percent of the same compute power. Totally revolutionized that business. John Walker was a brilliant fellow, brilliant software guy, classic short sleeve shirt, pocket protector in his shirt pocket. But he used to write and he wrote beautifully. And he wrote these things called information letters which were sort of a catalog of the history of Autodesk one of which came out after he had gone to Switzerland to be a programmer, he had left management, called Information Letter 14 which Bill Gates read and quoted extensively because it was a self-criticism of Autodesk had sort of, in John's words, "lost its way." But two things about John, at the Autodesk IPO it came out in a very weak market. And you know how these things work, you have a preliminary prospectus with a range and I don't know what the range was ten to twelve, let's say. And so you come to what's called the pricing call. These are all technical people so John says, "Well, I want you to be on this call." And so the banker gets on the call and I can tell he's going through this long explanation, lots of words.

House: You mean John is going through.

Bertelsen: No, no, no the banker was going through the words. And I can tell he's going to suggest a price below the range, at the bottom of the range or below the range. And he's expecting John to go ballistic. So let's just say he's gone on and on. "So, therefore, in order to have a good offering we recommend a price of either \$10 at the old low end of the range or 9.75. And there's this silence. And John says, "Are you pricing it too high?" This is followed by another long silence from the banker wondering whether is he...

House: Is he kidding me?

Bertelsen: Is he kidding me? And he finally says, "I've never been asked that question before." But John was very astute. And they didn't need the cash, per se, because they were making-- they had 95 percent gross margins in the software business. And people were calling him up to order the stuff. So they didn't need the cash. What John understood was if you don't have to push it with these people that are buying your stock for the first time in the public, and you're still a small company why push it? He brought ten years of goodwill because those people made tens of millions of dollars on that company. The second thing was at one point in time and this was later on so-called poison pills became the de rigueur of the day. So this is how to implement poison pills which isn't a very aggressive thing. So I go up to make this presentation and I know Autodesk is a very informal place but I have to go through this whole complicated explanation, how it all works, et cetera, et cetera. And the former CFO has been the president and John is sitting there through this whole thing. And I'm thinking I wonder if John understands what the hell this is all about. He understood it perfectly. And he said, "What you're explaining is is you want to have a bunch of

nuclear missiles to shoot off to prevent somebody from shooting nuclear missiles at you,” which is kind of essentially correct. He says, “I don't own stocks in companies that have these kinds of things,” because he was a big shareholder democracy guy. And I looked at the CEO and I said why the hell did you invite me up here without talking to John? <laughs> But he's just an example of a very smart interesting.... probably at the time he was more well-known but today most people have never heard of John Walker. Brilliant guy. Brilliant guy. He didn't look the part but he had a quote from Churchill on his desk which was something to the effect sometimes doing your best is not enough. I mean he was a hard-driving guy. He was a hard-driving guy.

House: I think I met him one time. And I didn't have enough impression to have...

Bertelsen: When Autodesk hired Carol Bartz in 1992 and I was on the board by the time he had come back, this was relatively soon after he wrote this Information Letter 14. He was unhappy with where the company was going. And Carol by that time had gone from DEC to Sun, I think. Well, first she wasn't a software person. She was a computer person. Second, she was a woman. Other than Judy Estrin you could have counted the number of women CEOs in tech on your one hand, I think, if that.

House: Yeah, this is the mid-90s, right?

Bertelsen: Ninety-two, early nineties. John drove that. The board, we were on board. There was a number of us on the board that were on board with that decision. But John met with her and gave us the sign off because the board committee that was going to recommend it we thought she was the best candidate. He's just an example of a guy who was not bound up by lots of stuff that you didn't need to be bound up by. Very thoughtful. And she did a great job there. She took the company from 300 million to over 2 billion. She did a great job there. I remember my interview with her it was at a restaurant in Menlo Park. And it was rainy. And she had been meeting all the technical guys. And she was a little late. And she came kind of busting into the restaurant. She looked at me and her first words out of her mouth were was, “Are you the normal one?” <laughs>

House: I'm looking for him. <laughs> Are you the normal one? I love it.

Bertelsen: So she basically interviewed me as much as me interviewing her. Yeah, I'm kind of rambling on here but even then-- so I'm 20 years into my career but I'm of the board of a public company. These are just opportunities you would not normally have.

