

Joseph Mestenhauser

- Refugee from Communist Czechoslovakia, 1948 1-2
 - legal studies in Czechoslovakia 2
- Comes to United States and to the University of Minnesota 2
 - attracted by "friendliness" 4
 - Moore, Forrest 4, 11-12
 - Ph.D. - political science, 1960 4
- Office of Advisors to Foreign Students 5
 - response to international crises 5
 - problems of funding 5
 - overhead on grants - consumed by Central Administration 6
 - University of Minnesota response to international students 7
 - Golden era - 1945 to mid 1960s
 - Cold War climate 8
 - privacy of student records 9
 - seminars on American life 9
 - Minnesota International Center 10
 - religious, women's groups 10
 - Brooks, Gladys 10
 - Land-Grant mission 11-13
- Decline of University of Minnesota's commitment, circa 1975 14-15, 17
 - Cold War - CIA 14
 - decline of funding 14
- Orientation programs 15-16
 - lack of leadership - Moos, Malcolm presidency 17
 - Wilson, Meredith - positive influence 18-19
 - Magrath, C. Peter 20-21
- University report on International Programs 21-
 - Keller, Kenneth - picks up momentum again 23
- SPAN (Student Project for Amity Among Nations) 25
- International scholars at the University of Minnesota 26-28
- Peace Corps 29
- Mestenhauser's teaching assignments 30-35
 - College of Education 30
- Problem with Language Department 36
- Kvavik, Robert - his influence 36-37
 - Metcalf, Michael - his influence 36-37
- College commitment to International Studies 37-41
 - decline of management 39-

Interview with Josef Mestenhauser

**Interviewed by Professor Clarke A. Chambers
University of Minnesota**

**Interviewed on August 1, 1994
University of Minnesota Campus**

Josef Mestenhauser - JM
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers. It is August 1, 1994, a Monday morning. I'm interviewing Professor Josef Mestenhauser in his own office in Burton Hall. Mr. Mestenhauser has been with the university since 1951 in one capacity or another and was particularly active in working with international students for a large number of years and brings that perspective to everything that he does and now to his work in the College of Education.

Joe, why don't we start with just a little bit of autobiography. I know that you were born in Czechoslovakia but beyond that, I don't know much about your early life.

JM: I got away from Czechoslovakia when the Communists took over . . . shortly after that, in March 1948 already, and floated around Europe in various refugee camps. Eventually, a scholarship became available, which I received in a small college in the state of Washington, in Cheney, Washington. It was one of the teacher colleges originally. The scholarship was as a ski instructor, essentially.

CAC: [laughter]

JM: In exchange for being a ski coach and ski instructor, I received my first American education, which helped me learn English because I spoke, virtually, none. I sort of felt like a pioneer because skiing was just starting in this country. People hardly knew anything about the kind of equipment and stuff.

CAC: You had the equipment of secondary education in Czechoslovakia or more? How far had your education been in Czechoslovakia?

JM: I was just about three months short of my final Ph.D. in law.

CAC: In Czechoslovakia? Then, you had to come back and start a baccalaureate from scratch?

JM: Essentially, yes, because first of all the legal system, of course, didn't translate into anything here. The closest to it was international law and organization, which is why I ended up in political science here. Of course, I immediately developed a great interest in American government. I worked with Asher Christiansen there.

CAC: Ahhh.

JM: That was a golden era, that Political Science Department at the time. [Charles] McLaughlin was my major advisor and Werner Levi was the other one. He eventually left here. I finished with Max Dill. Harold Deutsch was my minor advisor. I took kind of an approach to Europe as an area studies; so, that was my minor.

CAC: I want to back up a minute. How old were you when you left Czechoslovakia?

JM: I was about twenty-two.

CAC: Did you leave by yourself or with family?

JM: Pretty much by myself. My father also had a bout with the Communists. He was a Social Democrat and they went after him very . . .

CAC: Did he escape, too?

JM: No, no, no. He died eventually there. [unclear] pretty much finished him in prison. In 1951, he died, right on Christmas Day and I didn't know anything about that until about three years later.

CAC: You made your own way by yourself all the way to Cheney, Washington?

JM: Completely by myself, yes, yes.

CAC: That's a remarkable story. Do you want to say just a little bit more about that for posterity?

JM: For some time, it was the sort of thing I wanted to forget, you know. [laughter] But now, I think it sort of confronts you. When Czechoslovakia opened up again in 1989, then, all these little things started coming back together. Quite coincidentally, this last summer, just a few weeks ago, I went back to Prague and attended the fiftieth reunion of my [unclear].

CAC: Oh, my.

JM: That was a trip to history, I'll tell you. It was an incredible experience.

CAC: How many showed up?

JM: It was eighteen of us left.

CAC: Out of?

JM: It was sort of attrition because we graduated still under Nazi Germany. When people were showing the pictures of this classroom, there was a big picture of Hitler and the Swastika right below him. The Germans, of course, didn't have any use for intelligent Czechs so they started cutting our classes from the fourth year half way each year. From something like 400 in the class, we ended up about thirty-six or something like that. Only eighteen finished the actual examination. Some of the other ones got drafted for what they called the [unclear], which was kind of the paramilitary German forces and many of them died in it.

CAC: So many of the refugees, however, headed for Paris, or London, or Geneva?

JM: Yes, that's right.

CAC: But, you chose across the Atlantic?

JM: I always wanted to learn English. The United Nations was here and I was sort of expecting to go into some diplomatic service for which I was already accepted actually. I spoke French and German at that time but no English because English was forbidden. It was only German. I decided that was it. I didn't ever expect that it was going to take that long, of course. I was [unclear] my friend and I was telling them that it would take about five years before . . .

CAC: How did you ever get to Cheney, Washington?

JM: The college advertised a scholarship for one of the refugee students who was a skier. I just happened to have had a little line there under hobbies and I put down skiing. I had actually been more than a hobby skier; I was a ski instructor in Czechoslovakia even before I was old enough to get the final certificate. I was born and raised in the mountainous part, so skiing was for us not just a sport but, in fact, a way of life. I used to go to school on skis. That always gave you a good condition. We raced in cross country and downhill . . . everything. I've skied ever since.

CAC: Do you still ski?

JM: Absolutely, yes. I go to Colorado once a year and between quarters, too. I'll try to do that as long as I can.

CAC: You get a baccalaureate in the state of Washington?

JM: They gave me a bachelor's degree after that one year.

CAC: I see, because you had the equivalencies.

JM: I didn't have any documentation; but, a number of my professors had also escaped so they gave me testimonials that I had finished. The U.S. Office of Education, at that time, had a wonderful section which was called the Credential Evaluation Section. They really seemed to understand the European educational system, so they certified that I already was past the bachelor's degree. It was no major deal for them to do that.

CAC: What attracted you to Minnesota then?

JM: I started applying to other places and Minnesota was the friendliest. It was Forrest Moore's office, of course, that I was responding to.

CAC: *Minnesota nice.*

JM: I had admission to Fletcher School, to Chicago, and the University of Washington, I think; but, Minnesota was the friendliest one.

CAC: How did that friendliness express itself to you so you would recognize it?

JM: Just the warmer letters that you received. The invitation that things would work out here, and even if I didn't have the full funding that there would be enough people who would help me out, and this sort of thing . . . generally inviting. This was collaborated by other people whom I trusted and who said, "Yes, Minnesota is a friendly place." So, I ended up here then.

CAC: These letters were from Forrest Moore directly?

JM: They were from Forrest Moore, yes. It was kind of fate almost, you know, that I ended up . . . when there was a vacancy in his office, which was beginning January 1, after I got here in 1951; so, I applied for that, and I got it, and have been there ever since.

CAC: And, then, went into political science for your Ph.D?

JM: I was in political science, yes. I finished my master's degree in 1952 and then my Ph.D in 1960. It was kind of interesting because my interest was always to find out what really attracts people to these kinds of ideologies that I had just lived under, Nazism and Communism. But, Europe was too rough for me in a way and I didn't want to sort of revive that sensitivity; so, I chose Indonesia as my study. There, of course, Nationalism was one of the ideologies there and Islam was the religious ideology that I was sort of trying to compare to Communism

because, to some extent, it is a kind of secular religion, of course. I also studied Communism there, too. To my greatest surprise, the Communist coup that was planned in Indonesia was actually planned in Prague by people who had trained me several years before that. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] Did you travel to Indonesia?

JM: No, I had a fellowship to go there, but at that time Sukarno just cut off all the Americans; so, I was unable to go there. I did all my research at MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology] and Cornell. They were very pleased to have me there because there was not that many people interested in it.

CAC: Oh, very few.

JM: We had a lot of Indonesian students here, of course, so they helped me with the translations.

CAC: Tell me a bit about the Office of Advisors to Foreign Students that you were part-time and then full-time with Forrest Moore. You were there for thirty years?

JM: Just about. The office reflected almost completely conditions that prevailed in this country and the relationships to others; so, it was like a barometer actually. If you start thinking about some of the trends, you can almost count on the major historical developments that affected international student populations. I started about 1951 and we had, then, a major crisis with the Chinese students, who obviously could no longer go to the mainland. That was the first emergency program.

CAC: These were the Chinese students from Taiwan?

