

John Wallace

- Youth and education 1-
 - high school, Oklahoma 1
 - Yale University, 1957-61 2
 - philosophy major 2
 - small group learning 2-3
 - Ph.D. - Stanford, 1961-64 5
 - NDEA research fellowship 5
- University of Minnesota 8
 - Philosophy - detached from societal concerns 8
 - problem of language 8
- Wallace - post-doctorate fellowship, Oxford, Greece 11
- Wallace - Case Western Reserve University 12
- Wallace - Rockefeller University - for two years 12
- Wallace comes to the University of Minnesota as a professor, 1972
 - Philosophy of Language 13
 - large classes 14
 - Honors seminars 15
 - Philosophy of Science Center 16
 - Brodbeck, May 16
- Wallace -associate dean - Graduate School 16-17
 - competition for research funds 16-17
 - impact of federal government funding on undergraduate programs 19
- Shift in pedagogy, 1970s 22
- Wallace - assistant to Vice-President Keller on undergraduate education 23
- Concern with outreach to community 24
- Counsel from Sorauf, Frank 25
 - and Corcoran, Mary 25
 - reviews 25 reports on undergraduate learning 25
- Recommends college honors programs 26
 - monitors for minority students 27
- Keller, Kenneth - his interest in educational issues 29
- Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program 29
- Morrill Hall meetings 30
- Central Administrators overworked 31
- Keller, Kenneth - his assets and liabilities 33
 - vision for University of Minnesota's future abandoned by Regents 35
- Student community service 35
 - Campus Outreach Opportunity League 36

Interview with John Wallace

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

**Interviewed on September 8, 1994
University of Minnesota Campus**

John Wallace - JW
Clark A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: It's Thursday morning, the 8th of September, with John Wallace, long of the Philosophy Department, a person who has played a major role in many educational initiatives the past ten, fifteen, twenty years. He served also in the Graduate School, also in Morrill Hall in the office of the vice-president for Academic Affairs, so John has been around in many different places as chairman of Philosophy as well. All these things will come out in our conversation.

John, as I suggested before we turned the machine on, it's kind of fun to get a kind of brief academic autobiography of your education, where you came from, how you got interested in philosophy, the fields where you went to Graduate School. Then we'll come down to Minnesota pretty quickly.

JW: I went to public high school in Tulsa, Oklahoma. I went to Will Rogers High School. I was a good student and I went to Yale. That experience at Yale was extremely important for getting me into academic work, academic life. I had a very unusual career there in that as a freshman, I was in a special sort of intensive program called Directed Studies which was three interrelated courses in history, philosophy, and literature, and taught on a system that really reversed the standard system of lecture and discussion. This was discussion and lecture. Basically, the thing was taught in small seminars that met in each of these subject areas once or twice a week, and then every week of so there would a lecture in which someone would try to weave together the themes that we were reading. It was terrific! It was just terrific.

CAC: This was from the outset as a freshman right straight through?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Groups of ten, twelve, fourteen?

Interview with John Wallace

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

**Interviewed on September 8, 1994
University of Minnesota Campus
St. Paul, Minnesota**

John Wallace - JW
Clark A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: It's Thursday morning, the 8th of September, with John Wallace, long of the Philosophy Department, a person who has played a major role in many educational initiatives the past ten, fifteen, twenty years. He served also in the Graduate School, also in Morrill Hall in the office of the vice-president for Academic Affairs, so John has been around in many different places as chairman of Philosophy as well. All these things will come out in our conversation.

John, as I suggested before we turned the machine on, it's kind of fun to get a kind of brief academic autobiography of your education, where you came from, how you got interested in philosophy, the fields where you went to Graduate School. Then we'll come down to Minnesota pretty quickly.

JW: I went to public high school in Tulsa, Oklahoma. I went to Will Rogers High School. I was a good student and I went to Yale. That experience at Yale was extremely important for getting me into academic work, academic life. I had a very unusual career there in that as a freshman, I was in a special sort of intensive program called Directed Studies which was three interrelated courses in history, philosophy, and literature, and taught on a system that really reversed the standard system of lecture and discussion. This was discussion and lecture. Basically, the thing was taught in small seminars that met in each of these subject areas once or twice a week, and then every week of so there would a lecture in which someone would try to weave together the themes that we were reading. It was terrific! It was just terrific.

CAC: This was from the outset as a freshman right straight through?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Groups of ten, twelve, fourteen?

JW: Yes. In that first semester, I had a professor—his name was Allen Anderson—who was a young philosopher and logician who . . . I don't know, we just hit it off. He was then kind of a mentor for me all my time at Yale. Part of the Yale system was kids had scholarships—I had a scholarship—that involved doing some work for the university, and I really worked as a research assistant for Allen for the four years I was there. He was a logician but his interests in logic were sort of unusual in that he thought there were ways of applying it to analyze basically social systems and social structures. So he was interested in the philosophy of law and trying to use logic to analyze some of the way that legal roles work, and so on, and worked also with a sociologist who was interested in really radical new approaches to teaching. They were trying to analyze the structure of . . .

CAC: This is the late 1950s?

JW: Yes, I went to Yale in 1957 to 1961. I did some research, which they set up for me to do, already as a sophomore. I really was almost treated like a graduate student from the beginning and it was not so much because of my talent—I had some talent—but because of my enthusiasm and the environment that they created for me.

CAC: You had a green light.

JW: Yes.

CAC: I'm going to interject a moment. This Professor Anderson, if his research and interests were tending that way in the late 1950s, I'm guessing and sensing it was forged within philosophy departments nationally which certainly must at that time with logic have been tending toward a more precise kind of mathematical logical structure?

JW: That's partly right, Clarke, but not completely. Allen's interest was really in the most modern kind of logic which was highly technical and mathematicized but with this vision or hope that that sort of level of precision could be fruitfully applied to these more . . . well, we might think of them as more sort of open ended kind of social structures and practices. Going back to your point about being something of a [unclear], that's true and it's not an approach or use of logic that's really taken off all that well. But in terms of intellectual context, another important thing at that time was the theory of games which [unclear] and Morgenstern had developed, highly technical, highly mathematical but with the promise—also I think pretty much unrealized in practice, although I'm not an expert on this—that it would illuminate all kinds of economic theory. So that was a kind of an inspiration to Anderson and his coworkers there that similar intellectual harvests could come from applying the highly mathematical techniques of contemporary logic to these more sort of social kinds of settings.

CAC: So that's the model you accepted as a very young man?

JW: Oh, yes. I bought it hook, line and sinker.

CAC: It's very seductive.

JW: I was very excited about it. It fitted my interest. I had some mathematical talent and a lot of sort of broad interest in literature and history. I was one of these students who was just most interested in the last thing I heard about. [laughter]

CAC: I'm imagining that undergraduates then and undergraduates now—even though they were attracted to philosophy which would have been a small segment to begin with—that not many undergraduate students have the talent to manage that rigorous a discipline.

JW: Yes, I think that's probably true.

CAC: You folks are highly selected when you get into that and the professors are likewise?

JW: I think so, and if they see someone that has the interest, and the enthusiasm, and enough talent, of course they encourage them. That was a terrific environment for me. I was under a lot of pressure from my father, who was a hospital administrator, to become a doctor. I now see in retrospect, I see it with my own children that it's a I don't care what they do just so they have enough money to live kind of attitude. My dad had gone through the Depression as a young man so I was under a lot of pressure to do that. I don't want to exaggerate it but I felt a lot of pressure. So here was another bunch of grown-ups, namely this little group of professors I fell in with, who were doing the stuff that really fitted much more my interest than medicine. To me that was a window of here's an adult life that's possible, that's real interesting. . .