House: So when he did the Cisco underwriting it sounds like you worked with Morgridge and Ed Leonard and people like that.

Bertelsen: Ed Leonard was on the company side. Yeah.

House: But you did not work with Sandy Lerner. Were they already kind of...

Bertelsen: No. They were kind of out of the company. They would have their input and I think they read the prospectus and such. But it was...

House: Pretty clear they weren't a part of it.

Bertelsen: Yeah. John was driving the-- had his hand on the rudder at the time. Yeah. He was very respectful, don't get me wrong. But he was driving the...

House: Right. Just reacting to the Bartz being one of the few women. So Sandy Kurtzig had been ASK and taken that public already. Janelle Bedke over at Software Publishing...

Bertelsen: That was one of my clients. I actually did the Software Publishing IPO. Of course, then it was Fred Gibbons.

House: Oh yeah, Freddie and Janelle together, I think.

Bertelsen: Yeah. She was his number two.

House: So you did Software Publishing?

Bertelsen: Yeah, I did that IPO. I went on their board. And then Fred had that tragic thing where he had a stroke either before he crashed into a tree or after he crashed into a tree. And then Janelle became CEO sometime after that. Yeah.

House: So that was an interesting-- I didn't realize that we interviewed both Fred-- I interviewed both Fred and Janelle in that seat about three months ago. My God, the team she put together was Scott Cook's wife Signe, Nancy Schoendorf, Diane Wheeler. When you go down the list she had an All-Star team with this little scrap-apple company. And I asked Freddie, I asked how did that happen? Do you know what he said? He said, "My dad was a ship captain." I said what's that got to do with it? He said, He wasn't home eleven months of the year. I thought women ran everything."

<group laughter>

Bertelsen: You know, Fred went to business school with President Bush II at Harvard.

House: Oh, did he?

Bertelsen: Yeah. I'm pretty sure they were in the same business school class at Harvard. Software Publishing was a great company. I worked on that IPO. That was somewhere around the same time as Autodesk, '84, '85. Originally, they were very Apple-focused but then it was PC. PC.

House: Well, yeah, they sold PFS to IBM, I think and carried them quite a ways.

Bertelsen: I think Janelle was gone by that time too until they bet on IBM's OS/2 instead of Windows. But how did you know at the time? That and the fact that people began to-- their main product was Harvard Graphics. And the big guys like Lotus 1-2-3 and others started to bundle stuff together and that was the package they gave away. I don't care how good a manager you are. It's hard to compete with for free.

<group laughter>

House: It really is. It really is. So let's shift gears. So thank you for these. These are great perspectives. And I'm sure there's a dozen more we could chase down. I think what I'd like to pursue for a moment is your involvement with CITS and UCSB and Berkeley. You've been engaged in what I would call public outreach, on the other side of the equation.

Bertelsen: Well, I consider myself having been very fortunate for a number of reasons. Like Reece Duca, my classmate, both my grandparents were immigrants; one from Norway, one from Germany, via Canada. So the opportunities I had are a product of two prior generations that made huge sacrifices. But a very classic story, a very classic American story. Growing up in Palo Alto, going to the Palo Alto public schools I would say those fifties, and sixties and maybe into the seventies it would be easy to call that the golden age of public education. The public schools in Palo Alto, and to this day it's true, were uniformly excellent. We were well prepared for university. I mean I was writing essay exams in my sophomore year of high school. And English papers, critiques, et cetera. So then I go to the University of California and for four years at Santa Barbara. And between a scholarship I had, my last two years, ROTC paid me \$50 a month. Working summers, having a little bit of savings from working summers. Essentially, I paid my way through college. In round numbers may be it was \$1000 a year, \$1200 a year which is, you know, maybe \$7000 or \$8000 a year in today's dollars. And then on to Berkeley. Somewhat similar. I did borrow \$2000 from my uncle. But, again, I got world-class education at both places essentially for free. I came out. I had no debt. My uncle did make me repay the \$2000 I borrowed which was a good lesson. So I think hopefully some of it was self-engendered but also based upon how I was brought up that was something that I felt was appropriate to support. And so we started small. We started supporting Santa Barbara and Berkeley. And then I got invited to be asked on the foundations of both Berkeley and Santa Barbara and got involved in that. And then got involved in things on campus. Santa Barbara a number of years ago started something called the Institute for Energy Efficiency which I'm on the advisory board there at the college of engineering. I'm on the Dean's cabinet. And all of that fits in well with my technical expertise even though I'm a lawyer. But all of that fits in well with that. And then a fellow you know Bruce Bimber, and while you were involved in starting it CITS, the Center for Technology and Society I just fell in love with that from the first time Bruce articulated that at a trustees meeting because it seemed to me that that was talking about something that was not being talked about which was how does all of this technology impact what's happening in society? And you've heard me go on and on about that. Berkeley, a somewhat similar story although a bit more focused on the law school there. And, again, but a great public university. One of the things that's all the rage in legal education may be even undergraduate education is clinical education and clinical experiences. And I think a little bit of that or some of that is fine. But law firms, like ours, can turn these people into technocrats in six months. We're great at doing that. So I really think they need to continue with a focus on teaching-- having people that think-- great minds think logically, want to find out the way things work, inquiry. And I think Berkeley is a place that