JM: Yes. It was funded by the federal government. That's why Forrest needed somebody working full-time. My position, then, got to reclassified and I became a full-time person almost immediately. Then, you had a Hungarian crisis, for example. Again, there was an influx of Hungarian students.

CAC: In 1956.

JM: We were always part of the office that was managing it. Then, for example, we had that major Korean project. That was the AID [Agency for International Development] funded project. I guess AID wasn't called AID, at the time, yet. We had something like 100 Koreans here at any one time for about eight years or so, awarding the masters and Ph.D.s as a method of strengthening the university. It was one of the earliest institution building development projects.

CAC: That's an interesting connection. Tell me how it functioned in detail a bit more. Would that office respond immediately? Were there funds made available by the university, by the federal government? How did it . . . ?

JM: I'm glad that you asked about that because that was a very interesting feature of how the university functioned at the time.

CAC: That's what I want to know.

JM: We were part of the office of the Dean of Student Affairs.

CAC: Dean [Edmund] Williamson was still there then?

JM: Dean Williamson was the dean and he reported to Malcolm Willey, who was the Academic Affairs vice-president. This particular project was very lucrative for the universities. Like, Michigan State was raking in 60 percent of a every grant that they got as overhead. Here, the problem was that we did get very heavy overheads too, but they didn't go to the actual programs. They simply went to the general university fund.

CAC: Then, you had to fight to get them back?

JM: Mr. Willey decided, at that time, that we would not administer the program; so, they established a brand new office. A fellow by the name of Tracy Tyler, if you remember him.

CAC: Oh, yes, Tracy D. Tyler.

JM: Yes. He managed that; although, he really hardly did any managing. He was essentially the [unclear] of the money. We had to do all the work for them and they received no funds for that additional input. The justification was that these were not students, that they were special people like faculty and, therefore, it would be Academic Affairs dealing with that directly. I had felt during my . . .

CAC: But, in fact, they were students.

JM: . . . entire career this line, this sharp division, between student and Academic Affairs to have been always a dividing line . . . a great divide.

CAC: When, in fact, the money was coming attached to students who were studying here?

JM: That's right, yes. Precisely.

CAC: For example, the money was coming from the Office of Education in Washington for the Taiwanese students, and the Hungarian students, and the Korean students?

JM: That's right.

CAC: It attached to them so they got a scholarship to enable them to study here; but then, the overhead went to the university and, then, the Foreign Office got some of that?

JM: Very little of that, yes. There was a great distance between when the money came and the when it was doled out.

CAC: How large an office then . . . how many professional and how many support staff did the office have at that time?

JM: The numbers were increasing so dramatically that I think from the 300 that we had when I started working there . . .

CAC: Three hundred students?

JM: Three hundred students. Of those maybe 100 were Canadians. They're hardly regarded as foreign students, you know. The numbers increased dramatically immediately and the Canadian students declined as they improved their own institutions. We had, probably within a year's time, something like 1200 students. Probably, our total staff was about an equivalent of two and one half.

CAC: Two and a half professional with some support staff?

JM: With support staff, yes.

CAC: It was Forrest Moore and you and . . .

JM: A half-time assistant, yes, and a secretary. My special responsibility at the time was kind of interesting also because nobody really quite knew how that office was going to develop. That was one of the assumptions . . . that we would essentially be coordinators, but that the foreign students would be mainstreamed into the institution so that we would only manage the very minimum, like immigration rules and regulations and things like that; but, soon after that, of course, it became the opposite. The faculty didn't know how to deal with them. The rest of the office didn't know how to deal with them; so, we became the focal point.

CAC: I would hope so, yes.

JM: The departments managed international students variously. Some, like on the St. Paul campus, took almost a paternal interest in them. In other departments, like Economics or Management, they could hardly acknowledge that they existed. We only had students. We didn't have any international students. The advantage that job gave me is that you were really part of the whole system because foreign students were everywhere. You really had a feeling for the whole institution, for every part of it. I don't mean just the academic . . . from the janitors all the way up because everybody had to somehow deal with the international students. We had to

study about where they lived, about the housing, how they were financing themselves. We dealt with their own governments, for example. I felt that I really was back in diplomacy, that this was very much a kind of cultural diplomacy that we were dealing with because the funding was always limited and even though Mr. [James Lewis] Morrill, who was the president at that time, was very much the central figure to international education nationally. He was a member of all the different commissions and had put his name to various reports that were coming in. That was, again, kind of the golden era of international education. The euphoria still persisted after the war that this was a very important function and people still believed in the government here, too; so, the government played a fairly significant role in expansion. The Fulbright program was blossoming, too.

CAC: When you say the golden era, this extends up into the 1960s and 1970s . . . what you're talking about?

JM: The Vietnam War started, of course, clouding this whole thing and the Cold War itself, too. I think that this era ended with the Vietnam War.

CAC: I see.

JM: And to some extent, it ended with the assassination of [President John F.] Kennedy or shortly after that. Under Kennedy, the Fulbright program was the largest ever. It was not just part of the Cold War; really, there was some commitment to it, that this was really essential, and that Americans had to play a responsible role in world affairs. The paradigm was one that was acceptable. What happened, you see, in 1966, you had the CIA [Central Intelligence Agency] disclosures, that CIA was funding academics, and students, and so on. That began to discredit this whole field.

CAC: Was that discredit understood by the host university, here for example, or the faculty?

JM: It always was, yes. There were all kinds of commissions that actually studied this. I think that it was [Edwin] Fogelman from Political Science who chaired that committee that was investigating the extent of the infiltration [unclear] participation of faculty.

CAC: Even here on campus? You're not talking about a general national [unclear]?

JM: No, we are talking about faculty being interviewed by CIA routinely when they travelled abroad, for example, and things like that. I think the foreign students were supposed to have been somehow monitored also at the time by CIA. It was very definitely the Cold War paranoia that was involved in it and we were continually . . .

CAC: It was your office that had the records on these students who were here?

JM: We had the records, yes.

CAC: What would your judgment be about the extent of the penetration of the CIA with the students that we had here?

JM: I don't really know. I think what was happening is that the directory that we were then publishing—they were still being published; every year was a directory published—eventually found its way to CIA through Malcolm Willey because CIA had a way of coming directly to it. There were no legislation that made it illegal or anything like that. We operated in the Dean of Students' Office under pretty strict ethical guidelines of the Psychological Association, I think basically. Information that you had including the whereabouts of the students . . . that this was not public information. Then eventually, as a result of that, as a matter of fact, the privacy of the records legislation got going. That was the originator.

CAC: That protected international students?

JM: Protected international students as well as anybody else, yes.

CAC: I know that you and Forrest Moore added to the important legal work of covering visas, and the financial work of helping with fellowships, and all of that. You also introduced rather early—you would know better than I obviously—a series of informal and formal orientation programs?

JM: Oh, absolutely.

CAC: Say something about that. Again, you're operating on a limited budgets. How about that program?

JM: We always took the idea of exchanges very seriously, in thinking that it wasn't just educating foreign students, but that we also could use their presence to educate our own people.

CAC: Right.

JM: Early on, probably around the Hungarian revolt, we started a seminar which was called "American Life Seminars." That's why I was remembering your house over in St. Paul, because you often hosted us.

CAC: That's true.

JM: You often initiated these seminars.

CAC: We must have had . . . how many faculty doing that?

JM: We had about three of these seminars running simultaneously and, probably, about twice a month throughout the year; so, we involved quite a large number of faculty. It was on various

topics. Each crop of students would select their own topics. We would usually start with you, of course, with kind of an overview of American intellectual history, which got that going. We always encouraged some of the international students to respond also; so, it was kind of a combination of intellectual and a little social ending with a little coffee and cakes. That was very well-received. Asher Christiansen was also one of the favorite hosts and lecturer. He and his wife both were just delightful. Harold Deutsch hosted us quite often out here in Prospect Park at his house. That's just what started it; but, we also had a whole bunch of programs in the community that we were developing.

CAC: You had advisory committees from the community, not only of these faculty?

JM: Yes, indeed.

CAC: Where did these folks come from?

JM: We created that organization ourselves, which now is called the Minnesota International Center [MIC] and still going very strong.

CAC: It was initiated out of your office?

JM: Bill Rogers from, at that time, the World Affairs Center and I gave impetus to it and, eventually, created this organization, which was kind of the support group. It was both for practical reasons . . . we knew the staff was never going to be large enough to manage these kinds of things, but genuinely because we also thought that the community had its responsibility.

CAC: You bet. What kind of community folks could you attract to that?

JM: They were people from all walks of life. It started mostly with the religious groups . . .

CAC: Heavens.

JM: . . . and then the women's groups. They provide the home stay. Then, very soon, it sort of grew into people like bank managers and some of the international businesses started getting interested and involved in it. The women brought their husbands and their husbands brought their business friends; so, before we knew it, we had sponsoring organizations . . . the Minneapolis Rotary Club and some of the other service clubs. That gave us an [unclear]. They actually decided to sponsor some of these same types of discussion groups but at the community level. They're still going strong today.

CAC: God!

JM: We've got some fine leadership, people like Gladys Brooks who, for example, was president of the MIC for a long time. She was kind of an old dame and even today still very active in it.