CAC: So it's not only intellectual, it's a career interest? You know right away that you're going to be a professor?

JW: Yes. I'm not quite sure when that dawned on me but pre . . .

CAC: [unclear]

JW: In a sense, people who write about these [unclear] schools I think make this point that they give young people a sense . . . here's what I'm doing . . . it's really demanding, and it's complicated, and you can do it. They convey that sense that you can do it. There's a lot of things you can do but you can do it.

CAC: You ran into more professors than Mr. Anderson who had that same motto and that same encouraging . . .

JW: Yes.

CAC: That's a remarkable undergraduate experience.

JW: Yes. At that time at Yale—they still have it—they had a senior year experience called Scholars of the House in which about twelve of us were relieved of all course responsibilities. That was a great thing for us. We wrote in effect a kind of a master's thesis . . . not just a master's thesis, we got together for dinner about once every two weeks, the group of twelve scholars and their advisors. Two of the scholars would present their work in progress. That was another extremely powerful intellectual experience. I can remember a lot of the kids' projects. One kid was writing about the kibbutz, a system and movement in Israel. The kid did write a play, who is now an actor now. I see him frequently in movies. Eating together and hearing about that, hearing the advisors draw people out, and make comments, was a kind of intellectual community which I must say I find I try to recreate it from time to time. [laughter] It was a terrific experience.

CAC: Except that Yale, at that time, was still all male?

JW: It was still all male, yes.

CAC: So that the seminars you're talking of, this is an all male environment. Reflecting back on that, what are your thoughts?

JW: [laughter] It's a big mistake.

CAC: You can't image what those seminars might have been like had other points of view been there, other experiences?

JW: Well, that's true except that I can now try to project back but basically it would have been quite a different experience to have women there. It would have been much better.

CAC: You didn't appreciate at the time that this was possibly a confining or limiting situation?

JW: It didn't occur to me. Then there's a whole other side of course at Yale, life on the weekends. The kids went crazy and either imported the girls from Smith and Vassar or from the nursing school across the street or went hither and yon. [laughter] Actually, I had a girlfriend in Tulsa and I pretty much didn't enter into that part of it. It was a very intellectual experience for me. [unclear]

CAC: Heavy drinking? Question . . . on the part of some, not you.

JW: I learned to drink vodka while I was there. [laughter]

CAC: Wasn't that part of the weekend ritual?

JW: Yes. I know from my own children's experience of college, private colleges, there's really a terrible problem with alcohol. My sense is that at that time Yale didn't have a terrible problem.

CAC: I raise the question because later on we'll talk about other models involved in active learning, and I'll be curious then to see whether that kind of behavior then doesn't happen because of other incentives and other possibilities.

JW: So, I was already sort of a budding professor with a lot of intellectual interests, and technical tools, and so on. By the time I left Yale, I also was married, actually during my senior year at Yale.

CAC: To the Tulsa woman?

JW: To the Tulsa woman.

CAC: Now, John, that was unusual for the late fifties?

JW: Oh, yes. Out of a thousand kids there were probably a dozen, that is, out of a thousand seniors who were married. This is not our topic really but when I think of it now, I was twenty-two when I got married.

CAC: I was a child groom myself. [laughter] I was married at twenty-two in the middle of the war.

JW: I won a Marshall Fellowship which I didn't take because I was so intent—I think it was the pressure from my father . . . I don't regret this actually but everyone thought I was crazy at the time—in getting on with the real business of adult life. I didn't want to take a two year vacation at Cambridge, as wonderful as that would have been. I had a fellowship to go to Stanford for my Ph.D. which I did. There I formed a close relationship, partnership, with another professor named Donald Davidson who has since and just then was rising, was becoming quite a prominent philosopher. I worked with Donald in pretty much the way I'd worked with my mentors at Yale. I didn't carry a lot of the Yale projects with me but became convinced that the Davidson project was the right project. I'm very teachable, in retrospect maybe a little too teachable but I learned a lot from these people, and they were extremely generous with their time and encouragement and so on.

CAC: Did you get a chance to be a T.A. [Teaching Assistant] at Stanford and work with undergraduate philosophy students?

JW: Well, this is an interesting thing. Basically the answer is no and it's not a chance that I wanted. They had one of these National Defense Education Act Fellowships which in their wisdom, and their concern about getting through Ph.D. programs, and not getting distracted was

supposed to be a full ride without any need to be a T.A. What I did is, I got through in three years and . . .

CAC: Ooof, nobody does that.

JW: . . . but you see I already had in effect a master's degree experience. The experience of writing that senior Scholar of the House project was a real accelerator; so when I sat down to write a Ph.D. dissertation, which is such a hurdle for almost everyone who's doing it for the first time, I was almost doing it for the second time. I don't want to over simplify but I got through. I did T.A. in one course. Davidson taught a course on the philosophy of literature in which we read Dante, and Joyce, and Homer. Some of those things I had read as an undergraduate and some I hadn't. I did do that one little bit of T.A.

CAC: Most of your work was formal philosophy?

JW: Yes.

CAC: And you found no one as Mr. Anderson reaching out to use philosophy in the marketplace with law or business and so forth?

JW: No. In retrospect, I see in my more recent work a sort of returning to some of that broader vision. This was now 1961 to 1964. I think a lot of disciplines, but certainly philosophy maybe above all, were being highly professionalized, and high specialized, and highly sort of internally focused. This was true and is true of Davidson's work.

CAC: To an outsider, it would seem sometimes almost solipsistic, feeding on itself.

JW: Yes. These dynamics of these disciplines are really interesting to reflect on. One healthy thing about philosophy is there's a kind of constant dialog with the great figures of the past; so however narrow or specialized, and highly formalized some of these ways of approaching questions are, and they certainly are, there's a constant sort of refertilization of Is this what [Immanuel] Kant said, or what he didn't say? Does it give us a better way of formulating or understanding what Kant said, or Plato, or Aristotle, and so on. What's missing is all of those guys were intensely involved in communicating with wider publics, and trying to influence, and often did complain bitterly about it, but anyway to influence wider development within the society. So you're not getting it, so to speak, directly but you're getting . . .

CAC: Right. Now, these subjects were taught in a free standing history of philosophy courses or was it insinuated into many of the courses that you would have had in formal logic?

JW: It's insinuated not so much in formal logic. Formal logic itself has a separate discipline that's become like mathematics, sort of leaves its past behind, but other areas of philosophy that were using some of these formal methods like the philosophy of language, and to a certain extent

the theory of knowledge, in fact all the areas of philosophy, philosophy of action, to try to use these new formal techniques.

CAC: And used these earlier figures, not to dismiss them?

JW: No, no.

CAC: You see that's the habit in history frequently. We read really old historians just to see how limited they were in their perspective.

JW: Bertrand Russell was one of the great figures in thinking that logic could eliminate philosophy and so on. Yes, he thought that [Georg] Hegel was an idiot and said so at length. But then other people come along and said, "No. Well, Hegel wasn't such an idiot as Russell thought." [laughter] So there is some of that [unclear] rhetoric. So the whole thing tends to balance.

CAC: Now, that was true in your formal training both at Yale, and Stanford, and at Minnesota when first you came here?

JW: Yes.

CAC: That most of the department in fact take that model of conversing?

JW: Yes, I think it's a very healthy thing about . . .

CAC: Even the philosophers of science who dominated this department when you came into it?