they continue to do that. And to ask the big questions. And so then I was invited to go on the foundation board there. Berkeley, which has lots of obvious positives and advantages also has its challenges as well, one of which is certainly financial. You know, when I was growing up or certainly through the sixties when I went to both places I think most of the people in California well understood the benefit of the University of California, whatever you want to call it, the social contract, the social compact was well understood. Certainly, my parents well understood it. And I think for a number of reasons that has frayed over the years. Davis is may be the best example. Davis, and I think still is, is hugely important to the agriculture industry in California. Science, the whole nuclear science came out of Berkeley and all of those people there, Lawrence, and Oppenheimer and et cetera. The same is true with San Diego Scripps, you can go to each of the campuses. And if you were to rip out those campuses out of those communities they would be devastated really. But you've got over 30 million people in the state now. These are elite academic institutions, virtually all of them. So less than eight percent of the high school graduates qualify to get in. And if you do get in it's hugely expensive. I mean the total cost with room and board, et cetera, is over \$30,000 a year. So I think to a lot of Californians, the UC has become kind of remote. They don't see-- it's not as tangible. I think that fabric-- and I think that needs to be rebuilt. I think there's ways to do that. And I think all of the campuses, at Berkeley, there's actually a trustee meeting this Friday where they're asking these questions about the strategic plan for the campus. Another example, the California legislature used to be full of UC grads. I'm not sure there's one UC grad anymore in the California legislature.

House: Is that right? That's hard to imagine.

Bertelsen: Yeah. It is hard to imagine. And sometimes there's even a hostile relationship there between the government and the universities. People don't realize that statewide, the state funding is well below 20 percent. And at Berkeley it's lucky if it's 10 percent.

House: I think it's a seven percent last year, something like that.

Bertelsen: Yeah, it's a huge issue. But I think, in particular, my generation-- I know Reece Duca feels this way. I'll make reference to him, again. Jeff Henley who was at Oracle and made a \$50 million gift to Santa Barbara feels this way. So I think it's really important that these great public institutions of which I think the University of California is one should be supported. So that's my motivation.

House: That's great. So CITS itself, Bruce gave a presentation at the board meeting and you happened to be there.

Bertelsen: Yeah, and Bruce, of course, is a political scientist. That's his area. So that fit with mine.

House: Oh, okay. I hadn't thought of it that way.

Bertelsen: He's a professor of political science.

House: He's a EE guy. I hired him.

Bertelsen: He's a EE guy. He worked at Hewlett-Packard. The whole thing. And I'm not a EE guy but I pretended to be. I was a EE guy in television.

House: Yeah, there you go.

<group laughter>

Bertelsen: So, yes. That vision there which you're well familiar with having articulated it and being on the board just makes a ton of sense to me.

House: Great. Well, I admire the prodding and poking you're doing for that group. I think the group is all sort of homogenous in terms of our belief. But you phrase it in such a provocative way, I love it.