CAC: She and I are co-chairing the 125th anniversary of the College of Liberal Arts this year.

JM: She was one of the early graduates, of course, yes. I think that she always regretted that—she is [one of the] very few highly educated women; she took a master's degree in international relations at the time—she never got a diplomatic appointment of some kind. She always supported the Republican Party financially as well as otherwise. I think that was her biggest disappointment.

CAC: She was active in all kinds of civic affairs.

JM: She was . . . even there for the city council and worked there. Yes, indeed.

CAC: You speak of women bringing their husbands and, then, enlargement through Rotary International and so forth. Say something more about the nature of women's volunteer work in the 1950s and 1960s. It seems to me, it was far more extensive then than it came to be later because women who would be doing that kind of work then went into paid careers.

JM: That's right. [unclear] feminism and [unclear] volunteerism as a work. For me, volunteerism, actually, was not only a sort of practical measure to try to extend the functions of this office, but I started getting interested in leadership as a variable and I found out that the earliest concept was really voluntary, that services were being performed by volunteers before it became professionalist. So, that got me into studying leadership volunteerism and professionalism. I'm still with it. Right now I'm putting together a two-credit intensive institute here in the College of Education that's going to be on cross-cultural perspectives on leadership. That's what I started on my sabbatical in the Philippines, my first sabbatical, is studying leadership under cross-cultural conditions . . . how American educated Filipinos in a culture that was dominated by American influence . . . how these directly influenced and how residually they influenced the student leaders who were not studying abroad anyplace else. I never published this, unfortunately—although, I did finish it—because Marcos took over and my publisher got raided by the military. [laughter] So, that's where it ended up.

CAC: What you're describing is a Minnesota phenomenon because we know it. Was this same thing happening at other major universities? Was the University of Minnesota just going with a national trend or did we have some special kind of leadership?

JM: I think, Clarke, we were quite unique here because of Forrest and his leadership. We continually wanted to be known just as a service agency that extended visas or things like that, but that actually looked for the education. I think that there was a little more to that, too. At least, I personally attribute this to the Land-Grant tradition. I started under Mr. Morrill. That was no joke for anybody. You got an orientation that you were an agent of the state and that you were to work for public good and this sort of thing.

CAC: How did that message come down to you?

JM: It was both direct and also very subliminal. You kept being reminded of that continually, that the public are your bosses—not your real boss—and you must respond to that. Of course, I worked in a field which was called Community Outreach Programs. That's why they started all these Minnesota groups and so on. That's where we really saw the interplay. It was sort of an interdependent situation because the university—even today, of course, it is—was kind of unique. The public really supports the university and the university responds in kind. That was the lesson and it was intellectually very comfortable for me because I come from that kind of an intellectual tradition in Czechoslovakia, which was not dominated by that kind of tradition. It was a very elitist tradition that I come from but my father, being a Social Democrat, was always in the opposite tradition. It's funny how you draw back on your early life to remember some of these kinds of things.

CAC: When you say that Minnesota was not uniquely but certainly powerfully in this tradition, how could some student in the future, some scholar ten, fifteen years from now, be able to demonstrate that? Is this a comparative, subjective sense you had going to national meetings that Minnesota was kind of in the forefront? How do you make this comparison?

JM: I think it's much more than that. I think that we have worked not only with the community groups but also with the students themselves. We encouraged a kind of infrastructure. There was a group called the International Student Council. It was very strong. Of course, the dean really supported that. I often wondered what really helped or encouraged the development of that kind of a program and I'm sure that Dean Williamson had something to do with that. He was, to some extent, misunderstood by many; but, he really did believe in student responsibility. *In loco parentis* was often what people sort of used. Down in his later age, he became very rigid and unaccommodating, which I think was one of the reasons why Malcolm Willey never reached to us to manage the Korean project. He and Ed Williamson didn't get along at all. In fact, they were almost at sword points.

CAC: You would find this point of view in these programs more aggressive, more assertive, here than in Michigan, or Wisconsin, or Indiana?

JM: Yes, absolutely.

CAC: Why would that . . . they're also Land-Grant. What is the Minnesota story here?

JM: I think it was a combination of Forrest Moore being here and myself, and having that skill, and having the kind of environment in which we could function.

CAC: That's what I'm looking for is the environment at the University of Minnesota and the larger surrounding community that would be unusual here. . . again, not uniquely. All these things happen elsewhere.

JM: I basically, attribute that that way and you might say that this is a subjective variable here; but, I think that most of our graduates when they returned to their home countries, continued to believe that they grew here and that this kind of combination of the academic work together with the participation in various activities and so on was it.

CAC: So, [unclear] loyalty to Minnesota [unclear] whole idea?

JM: Absolutely. Every once in awhile somebody comes back to my attention like this. One of them is a fellow who became the manager of all the Aga Khan funds. That's a major foundation, the one that traditionally they used to weigh in in gold and, then, they'd dispense the money. He also, essentially, attributed his whole career to having had that kind of a combination of things. When he recently built one of the largest medical complexes, he not only drew on his experience here at Minnesota but, in fact, continued to invite Minnesota faculty and others as consultants to that project. For example, he, in his own mind, determined that we had a public good in mind rather than just a contract. He knew that we would have the responsibility and try to help them out as well . . . that we had that kind of other orientation. He also realized that we were going to be reasonable, that we were not just going to slap them with a big bill, like Harvard would. That certainly was the mentality that got through.

CAC: Yet, there's a prevailing perception of Minnesota as being the heartland, isolationist, unconcerned with foreign affairs. What you're saying runs directly against that—including people in the community.

JM: I think that's true because that whole situation that turned around in Minnesota from that hardcore isolationism. By the 1950s, this was really a very international place. I think people like the Minneapolis paper had something to do with that transformation, too.

CAC: Ahhh!

JM: It's not an accident, incidentally, that Mr. John Cowles, the old man senior, originated a special scholarship program that we administered that helped bring students from developing countries in journalism and social sciences.

CAC: I see.

JM: That lasted a long time . . . until he retired, finally. Then, they cut it off. At that time, of course, the Vietnam War started turning inward instead of outward. There was a sour experience for us in international affairs. Shortly, at that time, you had the oil crisis, for example. Then, you had the hostage crisis. That really sort of ended the international education.

CAC: I think it really dampened it here at Minnesota.

JM: Yes. The budget cuts started coming in; so, little by little, some of these functions got eliminated. In fact, many of the functions that they lost, at that time, had been lost because of the sort of radical movement that regarded these as being patronizing or something like that. For example, we had a program called the American Brother/Sister Program. That was an effort to assign American students to foreign students as they were coming in . . . to try to reach to the undergraduate population because most of our international students were in the Graduate School level. That, we lost almost immediately because that was regarded as being part of the patriarchy.

CAC: Or process of coaptation.

JM: That's right, yes. Then, the program that we lost second was called the Student Leadership . . . let's see, what was it called? That was directly attributable to the CIA activities. There used to be a National Student Association that had a very strong international student program.

CAC: Yes.

JM: The Minnesota student government, which was then called the All University Congress, always played a major role nationally in that group. Because of that, Forrest and I had always been advisers to some of these projects. You can imagine what that did to us when the CIA incidents came out and showed that the CIA was funding the National Student Association, which, of course, killed the National Student Association almost immediately and, then, killed this Foreign Student . . .

CAC: What approximate year would these things be occurring?

JM: This would have been the late 1960s. The disclosures took place in 1966.

CAC: Okay.

JM: We had, at that time, a program that was called the Foreign Student Leadership Project. That was really unfortunate because that was not funded by the CIA. That was legitimately funded by the Ford Foundation.

CAC: You speak of the Ford Foundation now. What other national free-standing, non-governmental, foundations were actively . . . "

JM: Virtually, every foundation had a major, major program: Ford, Carnegie, Carnegie Brothers, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Carnegie Corporation itself.

CAC: The Minnesota program was plugging in with special applications for those?

JM: Absolutely. We were dealing with all of these foundations.

CAC: That helps in the 1950s and 1960s?

JM: They brought in large numbers of funded scholars and reached the graduate programs in much the same way as the government programs. The Fulbright and the AID programs did that, too.

CAC: Both you and Forrest were active in the Institute for International Education, IIE.

JM: Yes, IIE and NAFSA were the two major private groups.

CAC: What is NAFSA?

JM: National Association of Foreign Student Affairs, it was called.

CAC: [unclear] you were doing more elaborate orientation work?

JM: Because of the way that we both published and that we sort of looked at the quality of education and so on, we were always kind of at the forefront of the intellectual movement in this field, too. We got invited to bid on other kinds of contracts and that's where we started developing some of these Fulbright Centers, for example. The Fulbright legislation permitted incoming scholars to be sort of oriented, I guess was the term used. It was sort of like a decompression chamber before you get into the academic life. You recall, of course, those years very well because you were the director of several of these centers for awhile.

CAC: That's why I know more about them intimately. We used to run 150 students each summer . . . August, for two weeks.

JM: We had one of the longest ones because we also tied with the English Language program. When Betty [unclear] came and developed that, that strengthened . . .

CAC: That was English as a Second Language.