JW: Yes. All this uses a tradition. There's selectivity but [René] Descartes is a hero for modern philosophy. He was a hero for the Grover Maxwell and for the Hegel. Hegel wrote a lot about the mind and whether we know our own interior thoughts better than we can know the external world and so on, and recognize that those were Cartesian themes. Now, there may be some contemporary of Descartes which no one now is reading who would actually be just as rewarding to read. I can't really speak about that. There is at least some rather extensive ongoing dialog with the past.

CAC: Well, I ask these series of questions as a lay person and almost everyone listening to this tape later, ten, twenty, thirty years, will be lay persons and there's a widely shared perception that you must be aware of that we look upon philosophers as still pretty technical for the most part.

JW: Yes.

CAC: So I think this clarification is extraordinarily important to understanding the field.

JW: Now, sort of looking ahead a little bit in our conversation. When I go around the country now and talk about connecting teaching to students' work in the community . . . They say, "What's your discipline?" "Well, I'm a philosopher." "Do you find any way to connect philosophy with students' work in the community?" I say, "We talk about ethics." "That's amazing! I would never have thought that a philosopher would . . ." [laughter]

CAC: [unclear] in philosophy which perhaps too basic. It didn't spin out for us.

JW: So, yes, I realize the reputation and I think it's largely deserved. From my present perspective, I think it's really a misfortune that the subject has become so insular and that its professionalization has given it this detachment from the wider human concerns in society.

CAC: But your dissertation was philosophical grammar and your early publications were clearly out of that. Say something about what you mean by that. Is it the syntax of philosophical discourse or is it a broader concern than that? What are the basic issues as you might describe them to this lay person down the line?

JW: It's interesting. Of course, I've asked this question many times and still I hesitate about where to put [unclear] the wedge. To pick up on your introduction, it's not just philosophical discourse. It's language generally. The phrase "philosophical grammar" comes from Russell and it was Russell's idea that a lot of philosophical problems, traditional philosophical problems, were pseudo problems, kind of fantasy problems, that were generated by misunderstanding the grammar or the meaning of our language . . . endless talk about the nature of knowledge and so on. Well, Russell thought we ought to look at the kind of word the verb *know* is, and its family and verbs that take similar kinds of objects, etcetera, etcetera. If we got a clear picture of the grammar or our ordinary language in which these key concepts about knowledge, and purpose, and freedom, and all the great philosophical [unclear] occur, we would just revisualize the subject. He was extremely aggressive in thinking that a lot of the traditional problems and discussion was junk. Subsequent discussion hasn't gone that way. Once you approach this this way, look at the language that we actually use with these concepts imbedded, in context you'll find that what Kant or [Gottfried W.] Leibniz and so on were saying actually makes a lot of sense.

Just to describe briefly the problem worked on . . . the key idea is What is it to understand language? That's the key question. We have a very vivid picture of going to a foreign country, and hearing people talk, and initially not being able to make head or tail of it. Then later on, we do. We understand it. Well, what's the difference? Something's changed in our minds or in our capacity to deal with what we're hearing and the environment of what's that capacity like? What does it involve? It involves being able to perceive certain amount of what goes on as people using sentences. It's a matter of seeing those sentences having a certain structure. It's a matter of seeing the words in those structures connected to a public world in some way, how to think about that, and how to sort it all out, and what is the structure? The promise that mathematical logic gave to the project that I worked on with Davidson was that rather than just

making observation well, there's a structure and then just waving your hands about what that structure was, that mathematical logic gave you these powerful tools where actually thinking in detail about how simple parts, say the words, could be fitted together into more complex parts in various ways, and then to find those various ways actually being used in the natural languages. But there was a focus on the use of natural language and the idea of understanding natural language.

CAC: Do you think I would be able to understand your dissertation?

JW: Umm. Well, at a certain level, I think so. I mean at the level that I can write. In certain ways I don't understand it. [laughter] No, you would see it as . . . You might find it hard to sympathize with. You might think it was a little frivolous. Here's John trying to see natural language structure as having fairly simple pattern, as being built up, and some simple kinds of sentences fit easily with the pattern, but some other kinds of sentences cause all kinds of problems. It's a general intellectual exercise of fitting a model to a very complex phenomenon. And you could easily see what the model is and you could see, yes, if that's your model there are going to be some things that don't fit it . . . then all the contortions and struggles, and so on. [laughter] It's just a very familiar kind of intellectual task.

CAC: You understand the place I'm coming from in this project and that is that many of the persons I've talked with have come at it on the increasing specialization and esoteric nature of their own discipline, whether it's microbiology or agronomy or whatever, and with that a possible loss of collegiality, that if we don't really understand what our close colleagues and friends are doing, then there's a kind of loss. Now, maybe that was always true in the academy but people are saying to me that in the 1960s and 1970s, it gets accelerated.

JW: Yes.

CAC: Now, maybe it's too soon in our conversation to address that but if you feel comfortable, we could talk about it just for a moment.

JW: It's interesting. I'm going to mention my wonderful relationship later with Mary Corcoran and I've talked with Mary quite a lot about this. I hope you'll talk to Mary as well because she laments this as well. She says that in the 1940s and 1950s here, this was a wonderfully collegial place, and actually Mary thought that it continued to probably be better than most places, the tradition of people who met on a committee would continue to interact. I feel that way myself. The University of Minnesota for all its flaws has some wonderful features. My own experience fit with this idea of Mary's. You know as a general thing, this experience I mentioned as a senior at Yale where it was really structured . . . I don't know what it was like for the professors who were the mentors but I bet it was great for them, too.

CAC: They wouldn't have been doing it.

JW: They wouldn't have gotten into it if they didn't think they would enjoy it. From their point of view, it was the whole intellectual world from kibbutzes, to writing plays, to some esoteric problem in logic—I've forgotten some of the others. It reflected through these young people trying to get something done. That just happens so little.

CAC: We don't have places—now, I'm making a statement with a question mark at the end—from the 1960s through the 1990s, where this kind of dialog can go on very fruitfully in the academy.

JW: That's my experience. One thing that I did, Clarke—I don't know whether you were aware of this—for several years starting when I was in the Graduate School, is I led, coordinated, kind of a town gown discussion group that met once a month over in the Campus Club. It had some professors, and some professionals, lawyers, physicians, business people from the community. It struggled. The attendance went up and down but for the handful who liked it, it was terrific. The people from the community who took part really appreciated it. I mention it because it's such an out [unclear] that kind of thing. It doesn't [unclear] very much.

CAC: We can come back to that on the reflective end of our conversation. Let me veer off just for a moment. You were at Stanford in early 1961 to 1964 and looking back upon that, it is clear that all hell is beginning to break loose in the academy with feminine mystique, the environmental movement, with the civil rights accelerating, black power is coming along, concern of the American Indian . . . for students that ferment, which becomes more clear in the late 1960s, is very much there, and I would guess it must have been there at Stanford. Do you have any reflection on that?

JW: I have to say I haven't really gone back to study exactly what was going on but my experience was that I was almost totally insulated from it, oblivious to it, up until 1966 or 1967. When I went to Princeton—this was 1966—I spent a lot of time in New York around Columbia, then it was the anti-Vietnam.

CAC: Sure. That becomes must more focused and clear but there's kind of a inchoate tumult.

JW: You mention the feminist mystique which I agree is a kind of landmark. It didn't hit me.

CAC: I was ten years older than you or more, fifteen years older and I remember—I was tenured then and well established—but my friend in the neighborhood gave a copy of [Betty] Friedan's book to my wife and they went off evenings to have discussions about that. After about five weeks of that, [unclear] said, "You better read this." The same thing was going with many of my age, but we weren't trying to finish a dissertation; so that there was more openness to that. And Rachel Carson . . . better read Rachel Carson and [Michael] Harrington's *Other America* . . . better read *Other America*. These all come right there.