Bertelsen: Well, I've learned this through other sources. I was at an event for the UC Natural Reserve System this last Friday, I guess, it was. There's another example of, I think, a lot of people aren't aware of that the University of California runs some 40 natural reserve centers. They're not national parks but they're sort of akin to that and they do great research and great education. And they're, after 50 years, they're starting a capital campaign. And they're at Big Sur. They're at Santa Cruz Island, off Santa Barbara. They're at Sedgwick. East of Saint Inez and Santa Barbara. I mean they're all over the state. And, again, the value of that is hard to overestimate. And I think the CITS is another example of how you-- in terms of technology and society as we know-- I mean technology has been great for me and globalization has been great for me. But for some people or maybe for a lot of people it hasn't been all that great. And I do think there's unintended consequences that are out there. And, you know, in a way we seem to have lost-- we don't have many forums to talk about, whether you want to call them moral questions or ethical questions. I mean David Brooks has pointed this out, the New York Times columnist, that this sort of used to be the province of highly academic clergy people that would talk about these things. It was once the province of the universities. I don't know if this is accurate but he says, "Most universities now seem to take a neutral view on this. And so you're not getting the same kind of thought coming out of the universities that you would like to have on some of these big questions," which is why I like what Berkeley is looking at in their five-year plan. And, as you know, the elements of this are economic. They're social. They're political. They cover the entire landscape of how we live our lives. And how information gets disseminated. One of our fellow board members Dave Toole makes the point that information used to kind of come vertically, if you will. With the advent of the radio, everybody congregated on the radio. People say that when FDR made his D-Day prayer that over 100 million Americans were listening to the radio at one time. Still, the widest radio audience ever. Television, the Kennedy assassination, Vietnam, you know, Walter Cronkite. You sort of had this -- not single source...

House: National discussion in a sense.

Bertelsen: You had national discussions and you had a sense of the information being authoritative. And today you have a much more disburse, maybe horizontal. You have information is coming from all sorts of places, sometimes just from places that are reinforcing people's already held views. And whether it's authoritative or not is open to question. And that's just one element of it. The book "Hillbilly Elegy" talks

about the economic impact of it. And, I guess, he's sort of a venture capitalist now; J.D. Vance. Obviously, politically. So there needs to be a place where these things are looked at. I think it's important that the scientific method be applied to that, that they be data driven, not just a lot of opinions. And I think CITS is as good a place as any place to be a main player in that discussion. I think you feel the same way.

House: I absolutely do. It's music to my ears. But, you know, you've done more than I have to actually make it front and center and I really appreciate that. But, yeah, I think it's the crucial question of our times in many ways. So you've answered, maybe, the fundamental question I had for the interview and that is why do you feel like you do? You were a poli-sci kid.

Bertelsen: Oh man.

House: And the product of two grandparents that were immigrants. The constellation that shaped you is why you believe how you believe.

Bertelsen: I think that's right. That and \$20,000 of psychotherapy. No.

<group laughter>

House: But you're still married to the same girl. I did the psychotherapy for a different reason.

<group laughter>

Bertelsen: Well, she caught my attention early on for a number of reasons. One of which in our first year of marriage I was-- I was in my last year of law school and she was teaching. We were living in apartment in Marin County. And I was the youngest. My father was born in 1905 so that was a very traditional marriage And my mother was a minister's daughter. And so my dad didn't need a remote control for the TV because my mother turned the TV channel for him. <laughs> And I forget what exactly what I said but a tennis shoe came flying by my head. I said oh, I need to reevaluate how I look at these things. Yeah. That's an interesting question how all of that comes together. I give a lot of credit to my parents, obviously. And just from where they came from. And how grateful they were. I mean even though they didn't have a lot because they thought about their parents. I was doing a class at the Norwegian school of economics which is their business school in Bergen, I forget, about a year or two ago. And I knew my grandfather, my father's father had come from Bergen. And so my wife and I drove out to, I forget what it's called, but their historical society. And sure enough they found him. So my grandfather was born in 1865. And he came to this country in 1887 when he was 22. And so when my dad was born in 1905 he was 40. And then my dad was 39 when I was born. So three generations you got 150 years. And as it turned out the hotel we were staying in in Bergen was about two blocks from the church where my grandfather was baptized and confirmed before there was electricity. And it's sort of a historical monument now. It's not used for regular church services but it's still used. And just walking around there thinking about my grandfather. And he was the only one of the many brothers and sisters that by himself got in a boat, came over here and made a life for himself and his family. They all spoke Norwegian at home. He never really--