JM: Yes . . . our potential to get these kinds of things. Curiously enough, we lost that. When was it . . . when the biggest budget cuts started coming in, our bosses didn't think that this was really related to the university, that this was a service that we ought to cut out; so, we did. It was unfortunate because I think that the faculty who participated in these programs really acquired a new sense of internationalism . . .

CAC: You bet.

JM: . . . not only, by the way, they lectured but by the way they treated foreign students later. They encouraged their own students to apply for Fulbrights and so on. It was really a marvelous

educational program, but we lost that. Now, my old office is back at it. This afternoon, I'm going to lecture to a group of Russian Fulbright students. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

JM: That should be quite an experience because we really put a lot of money into Russia now.

CAC: I remember, particularly, Jim Gibbs . . .

JM: Jim Gibbs, yes, yes, yes.

CAC: . . . and what other professors from the basic disciplines?

JM: Harvey Sarles . . . again, Asher Christiansen . . . we started bringing in some of the people from Education also.

CAC: Who from the College of Education would have been . . . ?

JM: Bob Beck was the most favored one and Bob Keller, too. The Mr. Norway . . . what is his name? Gordon Mork. All the big names of people delighted to participate in that and they came to all the social functions as well. It was to them much more than a chore to give a talk. It sounds corny maybe to you, but we believed that this kind of a program produced a lot of synergy, that you weren't just doing one thing at a time, that there was a number of multiple goals being satisfied. I think that's still true.

CAC: I suppose the interviewer should remain in that capacity, but I've been impressed in the forty years that you and I have shared—I came in 1951—at the networking that takes place within the university itself and, then, to a larger community surrounding the university. One of the things in this project I have here is trying to catch the informal networks.

JM: Exactly.

CAC: With every person I've interviewed, this shows up. There's an outreach to the community. There is a cross-discipline. There's an engagement of faculty and community leaders. You speak of the golden age, which would be the 1950s and 1960s, until Vietnam, you say. Then, in 1973, the . . .

JM: If you associate that with the presidents, it certainly would have been Morrill and [O. Meredith - Met] Wilson.

CAC: Yes.

JM: Then, with Malcolm Moos, it really went down hill.

CAC: Or we associate it with national presidents.

JM: Yes.

CAC: Things go sour in the late 1960s and early 1970s . . .

JM: Absolutely.

CAC: . . . as so many things do [unclear].

JM: What was interesting under Moos is that, although he was really such an inconsequential president, he, of course, served in a very difficult era here, the Vietnam radicalism years and so on. Faculty actually really disappointed me particularly and others that they almost collapsed.

CAC: Say more . . . collapsed in what sense?

JM: They didn't know how to deal with this. Here you are wedded to this rational theory of being and, all of a sudden, you see students being so irrational. Faculty just was, too. They disappeared.

CAC: They disappeared from your program?

JM: They disappeared from the programs. They disappeared [unclear].

CAC: And the funding, of course, disappeared at the same time.

JM: The funding disappeared, too, yes. I think it was many of us in Student Affairs who really were sort of batting it out there, too, even with the radicals. That was our fault. Moos disappeared also. Whenever there was a crisis, he would pick up the telephone and call his cronies at the Ford Foundation and say, "Do you have any studies about such and such?" [laughter] What was amazing about that . . . Of course, I was already studying leadership intellectually at that time . . .

CAC: Ahhh.

JM: . . . so, I was able to see how the whole system, then, responded to fill the vacuum that Moos essentially left here. He really didn't know how to deal with that. His wavy hair did not . . . his charisma did not help; so, he just left the university kind of wide open to people like Don Smith. Yes, yes, he was the Academic Affairs vice-president at the time . . . and others. You saw very quickly how the system somehow develops its own way of dealing with this vacuum. I saw that again during the crisis with [President Kenneth] Keller, for example. I saw again that there was a kind of vacuum that existed and the crisis reflected on everybody. There was a lot of people who just filled in that vacuum. Leadership studies often show that this is the case.

The group takes upon itself the shortcomings of the leader and compensates for this somehow. It was amazing to see that.

CAC: Say something about Met Wilson's leadership then. Those were the good years.

JM: Those were the very good years, yes, yes.

CAC: In a sense, it's easier being a leader before 1967 and he was here from 1960 to 1967.

JM: That's certainly true. A college president, at the time, was really almost untouchable. That was probably one of the most revered functions that anybody held. I think that in contrast with Morrill, for example, he didn't worry about hierarchy quite so much. Morrill did relate to us because of his national involvement, but that was an exception because normally he really went straight through the channels.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

JM: [Wilson] really would simply try to humanize the institution and bureaucratize it less. He would reach out to anybody that he wanted to. He would come to the Campus Club and mix freely with the faculty, which was quite unusual because a lot of university presidents got sort of coopted into the crowd downtown, the private clubs, and the Minneapolis Club, and the athletic clubs, and things like that; but, Wilson enjoyed being with people in the Campus Club and in the Union with the students. He was visible. He was quite a different person.

CAC: He related informally with the international students, too, then?

JM: Oh, absolutely, yes. He would often invite them . . . because he was the first resident of Eastcliff.

CAC: Ah.

JM: Then, his kids, for example, were very much involved in the programs—he had several children—and his wife, too. They joined the Minnesota International Center. His conversion experience, I think, was the sabbatical that he took in England. That was very interesting because the British system, at the time . . .

CAC: That was long before he came to Minnesota?

JM: No, no, no. He was already here.

CAC: Oh, I see. He took not a whole year sabbatical?

JM: No, no, no. He took about three months or so.

CAC: Go ahead with that.

JM: It was kind of a leave of absence. This was, to me, very interesting because of my own interest in comparative education. He was asked to be a consultant on the conversion of the English system from the very elite to the mass system. Wilson, of course, was very much a proponent of the mass education.

CAC: Sure.

JM: That's why he subscribed to the Land-Grant theory also. He went out there and what was happening is that, under the pressure from the labor, the British system was beginning to crumble; but, instead of really expanding it, what they decided to do simply was to convert some of the lesser institutions into university status. So, they doubled university enrollments almost instantly without really doing anything. But, of course, they also doubled the cost. Wilson was advising them that they should start charging tuition; so, he became a persona non grata because, after all, the British tradition would not allow this. The institutions were fully funded by the government. I think this was really their downfall, eventually, because after this the pressures continued toward expansion and the system could not expand very well and they were unable to start charging tuition either. Wilson saw that this was a very good time for them to do it. There were certain breaks from tradition and that would have allowed them to do it. I have even recently heard a scholar, that I was with at some international conference, commenting on this. He didn't realize that Wilson was from Minnesota and that I knew about that. Wilson felt almost a compulsion to talk about this when he came back; so, we were the first ones that he called because he wanted us to hear his story, what had happened to him.

CAC: I see. What did he bring back, then, to Minnesota from the English experience?

JM: Essentially, it reconfirmed the direction of American higher education, not just in the economic sense but he felt that what was lacking in the British system was, in fact, really the esprit de corps that goes with the partnership between students and the institution. When you expanded, the need to have people to feel responsible for it . . . If you pay the tuition, it's a kind of psychological commitment to expecting something in return that gives you the reciprocity. That commitment, incidentally, was eventually confirmed by one of the best writers, I think . . . a sociologist of education, that I have run across and that was Martin Trow. I don't know if you know that name or not. He had, just shortly before that, published a little booklet, kind of a pamphlet, that I still draw on regularly. It's called something like *Conversion from Elite to Mass Systems*. It was initially designed for developing countries. He was trying to caution people who were helping with the educational system that the conversion and growth would have certain negative consequences. Then, he would describe them, including motivation of students, need for bigger bureaucracy that grew out of proportion and so on. Of course, we've seen that

domestically, too, because when the University of Minnesota from something like 12,000 students went to about 40,000 students, you saw the same thing happening, too.

CAC: Yes.

JM: In fact, by implication, it makes you wonder whether the contraction works in the opposite sense in building the elitist [unclear], which is probably what's happening because many of the critics of our current relations are seeing in it some sort of a form return to elitism.

CAC: You had a chance to observe all of these things close up and, yet, kind of on the margin.

JM: Yes. When you are in International Education, you are never in the mainstream. You are always a minority but the minority always gives you a look at the majority that's probably more profound.

CAC: You've commented on Mr. Morrill, and Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Moos. Along the same lines, how did International Student Affairs function under [President C. Peter] Magrath, for example?

JM: Very well, actually, because Peter was also very interested in it. He also had a kind of conversion experience when he travelled abroad. He came to us with some international exposure already and that was kind of based on that Land-Grant tradition as well. The Land-Grant universities were pretty much in the forefront of all of the AID development programs; so, he realized that this was very important to us. Then, of course, he married Diane [Skomars], who used to be a foreign student adviser.

CAC: I didn't know that.

JM: Oh, yes.

CAC: Did she work in your office, then?

JM: No. She worked in Duluth . . . UM-D.

CAC: Okay.