JW: The only thing of that kind that I was aware of and a little bit involved in as a graduate student was the threat of nuclear war.

CAC: Ah, yes. That was very strong in the Bay Area.

JW: Herman Kahn's . . . that god-awful book—I've forgotten its title—about how we got to get tough and we can't be timid about using this weapon. Then there was the other side. There was a wonderful journal called *The Bulletin of Atomic Science* in which there was wonderful thoughtful stuff.

CAC: You were following that as a graduate student?

JW: I was following that. These movements that in retrospect are so important and which had beginnings then, I was oblivious to them.

CAC: You come out with your degree in a good market.

JW: Yes, you bet. [laughter] Such a good market that we didn't even think about the issue.

CAC: But you took an overseas fellowship?

JW: I had a post-doctoral fellowship. This was a NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] fellowship after I got my Ph.D. [laughter] This was to be at Oxford. One of the professors I'd worked with at Stanford had sort of a joint appointment at Oxford. I was formally matriculated at Oxford. I actually spent most of the year in Greece. A really great year. I sort of took a vacation—not from intellectual work because I tried to write all the time but I stopped going to classes. Of course, if I'd been at Oxford I probably wouldn't have gone to classes either. Yes, there was that post-doctoral year. I was completely oblivious to looking for a job, and I really had . . . How can I put this? I was not concerned about the prestige, hierarchy, of colleges and universities. I think it was not so much good character but a kind of arrogance that I just assumed that I would land some decent place. But then looking for a job in Greece wasn't . . .

CAC: Why did you go to Greece?

JW: Well, because Davidson was spending the year there.

CAC: So it was to be with him and not Plato and Socrates?

JW: Yes. And it was warm and it was an interesting place.

CAC: Oh, it's just exhilarating that time of the decade.

JW: Yes, we lived in Athens in the winter and then we lived on Corfu.

CAC: Oh my!

JW: Have you been to Corfu?

CAC: Never have and I just know that I would be [unclear].

JW: It's a nice place.

CAC: I know Corfu primarily through the [Gerald M. and Lawrence] Durrell brothers.

JW: Then I went to Case Western Reserve. It was an up-and-coming philosophy department. It was new. They had just combined those two institutions. So that's where I went for a year but during that year, I was offered this job at Princeton, and so I went there. I'm not sure quite what 's worth saying about that. It was sort of the opposite side of the Yale experience. Now, I was on the professor or assistant professor side of a Ivy League place. I began to feel at that point how precious it was and I guess my Oklahoma roots were beginning to feel it. [laughter] This doesn't feel quite right. It was fine. I was very much in a research mode there. I've since become critical of the kind of acculturation that Ph.D. programs do but I certainly bought into it hook, line, and sinker. I went to Rockefeller University for two years at which there was in effect no students and no teaching. There were a handful of graduate students. I don't know whether you know about the Rockefeller University. It's basically a biological and research center but at that time the federal money for science was so fat that some president had the ambition to expand and create a psychology department and a philosophy department. They fairly quickly cut back, fired all the philosophers. It was clear that this was coming. They all landed in pretty soft spots. So that was a two year stint.

During this period, my first marriage had broken up, and I had just married my now wife, Sandra Peterson. Sandra had been a graduate student at Princeton. I had actually known her as an undergraduate, when she was an undergraduate at Stanford; but then I met her again at Princeton. She was an assistant professor at UCLA. I was at Rockefeller. We were going to get married and we were looking around for places so we could teach together [unclear].

CAC: That was unusual then, yes.

JW: Things just worked out that we could both get jobs here.

CAC: Where does she teach?

JW: She's in the Philosophy Department.

CAC: I see. They were waiving that rule that early then?

JW: I don't know what hoops Gene Mason had to jump through. Gene was the chair then. Gene is very politically astute. I don't know what he had to do.

CAC: But in another fifteen years, it's an advantage.

JW: Yes.

CAC: That must have been the cusp of change right there.

JW: It could have been.

CAC: So you both come to Minnesota?

JW: Yes. This is 1972. I got my Ph.D. in 1964, bounced around in a pretty standard way, and then came to Minnesota as a professor in 1972.

CAC: Into a department whose reputation, at least within the university, was for outstanding original work in the Philosophy of Science?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Not that there weren't other outstanding philosophers but again, I'm talking about perceptions.

JW: Yes.

CAC: What kind of an assignment did you have then?

JW: My area of expertise was the philosophy of language. The sort of picture philosophy departments have of themselves is there are sort of four or five important and alive areas, philosophy of science, knowledge, ethics, philosophy of language, and you've got to have two or three horses in each harness. So I was in the philosophy of language group. A good practice that the department had then, and still has, is that everyone teaches at every level; so I then began to teach introductory philosophy and introductory logic to these huge groups of students which I'd never experienced before in any form.

CAC: Measured by what? These are classes of what enrollment?

JW: Two hundred and fifty . . .

CAC: Oh my heavens!

JW: I was once in a deans' meeting . . . Deans used to meet for breakfast when I was in Academic Affairs then. Ellen Fahey, who was the dean of the Nursing School . . . I've forgotten the context; it was something about problems with undergraduate education and I had said something about the passivity and the terrible problems with these large classes. Ellen Fahey jokingly said, "Oh, John, I bet when you were at Yale, you never had a large class." [laughter] And that was true. I never did. Though most of the students did actually but I never did.

CAC: Well, but John, it made you adopt a style of teaching which ran against your experience (a) and against where you were going in active learning (b).

JW: Yes.

CAC: You were aware of that at the time?

JW: Well, the truth is, it took me awhile to become aware of it. I was not someone who was thoughtful about his teaching. I wanted to do a decent job and show up and . . .

CAC: The kind of socialization we all had. Sure.

JW: I was at Ohio State once on a site visit, and talking to professors in the honors program that they had there—and we all know who they are, so to speak, going the extra mile to work in honors programs, extra teaching. So this guy said, "In my department"—I think it was history—"my colleagues think of undergraduates as a necessary evil." [laughter] That is a mind set.

CAC: Oh, very widespread.

JW: Was I in that mind set or was I not? If you had to choose yea or nay, I was pretty much in that mind set because I was here to do research on the cutting edge of the subjects that I'd learned.

CAC: With two hundred students, all you could do was lecture.

JW: Yes. So it wasn't an immediate thing that this conflict, this dissidence between what I was now being asked to do with my own experience, but I think it was at work from the beginning in a sense of this isn't right. These kids aren't being treated right. This shouldn't be this way. There must be a better way of doing it.

CAC: You're a volunteer for honors seminars yourself at this time?

JW: Pretty quickly, I did. I've forgotten exactly when.

CAC: I think many of us did it for that precise reason.

JW: Yes. It was a kind of oasis where you could do good education.

CAC: I did a joint one with Burnham Terrell, your colleague one year.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

JW: . . . conceptual change, social change. With [unclear] doing *Discovery of the Americas* for one quarter and [unclear] historian named [unclear] who knew a lot about impressionism.

CAC: Oh, sure.

JW: That was my experience. The honors program was a place to practice the kind of thing that I'd experienced as a student. This may be jumping ahead, Clarke. But I was pretty young. I came here as a professor, so that particular ladder—I was thirty-three—and that particular ladder was behind me, and it was really quite amazing in a rich institution but where a lot was different from my own experience, in particular, perhaps, the most dramatic thing is the one we just mentioned. I began to get curious—I don't know why—about What is this institution and How does work? . . . something I'd never asked about Yale or Stanford. It was just this wonderful place that just gave me all this money and all this attention. [laughter] For some reason, I began to be curious.