he picked up a little bit of English, I guess. But anyway, if you start to synthesize that and think about that it would be not only incorrect but really bad form to think that this was all something that I had done. My whole career, in one sense, is serendipity. Somebody introducing me to John Wilson and John Wilson being who he was, the firm being where it was. I could have been-- one of the firms that I was interviewing with was in Santa Barbara and they did a lot of agricultural law. Well, there would have never been-- and another firm there wanted me to write wills. So I would have been writing wills for blue haired ladies in Santa Barbara. The whole thing is-- and I credit my parents for somehow getting it into my brain that you need to be self-aware enough of those kinds of things.

House: I was just thinking about your story. My great grandfather was born in 1853. And I met him. I was four. He lived until I was five. And I met him at four. And he was very distinctive. He was 91 years old at the time. But he spent like an hour with me. And it is vivid.

Bertelsen: Yeah, only my grandmother on my mother's side did I ever meet. And she spoke mostly German. Her husband had been a missionary minister to Canada and then came down here and taught theology at a seminary in Minnesota. Yeah, those are-- she loved Eisenhower. Of course, Eisenhower had a German background. And especially after all of the World War II stuff. But she was very upset with him when we started the moon program because the moon was God's nightlight and you weren't supposed to screw around with that.

<group laughter>

House: This is-- you answered so many questions that I kind of had on my mind. I'm really appreciative. What haven't I asked that I should, if you want to be memorialized in the computer history annals?

Bertelsen: What haven't you asked?

House: What's important for the next generation to hear from you?

Bertelsen: Boy, that's an important question. I think it's important to understand and to be part of something that's bigger than yourself. And that may sound a little theoretical. But I think especially in technology it's very easy to think you're special and to maybe not be as contemplative as you might otherwise be. You know, Peter Drucker talked about some of this stuff back in the sixties that a company is more than just about making money. That's really a byproduct of what you're doing. And that you should be doing something that's useful to others. And some of his protégés took that a step further and said that there needs to be a bigger purpose and employees will respond to that. That sort of the *raison d'être*, and I'm quoting here from other people, of great organizations. In the early days of GE making science for humanity or whatever it was or even Google, democratizing data. And it's not just about making the next killer app that you can sell to somebody and make your money. And part of that is having a culture. And one of the best definitions of culture I've had is it's the connective tissue, which I love that saying, that binds an organization. It sets the behavior norms and the modes of behavior and your attitudes towards performance. And if you do those things right it doesn't guarantee success but boy, I think, it makes financial success a lot more probable. And maybe, more importantly, the whole process a

lot more worthwhile and professionally fulfilling. That was my experience at the firm. A lot of people might pooh-pooh this but our ride was not driven by economics. We were good stewards of the business because we had to be. One, our clients wouldn't let us do things that other law firms could do. We were kept on a very short leash. But it was about what we were doing. It was about-- and it was about what we were doing as a group as much as it was what we were doing together. And that was what motivated and drove us. So one of the things I really don't like about what's called big law is a number of years ago this publication and it does some good things called the American Lawyer was published. But one of the things it publishes is this thing called the Am Law 100 and it's revenues of the big law firms and profits per partner. And this has sort of become, I think, too much so, the benchmark of how you rate this professional organization, what are your profits per partner and this sort of thing. I don't want to sound Pollyannaish but I just don't think that should be the primary focus. If you do things right that will come with it. Or, in our case, sometimes you get lucky and you're at the right place at the right time. But the greatest, if you want to put it that way, professional fulfillment of my career has been the stuff I was describing to you because nobody coming out of law school with one or two exceptions would have ever had the same experience I had. You just would not have had that kind of experience. I didn't know him well but I met Bob Noyce. I met David Packard. You know, all of these people who were giants in the industry and laid a lot of the groundwork for why this all happened. I throw John Walker in there, too. And women, Stephanie DiMarco who started Advent Software. Janelle Bedke. Carol Bartz. I've been very blessed in having dealt with some great women CEOs and executives. So I think I guess maybe that's going on too long. But I think that's what I'd say.

House: What a pleasure to have you here.

END OF THE INTERVIEW