JM: Because we were a systems office, then we worked with her, too, in the return. That certainly helped us. I think Peter had his own ideas. He knew that the president doesn't always have as much power as the Academic Affairs vice-president, but that he could initiate certain things, like committees, presidential committees, and things like that. That was the channel that he used and he, in fact, did appoint a couple of these committees that, eventually, led to establishment of International Education as *the* university strategic goal. When the planning strategy started unfolding—even though they were kind of sexy and fashionable theories and all

that sort of thing, too—Peter was really trying to do it quite seriously. In that sense, I think, he wasn't just pushing international, but he was seeing to it that it's represented. Whenever he travelled anywhere, he really saw that the faculty . . . Maybe, we influenced him ourselves to it because he did related to us quite directly. What happened is that the golden era, that I was describing that resulted in massive involvement of faculty abroad, came to an abrupt end with the Vietnam War; so, the younger faculty people that were coming in no longer had the fellowships, the opportunities that their predecessors had. We really started having a very provincial faculty. I think Peter saw that. It became, already, because of the emphasis on strategic planning, a certain vision that education was in trouble, particularly higher education, and that we were going to have to turn to some entrepreneurship and that if you didn't have a faculty internationally oriented, you weren't going to attract any of these lucrative things. Essentially, what he saw and what Nils Hasselmo sees now is that international education is good for your business. It's the only growth area still.

CAC: Of course, in Nils Hasselmo, we have the—I'm guessing but I'm quite certain—the only president who was born abroad.

JM: Yes.

CAC: He was himself an international student here.

JM: That's right, exactly.

CAC: What was the connection of the programs that you were engaged in with the international outreach in Morrill Hall? There were assistant vice-presidents for International Affairs and so on. What's that relationship?

JM: That was, essentially then, the outcome of this committee with Peter Magrath.

CAC: Say a bit more about that, please.

JM: Peter appointed this . . . Carol Pazandak was his assistant, as you recall. She became the chair of a committee that studied international involvement. I was her chairman of quite a number of subcommittees. We published a fairly comprehensive report that really impressed Peter.

CAC: You and Carol Pazandak were moving forces in those subcommittee reports?

JM: I think so, yes. When that report was published and processed, we had changed vice-presidents. [Gerry] Shepherd left somehow and who was the vice-president from the St. Paul campus who left us for Colorado?

CAC: Mr. Link.

JM: Yes, Al Link. Stan Wenberg quit or died, too.

CAC: There was quite a turnover right at that moment.

JM: There was a tremendous turnover. The report, as a result of that, never got formally processed for either acceptance or rejection.

CAC: I see. Was it carried to the senate after [unclear] also?

JM: Yes, Peter then sent it to the senate for comments. The comments were both favorable and unfavorable. The pressure for money was already here and CLA [College of Liberal Arts], particularly, was having great difficulties financially.

CAC: You bet.

JM: Much of the resistance really came from CLA, then, to this. They didn't want any more bureaucracy and as the faculty governance was strengthening itself, faculty didn't believe in centralized bureaucracy anymore. They saw in this an extension of more bureaucracy. I think that this is, essentially, what killed that report.

CAC: Was it killed or just partially implemented?

JM: Just kind of neutralized, you might say.

CAC: Was any of this picked up in the Keller Administration?

JM: No.

CAC: Of course, he faced other priorities.

JM: Peter then appointed a new committee: Michael Metcalf, and I, and the philosopher, John Wallace. The three of us were the task force to process that report. We had hearings. We had something like 500 people involved in hearings about that . . .

CAC: Good grief.

JM: . . . and what should be done. The momentum was already then . . . It was quite obvious that International Education or components of it were very much on the mind of many faculty, that they really wanted this dimension to be known, and that they did want the University of Minnesota to be essentially that kind of a—the term became—*world class institution*. That was when that term originated. Ken Keller, then, became the president after Peter Magrath left and we still continued that task force. We now reported to Ken. Ken had not much real sympathy

with that sort of thing, but he realized that there was a certain momentum and that he would have to go along with that.

CAC: He was facing other agenda, wasn't he?

JM: Yes, he certainly was. We finally did persuade the university. Then, even Ken took it to the Regents so that the international dimension became one of the five priorities. From that time on then, things did start happening again.

CAC: This is the office that Michael Metcalf himself . . . ?

JM: Actually, no. It started out with Bob Kvavik.

CAC: Yes.

JM: There was a search for the position of the assistant to the vice-president for Academic Affairs because we wanted International Education to be all institutional instead of any one college and we wanted it to be close enough to the decision making. The position was open then. There were four of us who applied for it including myself, and Michael Metcalf, and Carol Pazandak, and Bob Kvavik. Bob got that position then and it led to the sort of merger of all of the international units, which was very interesting because . . .

CAC: Including the old office of . . . ?

JM: The office of the international student adviser got merged, too.

CAC: That got merged into that program?

JM: We got, then, moved to Academic Affairs from Student Affairs.

CAC: Ah. This happens—again, having the student ten years from now in mind—in the Keller Administration?

JM: That's right, yes.

CAC: That whole thing gets coordinated . . . collapsed together . . . all international programs?

JM: That's right.

CAC: That's where this . . . your old office is now?

JM: This actually happened already under Peter Magrath because Peter told Frank Wilderson, in no uncertain terms, that he wanted our office moved. When Peter left and Ken Keller came

in, this was already a decision that was established. Frank decided not to fight it; though, I don't think he liked it. He was so involved in managing the police, and also the minority programs, and all that kind of stuff that he sort of let go eventually; but, he wouldn't let go of the study abroad, the ISTC. So, that fragmented the program to some extent and to this day, it's fragmented. I don't know now with Marvelene Hughes gone, maybe there will be a chance to move this through. She was also very much an empire builder here from what I understood. I never met her personally; but, she absolutely would not let the ISTC go and merge with the other . . .

CAC: For the student of the future, these initials are what?

JM: International Study and Travel Center. It has kind of an advising function also. I think that one of the reasons why we haven't really done too much in the study of our own area is because of, essentially, the distrust of the faculty of educational abroad . . . that it's not quality enough. I think that is also a result of this lack of their participation in travel and so on.

CAC: Now, you're speaking of the educational experience of Minnesota students abroad and not international students coming here?

JM: Yes. We always saw this as being, essentially, the other side of the coin. That's probably one of the biggest disappointments in this international field that we never succeeded in integrating those two functions because they are part of the, as I said, same coin.

CAC: Yes.

JM: It would have resulted in some economies and savings and we could have piggybacked on the goodwill of the faculty that we did have because of all of these networks that already existed. I think it would have really been a remarkable progress. Right now, it's just a bureaucracy that has gotten caught in the paradigm that seems to dominate all higher education . . . this competitiveness; so it's, essentially, a question of dollars and cents. If you can sell the program to send students to England, go ahead and do it and, maybe, some education will happen alongside with it and I'm sure that it does. I think we've still neglected many of the developing countries and others. I think, to some extent also, it reflected the lack of integration of foreign language programs with the study abroad, as well. The German Department was the exception to that. They were really very much—at least from my observation of that—related to it and they were quite willing to work not just with the German majors but also with anybody who was also willing to take German as a language to complement some other field.

CAC: I'm interviewing Gerhard Weiss this afternoon. I'll raise that question to him.

JM: Gerhard would be the statesman in this field, as I saw him at the time, yes. We had several of the exchange programs that we negotiated. Even though they were just one for one, they really supported an idea and that had also a lot of synergy to it.

CAC: Another free-standing program was the Student Project for Amity Among Nations, SPAN.

JM: Yes.

CAC: What was the relationship of your office and these other programs you're talking about to SPAN, if any?

JM: We had always supported SPAN because SPAN was a student organization as well as an academic program so we had the relationship to the student organization and supported that. Here is a program that was essentially the same for twenty-five or thirty years and still producing good results.

CAC: And doing precisely what we were talking about two minutes ago, that is, giving an experience abroad for Minnesota students.

JM: Yes. The problem with the program was that it was very spotty. If you had a good adviser who went with the project, then, the program worked. It was very dependent on that one individual and many faculty people went because it didn't pay very much. They simply took what they got, and disappeared into their own research, and met the students once or twice before and after. We knew from experience and from reports that many of the research papers got written in the Wilson Library . . . that the students essentially didn't need to go anyplace overseas.

CAC: Unless they were with a faculty member who really insisted on that.

JM: We had no relationship to the academic part of the program—to some extent we did because both Forrest and I had academic appointments; so, we often were the advisers to these students, in that sense.

CAC: Did Forrest ever lead one overseas?

JM: No. No.

CAC: You did?

JM: No. We were never really allowed to do that. It was a CLA program.

CAC: It's my memory that Mitch Charnley was the first director, initiator and, then, Professor [Theofanis] Stavrou.

JM: Yes. He still is, I think.

CAC: Can you observe the work of either Charnley or Stavrou?

JM: I don't remember Charnley very well in that program. Theo was kind of an academic entrepreneur in that whose inspiration worked very strongly. He was a very dynamic motivator. I think some of that was lost when the program became statewide. At that point, he started having to depend on faculty and others from other institutions out here; so, it wasn't just a University of Minnesota program and he was very possessive of it.

CAC: This is under Stavrou?

JM: Yes.

CAC: Do you know when, approximately, chronologically, the program was moved to incorporate other private colleges in Minnesota?

JM: No, I don't really recall that.

CAC: My daughter went with the Greek program from Carleton. She was trained in the Greek language by Theo's brother just very thoroughly so that by the time she got there in the summer . . .