CAC: Did your becoming chairman have anything to do with that?

JW: Yes, it did, and fairly quickly. I guess I succeeded Gene Mason. Gene was chair when I came, say for a couple of years. There were conflicts in the department, terrible conflicts, actually involving the Philosophy of Science Center.

CAC: Why would that be a conflict?

JW: Oh, I think when you think about it, Clarke, you see that there would have to be conflict. It's like within a family. You pick out three of the children for special attention and special treats. The members of the Philosophy of Science Center . . . This is the way it appeared from . . .

CAC: They had access to funds?

JW: They had access to all of our funds but then they had access to all of their funds.

CAC: Yes.

JW: But we didn't have access to their funds. [laughter] It was that kind of thing.

CAC: So they were more free to have research assistance or take a quarter off or travel?

JW: Yes. When it came to making appointments and some of us would feel that we needed another philosopher of language or another person in ethics; they had a kind of trump or a kind of—we always felt—exaggerated claim of well, this is a unit of special distinction. We hear this argument played quite endlessly . . . it's one of the academic arguments. From their point of view, of course, it was just a conflict, a situation that required great diplomacy to carry off. I think [Herbert] Feigl apparently did it pretty well. They excluded May Brodbeck. I don't know whether you were aware that May was never a member.

CAC: No. I didn't know that. That was her field.

JW: It was her field and I don't know why actually. I'm going to mention May. I became pretty good friends with May. She was a kind of a mentor to me. She was the one who got me in to the job at the Graduate School. I went to visit her a few times when she was down at the University of Iowa. I don't know whether Herbert Feigl didn't get along with May or whether May was too independent. May was pretty independent character and was not going to take much crap from anybody. [laughter]

CAC: To her soul's health.

JW: My sense though was that Herbert Feigl—he'd retired by the time I got here—had been a more successful diplomat than Grover Maxwell was or it may have been changing times, I don't know; but I could see from the point of view of the people of the Philosophy of Science in a perfectly good faith, it would be a conflict situation. They thought it was a special distinguished unit and they did need more colleagues from their point of view. They were part of the Philosophy Department. Maybe they didn't like that any better than we liked it.

CAC: From 1960 to 1972, there was a lot of money for adding positions everywhere.

JW: Yes. But about 1972 that began to change.

CAC: Yes, it leveled out.

JW: Yes, you're right. It would be easy to be a diplomat when all boats are rising. [laughter] How did things work? I guess it was May Brodbeck . . . May was a professor here for many years. She served on a lot of important committees. I don't know what all she did before I came. She became dean of the Graduate School about the time I . . . I think she was dean of the Graduate School. She wasn't a large presence in the Philosophy Department when I came in 1972. There's a committee called the Research Advisory Committee, a faculty committee that deals out . . . oh, at that time it was almost a million dollars a year in sort of seed money research finds. I got put on that pretty quickly. We reviewed proposals, and discussed them, and

gave away the money and so on. Then Warren Ibele became the dean of the Graduate School. I hadn't known Warren. Warren was a mechanical engineer. I see this much more clearly now that I did then. They wanted someone from the Humanities or Social Science side of the house to have a position of responsibility in the Graduate School and especially in connection with the research committee. There was constant concern in that committee that almost all the money went to natural scientists and biological scientists and it fueled the ability of those professors to then feed at the federal funding trough. In fact, that was the whole point of the fund and that was why it was established but it was a kind of natural force for democracy in the university which is a healthy thing. Everybody sort of felt the social scientists and the people in humanities ought to get some of this money, too, but somehow we just can't figure how to get it to them. [laughter] So, I was brought in, partly for symbolism I think, but also partly because maybe I would have some ideas about funding.

CAC: Partly because you straddle the Humanities and the Social Sciences in your own intellectual . . .

JW: Yes. These are relatively small things but we're going to talk about working for change . . . okay, let's look at the guidelines for the use of these funds and talk to some people in the Humanities and Social Sciences. What do they need? Maybe we're not funding the things that they need. Basically, what we fund is equipment . . .

CAC: Yes.

JW: . . . and research assistance. There's now a clause—I think it's still in there—about research visits. Some people said, "Look,"—the people in the Humanities—"we need to talk to our colleagues around the country." "Okay, let's buy them plane tickets, and let them come in, and talk." [laughter] I don't think we ever spent more than \$10,000 a year on that. It was a little modest.

CAC: Well, [unclear] what you were saying, we were talking about earlier and that is the relative isolation of specialists even within a university so that you find close colleagues frequently, you do have to go outside.

JW: Yes. That's a very good point. We did build into the guideline . . . okay, if you put in one of these proposals, if you're going to invite someone in, you've got to demonstrate to us that person's going to talk to someone beside you. [laughter] You have to find at least three and maybe give a colloquium in the department.

CAC: Well, that worked modestly?

JW: Yes.

CAC: And Warren Ibele was not unsympathetic to that?

JW: He was very sympathetic to it. And we also had a lot of discussions about look, in the natural sciences, there's all kinds of external money available; and so once we get our young professors started with university money, they ought to be able to compete but in the Humanities and the Social Sciences . . . some difference with disciplines. In a lot of disciplines, there's basically no external funding available. There was a regulation about when you've been at our trough once, don't come back, or something like that. [laughter] Well, that doesn't make sense in English, or History, or Philosophy and so there was some change of that kind in the way we interpreted that.

CAC: Did you have other portfolios in the Graduate School? You were half time, weren't you?

JW: I was half time. That was basically it, to ride herd on that fund and to ride herd on that committee, that Research Advisory Committee that I had been a member of. The Graduate School also then had a governance structure which I understand has now—I think wisely—been simplified. It was a governance structure that involved six policy and review boards that spanned from the Health Sciences to the Agriculture, to the Education, the whole bit. Those things had a lot of busy work to do, sort of detailed monitoring of regulations about faculty status, and the Graduate School, and sometimes kinds of course approval. Those groups had to meet . . .

CAC: Constantly.

JW: Constantly. [laughter] There were three dean level people in the Graduate School and we divided those. Each of us took two of those things; so that was kind of a portfolio. That was a waste of time.

CAC: How long were in this position?

JW: I must have been in it for three or four years.

CAC: Three or four years. But now these are the three or four years you're beginning to question the undergraduate learning process?

JW: Yes.

CAC: But you have an entirely Graduate School research basically set of [unclear].

JW: No, I think that's an interesting thing that probably I certainly wouldn't have predicted because it was such a learning experience for me. Probably no one might have predicted it. It seems so counter-intuitive because the Graduate School is the repository of the research ethic of the university . . .

CAC: You bet.

JW: . . . and sticking up for it in every setting and so forth. I went in to this administration stuff with a kind of intellectual interest. How does this place work? [laughter] Well, I tell you, when I saw how this little seed money research fund was played off against these huge national streams of money from the National Science Foundation, and the Institute of Health, and Department of Defense, and Department of Energy, and how the feds by putting in their dollars last, and putting in always the soft money, only soft, continuously competing for it, I came to understand why the undergraduates were getting the short end of the stick even though they brought in by far the bulk of the money. You look in the newspaper this morning, you get a rough idea of the budget. It's a couple hundred million. This is now—it would have to be deflated back then—but it's \$200,000,000 from tuition. That's direct payment basically from the undergraduates. There's some graduate money but it's predominantly undergraduate money. There's \$500,000,000 of support from the legislature. [unclear] the legislature is interested in research and so on. The political support for this place that generates that money is nine-tenths the undergraduates, so that the huge stream of money that's coming in to this place for the undergraduate mission—this is the my [unclear] analysis that I came to—this huge stream of money of the political and financial support that surrounds the undergraduate mission is by far the bulk of the money. The amount from the feds is a lot. Now, it's around \$200,000,000 a year.

CAC: And it's proportionally in the hard sciences?

JW: And it's disproportionately in the Medical School.

CAC: In genetic [unclear].

JW: IT has never been a competitor the way the MIT Engineering School or the Stanford Engineering School. Our Medical School is right up there with any of them. It pulls in a ton of money. It's very disproportionate.

CAC: Are you saying at this point, John, that in the mid to late 1970s when you're doing this that you become aware of a distortion of liberal arts as well as undergraduate instruction from the availability of outside funds?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Or am I putting words in your mouth?

JW: No, that's exactly what I'm trying to say . . . that the federal funding system had created a structure of incentives that very much reinforced the ethos of Ph.D. education and why people were going into faculty careers and so on. It had to do with the feds putting in their money last.

CAC: I hadn't thought about that.

JW: If you've got \$700,000,000 a year assured almost no matter what you do—teaching in small sections, teaching in large sections, have four-course teaching loads or two-course teaching loads—the legislature and the public is not sophisticated enough somehow to know the difference.

CAC: The professors are not.

JW: Then the feds are putting in \$200,000,000 a year, doing it very competitively . . .

CAC: And what is the rule for private foundations, Ford, Rockefeller, etcetera?

JW: Oh, it's such a small amount of money but it's the same principle.

CAC: It's your experience that it's proportionately smaller than the federal?

JW: Oh, yes, yes. It's much smaller. I've read some about this that after the war when this whole structure was set up, the federal structure, it was actually modelled on what some of the foundations, the Ford Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, had begun to do before the war. Then it was the idea that the universities, taken collectively, were a huge source of talent that could be bought fairly cheap because they already had jobs. [laughter]

CAC: You bet.

JW: But they had a lot of free time and so you didn't have to pay for benefits. It's what now people are talking about . . . all jobs are going to be outsourced and nobody's going to have benefits. [laughter] It wasn't just that. But it was this huge pool of talent that you could cherry pick. [unclear] If the Ford foundation wanted a project on hunger in Mexico, you could put out an RFP [Request for Proposal] and you could . . . this huge pool of talent with the best ideas.

CAC: And faculty groups all around the country, in private and state universities, would see that advertisement and would shape a request for funds that they knew was sympathetic to the goal?

JW: Yes. And department chairs would say, "Look, my department is going to be more successful, is going to have greater clout with our institution if we can pull down more of those funds."

CAC: Of course.

JW: "We need to reduce teaching loads here so the people can devote their attention to writing proposals for one thing, but developing the track record so that their proposals will be competitive." Well, when the private foundations are doing it, that was such a relatively small amount of money that it wouldn't have the kind of impact; but when the feds got into it, it had a huge impact. At least this was the analysis that I came to.

CAC: That you came to out of your own experience?

JW: Yes. The youngest, most vulnerable, the least experienced learners in this whole knowledge transmission system were getting the least resources, and the least attention, and that was a structural thing which no one intended, but there it was.

CAC: The old problem of unintended consequences. You said in jest, in a subordinate clause about twenty minutes ago, that it was your Oklahoma instincts that were coming out or something. That was in jest but in whole in earnest? What in your background with all this experience which is geared toward graduate research, scholarship, a traditional kind of. . . what got to you? I'm guessing that in the late 1970s, this is when you begin to focus on other issues.

JW: Yes.

CAC: So where did it come from?

JW: Well, Clarke, you know . . . I don't really know.

CAC: Fair enough.

JW: I realize that this point was a big transition for me. A lot of people, very understandably, are really stamped and shaped by their Graduate School experience. That provides a set of values, and standards, and a sense of collegueship . . .

CAC: A style, you know, in the cultural sense.

JW: . . . whose opinion you respect, and there's a national and international network of people whose opinions you respect, [unclear] work, and so on. I was completely in that just as a social structure. It's so powerful, and it has a kind of integrity, and though I criticize it, I don't trash it.

CAC: One can measure the consequences, the results..

JW: My experience was I was in that and I moved out of it. And I don't know why.

CAC: So, you don't think it was Oklahoma? You can't say that?

JW: Well, I can't say. I think . . .

CAC: Or a wife . . . or some students?

JW: I think although it had something to do with it, I don't know what. I don't think of myself as a terrifically secure or iconoclastic person. I maybe am a little bit of both of those things. I had a lot of good experience as a child [unclear].

CAC: Let me put it another way. I'm not a traditional interviewer. This is more a conversation and I'm challenging certain things as we go along which interviewer's are told not to do, just listen. But changes in the curriculum came at Minnesota as I see it—now I'm stating a proposition that you may not agree with—in the late 1960s and early 1970s: African American Studies, Chicano Studies, American Indian Studies, Women's Studies. And the initiative for each one of those came from undergraduate students, and not from the academy at large, and not from graduate studies because good god! there weren't any. So these changes occur, I say 1969 to 1976. So the initiative, the impulse, came from the students themselves?

JW: Yes.

CAC: I reasonably secure in that observation as an historian but you're not saying that in 1976, 1980, that that model . . . but you were aware of it directly?

JW: I guess I would say I was aware much more of the Women's Studies model than of the others. I was aware of the activity and I admired what Women's Studies people were doing a lot. Some of their teaching methods, I thought were just the right thing.

CAC: You were sensitive to that?

JW: Yes.

CAC: I think it was out of Women's Studies that you got a different pedagogy?

JW: Yes. I was sensitive to it but that wasn't, so to speak, the impulse that actually moved me.

CAC: Excuse me. They weren't part of your clients in the Graduate School because of their programs as undergraduates?

JW: Well, but they were a little bit. I worked with Sara Evans, and with Janet Spector, and I've forgotten the woman's name in the law school. A lot of those professors there were doing research as well. It was a little non-standard; so they would come by me, and explain what they were doing so that I could speak up for them—which I did. I was impressed by their research as well. But once I became focused on the problems of undergraduate education, I needed to be more active, more participatory, and so on; and looking around for who in the world is doing it, then I noticed the Women's Studies were doing some wonderful things.

CAC: That does suggest the compartmentalization of our lives, doesn't it?

JW: Oh, it sure does. Yes.

CAC: To move this along chronologically, you moved from Johnston Hall to Morrill Hall essentially, and from graduate to undergraduate?

JW: Yes.

CAC: How did you get the job and how was it defined when you went into it? And who was your vice-president? This is Academic Affairs we're talking about.

JW: The vice-president was Ken Keller. I'd known Ken for a long time and never really worked with him all that closely but he had been associate dean of the Graduate School as well a few years before. He had worked with May. I'd worked with Ken. There was a great furor over the firing of [unclear] and Ken was an advocate, a leading advocate, in trying to restore [unclear]; and I was on the periphery of that.

CAC: Was [unclear] in philosophy?

JW: No, he was in anthropology.

CAC: Okay.

JW: He'd been a graduate student in philosophy. Ken had all these visions of how the whole state higher education system had to be restructured, and the university had to become much more of a Berkeley type institution, and da, da, da, da—it will probably come out in some of these interviews. Ken was genuinely concerned about undergraduate education. He had a pretty elite vision of it, I think rather different from mine. I think he also had some political problems. He needed to convince some constituents that he cared about undergraduate education. So, he created and got the relevant faculty committees to agree to create this assistant vice-president position which would focus on undergraduate education. And oh, yes, by the way, it would focus on outreach as well because that was another part of the mission. [laughter] So it was focusing between the cracks.