JM: It must have already by a statewide program at that time. It went statewide relatively early.

CAC: Okay. I'll have to interview Stavrou and get that story.

JM: What the problem for us was is we were trying to expand study abroad and CLA leadership would always pit us against SPAN; so, it was kind of assumed to be somewhat of an adversarial relationship. We are already doing it, and that's an academically sound program, and what you are doing doesn't have any credibility. That was one of the problems. Fred Lukermann was one of the biggest opponents of any expansion of study abroad, at that point. He would really put brakes on virtually anything. The academic departments, particularly CLA, didn't want to . . .

[knock at the door - break in the interview]

CAC: SPAN was thought of by Dean Lukermann as the commitment of the Arts College?

JM: Essentially, yes. We had no problem with that, but it didn't touch on any other colleges. We had a systems-wide responsibility.

CAC: I understand. You were systems-wide for the Twin Cities, but also your office had Duluth and Morris?

JM: We were also systems-wide for the whole university including UM-D and so on. Eventually, the decision was made—it was probably under Ken Keller—that this was disentangled and our only systems-wide responsibility was on foreign faculty and their coming here. There

were a lot of difficulties. Do you know that the numbers of these international scholars has gone from something like 80 to about 1,000 . . . that we have that many people? As the system of sabbatical leaves is getting more and more popular abroad and as our own faculty get around to international conferences, there are a lot of these linkages, a lot of hookup.

CAC: This 1,000 person figure are scholars from international universities who come here to teach, or learn, to study?

JM: Mostly research. They would come in anywhere from maybe a month to a whole year.

CAC: I see.

JM: Those numbers have really increased. The problem that I have with that is that it's all one on one. There is no vision in the university administration to see that somehow harnessed to a larger network.

CAC: These are mostly established scholars that you're talking about?

JM: Not necessarily, no. They could be very much junior scholars, as well. That's why it's so important for the future linkages.

CAC: Geographically, this is a global . . . ?

JM: Pretty much so, Clarke.

CAC: I have a sense just eyeballing that increasingly, it's the Pacific rim. Would this be accurate?

JM: No, I don't think so. I'll come back to these former students of the golden era. Their students are now junior faculty who are coming here.

CAC: If you listed the continents in order of the size of that influence, what would it be?

JM: Latin America and Africa would be grossly underrepresented.

CAC: Okay.

JM: Certainly, Europe, and the Middle East even, and Asia would be very strongly represented. That's been always the [unclear].

CAC: And at time, students from the People's Republic as well as from Taiwan?

JM: Yes.

CAC: Do you have any sense within the university, to take the geography internally, which of the colleges, which of the programs would be receiving more of these scholars?

JM: The Medical School, and IT [Institute of Technology], and Agriculture.

CAC: It is a technical . . . it's not in the liberal arts?

JM: It's always been. Even that has always been kind of synergistic, too. Many of these foreign scholars and the participation of our own always brings out that synergistic dimension of it. There is a connection. I know we had once a grant from the Exxon Foundation. That was when Michael Metcalf was the director of OIP [Office of International Programs] before we merged with it. We got very much involved. Phil Porter was also working in that. I was, actually, the one who was assigned to IT and it was an interesting experience and in my own mind, for example, worked very well with the science oriented faculty, like the physics, the math, the chemistry and not so well with the engineers. They had a totally different mind set. [laughter]

CAC: [laughter] Tell me about that.

JM: Just as an example . . . we came to this meeting and they turned to me and said, "Joe, you are the expert on this international education. How do you define it?" I proceeded to define it and they said, "No, that's not what it is." They denied your definition. [laughter] It was difficult to function with that. The sciences could deal with your concepts because they understood them. They asked a few qualifying questions and, immediately, caught on. It was really like a concept formation that you saw in your own laboratory. You needed to work with the engineers a little differently because they were very much working on the concrete level of reasoning.

CAC: You didn't have direct experience yourself with the St. Paul campus on this?

JM: Oh, yes, all the time.

CAC: I'm just guessing—maybe that's a poor way to put a question—that the agronomists there, of various sorts, were so experienced overseas that they would know more quickly and almost intuitively what the programs were designed [unclear].

JM: Again, during the golden era, this was definitely the case; but then, when you started attracting some of the younger people, then you had a problem with that. For example, I recall that we helped them get a major grant for Rwanda, of all countries. The reason they got that is because we did a cross-cultural training session for them. The dean ordered faculty to come to it. We didn't know that until after that. You can imagine the [unclear]. [laughter] It was really unbelievable how little sensitivity they had. Even the science-minded people were going to go to Rwanda and conduct a house-to-house market research kind of oriented project, not realizing

that (1) they didn't speak French, (2) the Rwandans didn't speak French either, (3) the households didn't exist . . .

CAC: [laughter]

JM: . . . and (4) the principal method of killing in the first tribal war that lasted also twenty-five years was poisoning of food and, yet, we were developing then a certain new kind of bean that was strong in protein. [laughter] It was amazing. The leadership of the college was always very international. They came from that and that continued. That was the first college, Clarke, that had in its constitution that international education was their objective.

CAC: Heavens. How about the Peace Corps? Was there any training of Peace Corps volunteers?

JM: They did that, too. They had a contract for a long time. They, eventually, let that go when the Peace Corps changed its objectives away from rural development. For awhile, there was a kind of paradigm in both AID and in the Peace Corps when the poorest of the poor was the target. They had an in on that and they did a remarkably good job. They got several awards for the best recruitment, retention, and performance of the Peace Corps people. Ed Persons got, recently, an award from them, too, for that same thing.

CAC: Approximately, chronologically, when did that shift from rural to non-rural take place? I know there are two different rural projects.

JM: I think it probably shifted at the beginning of the [President Ronald] Reagan Administration.

CAC: That late?

JM: Yes. Reagan, essentially, treated Peace Corps as an extension of AID and lost that youthful enthusiasm. Even [President Richard] Nixon started already killing it, at the time. So, it was just another program. It didn't have that same kind of appeal that appealed to the younger people and that spirit. They had the so-called Third Objective, which was for [unclear] to educate Americans to conditions of development. That got lost also.

CAC: Do you have any sense of very many Minnesota students volunteering for the Peace Corps?

JM: Minnesota and Wisconsin are always the top in the country for recruitment. That's no coincidence, from my point of view, because I think, again, that this idea of service and the sort of progressive nature of the state, the clean politics, the clean life, and so on rubs off on the students, I think. I see that. It's my own conjecture. Nobody has any empirical study of that. It's like two and two is four, I think.

CAC: As an historian, I know, going back eighty to a hundred years, that Iowa had a disproportionate number of its young persons in missionary work and in the Navy.

JM: Is that right?

CAC: Yes.

JM: I always thought Michigan always had more missionaries, especially in China.

CAC: Joe, through all of this, you maintain an interest in your own discipline and research and here you are in the College of Education. Say something about the transition. I don't know when it was that you made this . . . you always did have a professorial appointment?

JM: Yes, I did. My appointment was always in International Studies and in the Speech Department.

CAC: I see. Did you teach there at all then?

JM: Yes. I was always, because of my interest in the educational exchanges which persuaded me that there was a lot of educational potential in it, trying to bridge the gap between International Studies, which was nation-to-nation behavior, to the person-to-person behavior in which I was involved. I saw quite a number of different connections. I have always been a loner in this kind of thing because the two shall never twine somehow and you can still see it. Because of the fact that both International Studies and Intercultural Studies are interdisciplinary, it confronts you with the issue of what is really the role of a discipline, and which one, and what is really the whole nature of interdisciplinarity. I think you appreciate that because you are not only an historian but also a humanist and also one who draws on other fields. I found that in International Studies, it's Political Science that dominates the theory—still to this date. In the Speech Department, it's the so-called speech theory or communication theory that does. The cultural and the international part becomes a kind of dependent variable. [laughter] That led me to believe that there is really several different international educations, each one with its own epistemology, and application, and usefulness.

CAC: What kind of courses did you teach occasionally in Speech, then?

JM: Intercultural Communication.

CAC: What kind of students were attracted to a course like that?

JM: There was quite a number of them, who wanted to go into foreign student advising as a career or national corporations as foreign assignments and things like that.

CAC: Is that primarily a graduate student [unclear]?

JM: Primarily graduate students, oh , yes. That's another one of my disappointments, incidentally, with the liberal studies programs because they tried to push all this kind of stuff into the first year or two of the undergraduate curriculum. This is the old tradition that this is the foundation of knowledge and provides the breadth from which you go into the depth. I think my problem is that with the freshman and juniors, they cognitively are not developed to the extent of understanding the concepts of other disciplines and that, therefore, you really miss the potential of seeing. That's why I'm in Education because they really see that and they give you the free hand to do the integration of different disciplines. So, for me, this is really a laboratory of integration of different disciplines. I'm not looking at that as sort of anti-disciplinary because you've got to respect each discipline for its own contribution to it.

CAC: What kind of courses have you acquired and built within the College of Education? Didn't you build them?

JM: Yes.

CAC: There was no such course?

JM: I am supposed to—when they brought me in they told me—innovate a new course each year.

CAC: Good grief.