CAC: Did he perceive [unclear] as an extension or what was outreach? What was the meaning of that word? That's your field . . . grammar, language.

JW: [laughter] Basically, Clarke, what it meant was we've got these three units, two of them huge—we've got the Agricultural Extension Service; we've got Continuing Education and Extension; and we've got the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs which was terrific but tiny—and we still have endless complaints from everybody under the sun that the university is not doing enough to make its intellectual resources available to the wider community. [laughter] And what's more, the span of responsibility of the academic vice-president which is so absurdly

wide that these wonderful people who were directing these things—Hal Miller, and then it was Norman Brown who is now the head of the [unclear] Foundation, and Tom Scott—hardly get five minutes a year of the vice-president's time, and never meet with each other, or when they do it's to beat the crap out of each other. [laughter]

CAC: I'm talking to [unclear] so go on.

JW: It was one of these political . . . What was I supposed to do about outreach? Ken didn't care what did, just do something. [laughter]

CAC: You had two portfolios basically?

JW: I had two of the neglected stepchildren of the university.

CAC: At that point, I'm guessing you don't know much about the outreach programs? I mean we all know something about them but you were beginning to turn your attention to undergraduate education?

JW: I'd learned a little about them, Clarke, in the Graduate School. I'd worked with the agricultural campus a lot through the Graduate School. I've had a handful of really important friends that I made and one is Vern Ruttan. Vern is an agricultural economist. He's now outreach professor and just the sweetest person. I hooked up with Vern a couple ways when I was in the Graduate School including when I got concerned about the research tail wagging the undergraduate dog, I talked to Vern about . . . Vern has thought a lot about how you structure knowledge creation and transmission systems and has studied things all around the world. I had this intellectual interest and extension and some knowledge of its history, so I knew something about it. But it was the undergraduate part of that job that especially . . .

CAC: How large a staff were you given for this new position?

JW: I had a secretary and a kind of administrative assistant or assistant to the assistant vice-president position. That was the substantial support.

CAC: How did you set your own agenda and priorities?

JW: I basically did it by appointing a committee. [laughter] Right off the bat, there was a task force on undergraduate education that I chaired..

CAC: Good way to start. This was different from the Council on Liberal Studies?

JW: Yes. It had a broad charge which was good. It was to include student life kinds of issues and programs as well looking at the academic side of things. It had some wonderful people on

it. Frank Sorauf was on it. Thank god! because Frank actually knew about a hundred times as much about the topic than I did. And he was very generous. [laughter]

CAC: He's now dean emeritus. He's no longer dean of the college.

JW: And he had just stepped down as the dean. It was a labor of love for him to go on this committee. And Mary Corcoran was on it. I talked with Mary a lot over the years about higher education issues. Flo Wigger was on it who was the head of the Office of Minority and Special Student Affairs. A lot of good people. We worked, I don't know, for almost year I guess, and really had a comprehensive report, and that set an agenda.

CAC: That report any serious student of this can find in archives or somewhere, right? There are printed materials?

JW: Yes. The reason I'm smiling and laughing is that when this committee first started working, people like Frank and Mary said, "There have been other committees on this subject. We ought to do a little homework, and see what they are, and take a look at their reports." Well, my god! it was work, so whose files these things are in is a matter of some digging around. I still have copies of the things myself. Maybe I should deposit them. But anyway, we found twenty-five reports which we were able to dig up.

CAC: Of various task forces within the recent past?

JW: This committee must have made its report in the early 1980s sometime. Within the previous decade or fifteen years, there had been twenty-five reports on undergraduate education. I don't think any of them were as comprehensive as ours.

CAC: I chaired the colleges which revised the undergraduate department.

JW: Yes. Well, what to say about this? It was extremely useful to have that report because it did set some direction. I chaired some other committees. There was a committee on the international programs of the university which are not purely undergraduate but which had large undergraduate dimension which I also chaired.

CAC: Like SPAN?

JW: Yes it included . . . This was at the time when people were beginning to say, "Look, we're moving into an international world, international economy. Education has to educate people to participate in this." Basically, one of the things I learned, and especially as I reflected on the fact that there had been twenty-five reports, is that one of the ways—and I think not intentionally—it syphons off energy and deflects criticism is by the endless generation of reports. At my advanced age, I resolved at the university to be a part of another one. [laughter] If you ask what came out of those reports that I did that actually happened . . . We actually tried to put in place

a system that would track the recommendation I don't know what ever happened to that. One whole part of it was my god! the kids are waiting in line to register . . . they go to one office . . . they bounce to the other . . . we've got to make this place more user friendly. We had dozen of recommendations on that theme. Frank Wilderson who was vice-president of Student Affairs at that point and this great . . . I don't know what was ever actually done in Frank's shop about this. I think some things were done. I think some things were done actually. But I see now in recent stuff in the student newspaper that the same complaints, the same bureaucratic run-around is still there.

CAC: Now, was undergraduate honors programs part of this?

JW: Yes. I'd forgotten that. I'm glad you reminded me. At that point CLA [College of Liberal Arts] had an honors program . . . had had for a long time. I don't know whether any of the other colleges did. I don't think they did. Anyway one of the recommendations was there ought to be an honors program in every college. And quite a lot of progress was made on that. I don't know whether that's been maintained. The College of Biologic Science has developed one. I don't know whether IT expanded but about that time had made a big push on its honors program. The College of Education developed one. I think the College of Agriculture did.

CAC: That's an important initiative.

JW: This was a model from MIT. A woman named Margaret McVicker developed something called "An Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program." This committee that I'm talking about now recommended that be done here. And that's been done. There is now around \$400,000 a year in that. Students and I think maybe their advisors jointly put in a proposal, and they get some money for supplies, and equipment and so on, and some stipend. That's in the active learning direction and fits with the research mission. It's a great opportunity for 300 or 400 students a year to do that.

CAC: Wasn't there a mentor program for minorities students as well?

JW: Yes.

CAC: That was out of your office?

JW: Yes. There was a whole section of the report on diversity and appropriate support for students of color. One of the things I thought about in preparation for this is How did change occur? I talked once about this to John Borchert about he'd started to CURA. He said, "Well, we wrote this plan. Then I pretty much forgot the plan." [laughter] "But as opportunities came up, I did things, and when I looked back at the plan five years later, I thought, gee! we actually did a lot of those things." That was sort of my experience with this. You create a kind of mind set so that then you are alert for opportunities. It was called the "President's Distinguished Faculty Mentor Program."

CAC: Yes.

JW: It was for students of color. Something in this direction was on this agenda, a kind of a wish list. During the capital campaign, an alumnus who runs Supervalu, Michael Wright, football player and now successful entrepreneur, wanted to give the university a million dollars for something that would benefit minority students. Keller may have been president by now. I guess he was president during the capital campaign and Rama Murthy was acting vice-president. I was the person they would come to and say, "What have we got that costs a million dollars for minority students?" We had this thing basically on the shelf ready to go. These changes are very incremental. They are fundamental or structural. They're positive and they occur because there's been some planning and thinking; and also, there's someone like I was that's at the table so that when opportunities come up, somebody can see them. There's people in companies saying, "You need a product champion." I don't know whether it's the same thing but sort of like that. You just need someone who's alert.