JM: So, I innovated one which is called now "Critical Issues in International Education," which is, essentially, the interdisciplinary perspective on it. I have, because of my own orientation, divided the course into two halves. The first deals with the content of the different disciplines and what they bring to bear to the issue and the other one is what I call "Perspectives" about it. For example, the educational part . . . how do you teach about it? How do you teach about other culture? How do you teach people to understand their own culture from a comparative perspective as others see us?

CAC: Among the student body here, which of that student body, then, are attracted to a program like that?

JM: They generally come from virtually every part of the College of Education and others as well.

CAC: What other colleges?

JM: We have people from Nursing . . . quite a number of them.

CAC: For heavens sake.

JM: We have people from Child Development . . . Educational Psychology, certainly. Occasionally, Humphrey Institute people come in here and take courses. We've had a few from Agriculture.

CAC: How large a student group do you get in a course?

JM: Anywhere from eight to thirty. This second course that I'm innovating now is going to be . . .

CAC: Excuse me. Do you get any international students?

JM: Oh, absolutely. That's the whole idea because I can now, finally, practice in a classroom what I had been preaching before outside of the classroom. I try to recruit students. In the IDE program, International Development Educational program, which we created here in the Department of Educational Policy and Administration, my hope is to recruit as many as half. What I would like to do, in fact, is to make sure that each one of our students has a learning mentor from another culture so that they would have a particular quarter . . .

CAC: Bravo.

JM: . . . of a study [unclear] where they would actually be studying together. This is an excellent opportunity to try out some of these ideas.

CAC: Many of us know there is a great deal of education that goes on horizontally among students who get to know each other in that kind of a seminar setting and work on projects together.

JM: This, I might, eventually, expand to cover the minorities as well because they are just as isolated as anything. That will probably be my next innovation . . . to get the gap bridged between intercultural and multicultural education. There is a huge gap there.

CAC: We have a long agenda here and this is certainly engaging and a very enriching kind of conversation we're having. As I look down at the agenda, we've touched on, not in order, many of these items. However, you have a last item that you wanted to talk about: continuing tensions. That's an interesting one and one that says a great deal about the climate at the university the past thirty, forty years, and currently. Let's go down that.

JM: These, incidentally, are not just of my own making, but they are some of the issues that exist in higher education anywhere.

CAC: Yes.

JM: I have picked up many of them from Czechoslovakia, as well, where it bounces back at you. Almost everything that you know, you can use in that kind of a setting. My last Fulbright was in Czechoslovakia for a year.

CAC: How recently?

JM: In 1991 and 1992. While I was there, I was a member of a very discreet governmental task force on educational reform. What I was studying myself, of course, was the impact of Communism on the thinking of people. I was very much interested in things like critical thinking, value orientations and what happened to them, the dependency relationships that they had . . . the kind of dual thinking—I call that bi-cognitive development—where you had to understand the Communist doctrine as one body of knowledge and everything else was the other body of knowledge. The two were unrelated. You had a kind of schizophrenic thinking about people.

CAC: That was one way to survive, wasn't it, if you were [unclear]?

JM: It was absolutely. It was the only way to survive, indeed. Communism has influenced and in such subtle ways that it's very difficult for them to see it. To this day, if you give a presentation and you identify several different approaches to things, the first question from the full professors will be, "Which one is right?" [laughter] How do you deal with that?

CAC: How long do you think it takes a culture to transcend those tensions?

JM: That's one of the issues we were dealing with in this educational reform. The people in the marketing are being pushed and reinforced by Americans all over the place. Everything is driven by economics and management. Their assumption is that you convert an economy and everything else will follow; so, education has actually becomes an appendage to economy.

CAC: I see.

JM: That's a pretty standard conservative paradigm; whereas, the more liberally oriented people, including many of the ex-Communists, believe that education still ought to provide the leadership in the society. When you ask them, "What kind of leadership?" they really don't know. They can produce the most fantastically sounding documents to you that really nothing because they are only of that theoretical level and they have never been educated to seeing practical application to it. You ask them, "How do you plan to do it? Do you have any strategy? Where does that fit?" All these points, essentially, bounce off you brighter when you are working because, then, all the westerners are coming and Europeans are coming in trying to help these people out and you see in what they are bringing in that they are reflecting the same kinds of gaps.

CAC: You're suggesting that these tensions exhibit themselves, manifest themselves, in Minnesota?

JM: Yes. They certainly manifest themselves locally as well, yes.

CAC: For example, you suggest that there is a divided loyalty to the faculty?

JM: Between the discipline, for example, and the institution. That's that kind of a loyalty that I see being divided. I think that's reflected in the reward system, the tenure system. For example, when you work in International Education, that tenure system is what makes internationalization difficult; because, anything that's foreign research and so on is the soft stuff, especially in the behavior sciences or the hard sciences. So, that makes it very difficult. I often do consulting in other institutions and the most recent one was at Macalester where we discovered that 21 percent of their graduates, by the time they graduate, have been abroad, except in sciences where it's only 5 percent. It's a marked difference; so, we met with the science faculty and they couldn't believe it. They started looking at each other and said, "No, that's not true. It's very good for our students. We'll have to do something about that." I said, "What are you going to do about that?" They said, "We'll tell them to go and study abroad." [laughter] I said, "What would you like them to study abroad?" They said, "It's good for their liberal education." I said, "How about studying physics and chemistry?" "Oh, no, no. They wouldn't get what they get here." This ethnocentrism of the discipline is another one of the aspects, especially in sciences. Many people still hold the view somehow that we are really the mecca of this and don't realize that in the past, maybe fifteen, twenty years, there are a lot more players in this field.

CAC: You see also—I won't say a chasm—a separation between the academy itself, the University of Minnesota, and the surrounding community?

JM: Yes, I call that the gap between university and the outside world.

CAC: But, earlier you were emphasizing the way in which your office, at least, was able to bridge that gap.

JM: Absolutely. I think so, yes.

CAC: But, it persists?

JM: It persists.

CAC: You see it evidenced again in what ways?

JM: I have a feeling that the academic mind, for example, doesn't really know what to do with the outreach. I don't know if you read the *Daily* or if you watch what's going on. Nils Hasselmo wants to appoint a vice-president for outreach.

CAC: Yes.

JM: I don't think that he conceptualizes it very well. When Bob Kvavik became the assistant vice-president for International Education . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: We're talking about these various separations. You find a separation also between what you call here conformity on the one hand and creativity on the other. Say something about that.

JM: Every system produces forces toward conformity and forces that go in the opposite direction. I think that in International Education, you feel that probably more than anything else because a typical department or faculty in, let's say, behavioral sciences is pretty much a dominate paradigm in the field. I don't mean necessarily all the same ideas but the way of thinking about that.

CAC: Sure.

JM: When in International Education you want to be, let's say, intuitive versus analytical, you've immediately got a problem with that kind of conformity and, yet, many solutions that are required and, certainly, the whole concept of creative thinking requires intuition a great deal. Those are some of the things that I sort of reflect my own bias here on in the interdisciplinary versus the disciplinary thinking. I see the discipline still heavily dominating the thinking. It's, in a way, kind of regressive because the interdisciplinary approach is not an anti-disciplinary approach. It simply is an approach that you use when a typical disciplinary approach can no longer explain the complexity that you see around yourself. It could be in various different ways. You can borrow concepts from others. You can juxtapose one with the other one or you can try to integrate them somehow. I've been a member of a small group that's called the American Association of Integrated Studies.

CAC: On campus?

JM: It's a national group.

CAC: It draws its members from what kinds of disciplines?

JM: From, virtually, everywhere—even from medicine and biology—where you see that there is a need to do that. For example, we have now a major grant at the university, a project called CARLA, the Center for Language Acquisition, or something. I'm a member of a subcommittee on that which deals with the issue of language and culture. That's the area that you really see the interplay of different disciplines, cultural anthropology, psychology, cognitive anthropology, and, certainly, linguistics and others. These seldom communicate with each other. [laughter] Each one of them uses culture but differently and defines it differently; so, you need some bridges and some connections . . . and in this electronic age and so on, that's what I see. The creativity comes when you take a theme like language acquisition and, then, you delve into it from the perspective of different disciplines.

I was amused just yesterday evening. The Minneapolis paper had a book review about a new book that just came out which challenged that the language problem is not cultural but in the brain. Yet, he didn't have any particular explanations. This is an area that, maybe, there will be some break through coming in and well it should be because we are the nation that's the most language dumb of anybody.

CAC: We have two big oceans.

JM: The creativity did come, basically, from a Central Administration perspective . . . particularly Bob Kvavik and Michael Metcalf. One of the reasons was—again with the exception of the German Department—the typical language departments are the biggest problems in international education because they have always been oriented to studying literature and assume that this teaches about another culture automatically. There was a study made about 1980 by the Council of Learning which was measuring three variables. One of them was a language. Another one was knowledge of conditions of the world. The third one was attitudes. The dominant hypothesis was that language majors would have the best knowledge and, therefore, the most receptive attitudes. The study concluded that (1) there was no correlation between any of the three variables, and (2) that the language majors, in fact, ranked second to lowest on the knowledge part of the test. Therefore, there was no correlation with the attitudes.

CAC: How do you account—again, I want always to bring the conversation back to Minnesota—for the fact that the German Department here has been more imaginative or progressive in this regard, at least?

JM: They saw, basically, that knowledge of the language is as important as knowing the literature of the language; whereas, most of the other ones often teach literature and translation.

CAC: Poetry, and novels, and so forth?

JM: Yes. That was one of the reasons they actually insist, for example, on reading contextually in German. Gerhard [Weiss] is one of the top people in the country. That's why he has been

president, virtually, of every major linguistic organization in the country and providing local leadership there, too, as well as national leadership. We always had a lot of difficulties with the language people. When they got back the requirements that language would be part of a liberal studies education, they relaxed themselves. They don't participate. It's strictly inward oriented there, too. They were not even interested in studying abroad very much because they teach people language here; so, why should they go and study abroad anyplace? When we sent out a questionnaire on how to enrich the [unclear] of the university, the Portuguese Department, for example, stated that they will recommend students to go and study in Portuguese speaking countries because this would improve their pronunciation. [laughter] That tells you . . .

CAC: Right. I think Mr. Metcalf has been able to—I'm going to interview him later—introduce courses not in the languages but in other disciplines . . . taught the language. My colleague, Kim Mulholland teaches a section of French history in French.

JM: Right. It was actually Bob Kvavik already who came up with this idea initially and they started it in Political Science. It's not very popular still; but, I think it's very impressive. They have one being taught in Spanish and one in French also and, then, in History, you have this one French speaking. I had volunteered to teach on in Czech but nobody quite agreed to that as yet. [laughter]

CAC: You don't teach Czech?

JM: No, we don't teach Czech. I was just kidding.

CAC: How do you suppose a large institution, like this one certainly is, can provide incentives for the kind of cross-disciplinary work to emphasis the creative rather than the conforming side?

JM: To some extent, it's already happening because of the shortage of funds. The austerity program is essentially forcing people to reach out. It's an unintended consequence of that. I can feel it already, too. Like, in the College of Education, for example, it used to have walls around itself and if you wanted to major in it, you also had to minor in it. Now, the whole campus is your learning field.

CAC: You find that your students and students generally in the College of Education, then, are taking more courses outside of the College of Education than would have been the case five years ago?

JM: Not only that, but we also admitted to graduate programs students who don't have undergraduate background in education. That's a change. It's a major, major change only recently.

CAC: What do you see as the incentive pattern that brought about this change operating with in the College of Education? You say that it's retrenchment? It's austerity?

JM: I think, to some extent, it's also a question of leadership. I think we have much better deans now than we had even a few years ago. The deans, generally, function very much like a fiefdom. They built the walls around themselves and the whole atmosphere supported that. I think Academic Affairs' vice-presidents, generally, dealt with the deans. I see that in Czechoslovakia, too. The deans are more powerful than the director. That's now being changed as a result of some of the recommendations that we have made. For example, the Charles University [Czechoslovakia] has four departments of political science. That's a lot of resources. They can't get along with each other so one is in philosophy faculty. One is in law faculty. One is in economics. One is in social science faculty. The same way, for example, we had a problem with all the Statistics. We had about seven departments of Statistics. I think that's what's happening already. I think the American system developed out of, essentially, leaps and bounds and often very unthinking. There was simply additions all the time as the system grew and, now, when it has to contract, I think many of the gaps are beginning to show. They relate not only to the procedures but also to the major goals as well.

CAC: I hear you expressing a kind of hopefulness now that these things can be done even in times of severe retrenchment and, perhaps, if not bring the university as far as international studies are concerned back to the golden age you spoke of earlier but to reverse the downside that you saw in the 1970s and 1980s. Is that a fair kind of representation?

JM: I think so. I see a number of different things . . . that the university is much more cooperative, let's say, with the businesses. There's always been a lot of suspiciousness between the business groups and so on.

CAC: You mean the business community?

JM: The business community. Generally, the community is much more cooperative and despite some of the severe scandals that we have been subjected to now with the Medical School and so on, I see still continued trust and confidence in the institution, which, from my point of view, really shows that there is something solid that transcends all these kinds of temporary problems that we are facing. Yes, I do. I really do think that this is the sort of thing that the futurists have really anticipated already for some time . . . that there would be new alliances being forged between businesses and others. I am often consulted by CLA, which before simply was not possible; so, I am on committees there quite regularly and not only that they invite me but the dean here is glad that I do it. There is a lot of that [unclear] that people . . .

CAC: Would it exist for the professional schools as well: Law, Medicine, Social Work, Public Health, Public Affairs, etcetera?

JM: I still see the Medical School as being probably the most isolated one and probably, to some extent, some departments in IT also. That's maybe the nature of the thing. I don't know enough about it really to speak about it.

CAC: Are there programs similar to what you're doing in the College of Education, for example, in Law and in the Humphrey Institute?

JM: There are supposed to be; but, it's only now that the people upstairs are beginning to pay attention to it. They are going to be requiring reports and they are going to be asking people how they are really producing that internationalization and so on. Each college has some centerpiece that they call "International Education," behind which they hide. Not much is going on in the Law School, except maybe for a couple of sort of sexy faculty exchanges and things like that. I think that's going to change also.

CAC: The School of Management?

JM: The School of Management is really blossoming now; but, up until recently, it wasn't. I know Ed Schuh, for example, was the chairman of the search committee for the dean there. He was telling me about the difficulties that he was having when he first started defining the job functions. He called in the faculty and told them that he's looking for an international person and more than half opposed that on the ground that, after all, we have to be sensitive to Minnesota businesses—as if they weren't looking for the globe. [laughter] It was incredible. He said, "You are going to get an international dean whether you like it or not." You should talk to him, too, about some of his experiences. I don't know whether I'm quoting him right or not. The new dean clearly brought in the global perspective and it's already producing a lot of results. They're getting a new building and the legislature is responding well to it. Before that, St. Thomas, essentially, stole all the headlines on international business.

CAC: Yes. Interesting. I think that the Minnesota Foundation itself is trying to gather the funds to make these kinds of initiatives possible.

JM: What is sort of hopeful for me, of course, is the fact that international is now identified with excellence . . .

CAC: Ahhh!

JM: . . . and with the trend.

CAC: [unclear] marginalized . . . ?

JM: I think so, yes.

CAC: Do you have any other—I won't say final because I can always come back and we can talk again—summary things, this morning, that we've missed . . . things that are on your mind that you'd like to share not with me but with posterity?

JM: No, I don't really know . . . My whole orientation is, obviously, extreme enthusiasm for this institution . . .

CAC: Yes.

JM: . . . despite its handicaps and problems. I see it as part of changing times and the influence of essentially of outside variables that often tend to influence the institution more, which is what I often fault the faculty for . . . only looking inward instead of seeing the larger picture. That's where the disciplinary thinking is inhibiting . . . that kind of a larger picture. It's difficult to know what to do about that because I think that it really will take some sort of a major event like the *Sputnik* or something of that sort to happen for people to start looking outward again. I'm beginning to see many people do that and in our own faculty I see that, also. More and more people are responding. We had a little survey of interest and it clearly shows that it's on the expansion and, yet, the colleges of education traditionally have been neglecting that. They have been so dominated by not only American but state legislations.

CAC: Sure.

JM: They didn't have really virtually any way of looking beyond that.

CAC: Criteria for certification that [unclear] externally.

JM: Sure. Other departments still have that kind of a problem, too. With this type of thing, I am still feeling that international education is sort of like the missionary within the field out here . . . still trying to look for a converts, but that the atmosphere is very friendly to it and that the institution is responding.

CAC: I do often reflect myself on the processes of change in this regard. When I came into the History Department, it was entirely northern European . . .

JM: Yes.

CAC: . . . and American. We had but one half-time person doing Latin America and that was it. In the late 1960s and 1970s, we opened up Asia, the subcontinent of Asia, India, and to a limited degree, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America and got scholars in those fields who have established national, international reputations. We opened our department—we say the Third World—to the non-European and American world.

JM: Absolutely.

CAC: Looking back upon it, I don't know any traumatic event that forced that. It just seemed the department wanted to go that way and we went. It wasn't automatic. It took a lot of doing;

but, it happened without encouragement from Morrill Hall, from Central Administration, or anything else. [unclear] the process of change internally, how different disciplines respond.

JM: Yes, I think so. That was an interplay between the department and the discipline itself. I think that it's no accident that, for example, on this study that I mentioned to you of what students know about the world, history majors scored the highest. What was, of course, very surprising to everybody is that the typical social science majors, including political science and so on, were below the median. The second highest were engineers. This was a big surprise for everybody. I think historians especially . . . because I think that the study of history is not just a collection of dates and so on, but it's also sort of an encouragement for the self-reflection and the basis of a kind of mentor knowledge, mentor thinking. That, I think, from my point of view is really why I'm so interested in international education because that also encourages that kind of a perspective. That, for the future, is probably going to be more important than any study of any one discipline.

CAC: That's a good high point. Instead of trying to find more downsides, let's end it on that.

JM: All right, Clarke. I appreciate very much your interviewing me on that.

CAC: I'm grateful . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

Hermes Transcribing and Research Service
12617 Fairgreen Avenue, Apple Valley, MN 55124
(612) 953-0730