Another one I wanted to mention—this is about how change occurs—back in the Graduate School days, for years the Graduate School had had a summer faculty research fellowship program. You could get \$3,000 or \$4,000, roughly equivalent to a summer school teaching salary, for research. It was a couple hundred thousand dollars a year. That was good. Henry Koffler, when he was vice-president, had established a so-called research magazine. This was a public relations effort. There was an editor and a little staff. For a couple hundred thousands years, they were putting out a magazine about the faculties research. Some questions were raised about that. That's another story. It was folded up and there was a budget of \$200,000 just sitting there. I was at the table with Keller, who was vice-president and Warren Ibele. We were having some sort of review of the graduate school's budget. I had talked about this, I think in advance with Warren. Sometimes Warren didn't focus on things. Here it came up again with Keller. I said, "Look, do you know what we're going to do with that \$200,000? I just thought I'd put it all into the summer faculty research programs, always oversubscribed. It doesn't cost very much. It does great things for faculty at various stages of their careers. Let's just do it." It was a small enough amount of money. I was sort of the product champion of that. Ken said, "Great." [laughter] So that program doubled in size.

CAC: So, it's important to be at the table?

JW: It's important to be at the table.

CAC: And to have some ideas when you get there.

JW: And have ideas that are not just your ideas but that have some sort of collective sense behind them.

CAC: I hear a tone here and in the body language—I wish we were on video camera—that there were authentic rewards to you personally in these two positions, perhaps particularly in the vice-president's office? Is that a correct assessment?

JW: There were personal rewards, yes, in two senses. I found that I really enjoyed trying to think these things through and to work with faculty committees.

CAC: You heard that you were pretty good at that kind of work?

JW: Yes, pretty good at it. The faculty committees were very rewarding. That's something I'll always take with me, too. As hard as it is to make large change for undergraduate education here, I'm convinced if you get almost any twelve faculty in a room for enough hours, like a committee works . . .

CAC: And ask them to address . . .

JW: And ask them to address it and to think about their own . . . Naturally, it's not the agenda but it's reflective of how they learned and how they would like their students to learn. They get excited. They come up with terrific stuff. Then the report is then visited on the unwashed world of people who haven't had that process of discussion, and the excitement tends to get lost. Working with the committees in terms of rewards was always rewarding, that kind sense of collegiality that come out in a joint product. Then it was rewarding that even though the grander visions were never realized that every now and then you could get a hit. You'd pick one off. [laughter]

CAC: Yes.

JW: Or a piece of it or half a loaf or a fourth of a loaf.

CAC: In these matters, I also hear—if my statement in summary is incorrect why you will correct it—that it's very important to have someone in a position of authority, a graduate dean or vice-president for Academic Affairs or even in some instances a president, who will at the proper time say, "Yes, go to it."

JW: Oh, absolutely.

CAC: In your experience, how much education of the higher administrative officers is required to get a green light?

JW: Well, that's a good question. It's complicated to answer. What's coming to mind, Clarke, is that having a team where there are relationships of trust is so important. These two positions that I was in, they got me to the table. I really didn't, except in fairly minor matters, have a decision making authority. I was an idea person, someone who had antennae out, who talked to

a lot of faculty; so I had a kind of authority that wasn't decision making authority. So if I was at the table—and I would say especially with Keller because we did have a really good relationship . . . Keller had this endless appetite for discussing educational issues at any level . . .

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: . . . Keller and Mr. Clinton. [laughter]

JW: I'll come back to how long did it take to make decisions? Keller had this infinite appetite for educational issues at any level of the scale, so from grand issues of design of the whole state system to . . . you'd talk to him about here's the way I teach my introductory philosophy course, Ken would have ten opinions about how to do it better. I had that kind of relationship with Ken, so with Ken frequently I had the experience of proposing these fairly modest incremental things. I said, "Ken, we could capture these dollars to do this." He'd say, Yes, do it."

CAC: But your education was there earlier?

JW: Yes, there was this background and also to a certain extent, that was Ken's style to really make decisions fast. I think it was Rama Murthy who actually got the first bundle of dollars for this Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program. That was very slow. It was in Rama's mind. I know he thought it was a good idea and I didn't know what he was doing about it. One day, he came back and said, "It's done. Fundable."

CAC: Just in a technical matter, did the professional staff in the vice-president's office meet regularly, occasionally? Who made the agenda? What did you do? How did you communicate?

JW: [laughter] Yes, we did meet regularly.

CAC: And how many professional persons, for example?

JW: Well, for example, let's focus on when Ken was there. The associate executive officer vice-president was Al Link. Shirley Clark was . . . what was Shirley doing? Was she the personnel vice-president? I've forgotten.

CAC: She was an associate vice-president and then became acting vice-president.

JW: Yes. So this would be pretty small. This would be five or six people.

CAC: But you met regularly?

JW: Yes, once a week, something like that.

CAC: And who created the agenda?

JW: They weren't terribly good meetings. They weren't awful, but basically there wasn't an agenda. People came with what was on their minds. There was kind of a style, I guess you would say. Actually working with Al Link was terrific. Al was a real pro. Al knew much more about what those of us at my level were doing in a way than Ken did. Al almost really ran those meetings. As I said, they weren't great meetings but boy! I've been in a lot of meetings that were worse. They were pretty good on the whole.

CAC: It was a chance for everyone to get informed on what's going on everywhere else?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Okay. But to use your word earlier, the success of it depended upon not on an agenda but on trust?

JW: Yes, yes.

CAC: Two way street?

JW: Yes. I don't know what else to say about that. In retrospect, if you look at sort of the actual changes, the improvements harvested, compared to the amount of time and effort put in, it seems to me like a—I don't know what your standard is—fairly slim harvest. There are things you can point to with pride that almost seemed to happen instantaneously but those were built on this huge iceberg of discussion, of committees, of meeting regular, meetings of SCEP [Senate Committee for Educational Policy] in which all these things were chewed over . . .

CAC: And you automatically set on the Senate Committee for Educational Policy?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Did you sit in on the Faculty Consultative Committee?

JW: I did not. I sometimes went as a special resource person, but I didn't sit there regularly. Then there was regular meetings with the deans. One thing that I formed that was new was called the Undergraduate Deans' Group. The General Deans' Group included all the deans. In fact, people came from Duluth, and from Morris, and so on . . . so all the deans in the whole system. That was a group of fifty people. I met regularly separately with the deans of undergraduate colleges on the Twin Cities campus. So, what I'm saying is just lots of time, and all of these require some preparation, and some digestion afterwards. The scale of this place is really something to contend with. People who hadn't been in communication . . . I think a

number of good things probably happened that I don't even know about because the dean in Education knew what the dean in Liberal Arts was thinking about.

CAC: Sure.

JW: We formed a whole issue of the transition from high school to college and the university's requirements, etcetera. I said to Ken, "Look, we ought to have a group of undergraduate deans, some of them who are interested and school superintendents from around the state, especially the metro region. Those people ought to be in discussion with it." Ken Said, "Great!" So I wrote a memo for Ken. He appointed them and I ran a number of . . .

CAC: And each of these take a little money. There are reserve pockets for these kinds of initiatives?

JW: Yes. They don't cost much money. You buy them breakfast, and the big expense is their time, the deans' time and in this case, the superintendents' time to come. God! they loved being invited. [laughter] Well, the disjunctions in the systems of people who have really similar interests and challenges as leaders but who never talk to each other is breathtaking, but it's hard to organize.

CAC: As we talk, I'm thinking about other conversations I have had and will have, having in mind some poor historian who's got to write a chapter, okay . . . ? That's what I told Nils when I took this project on, that I wanted to find how things really function, how they happened. He knows coming up the line, how informal these things are and how complex.

JW: Yes. One other thing I wanted to mention, Clarke . . .

CAC: Please.

JW: . . . about sort of the conditions in let's say in Academic Affairs, to a certain extent in the Graduate School, too . . . but the Graduate School is a little bit of a backwater. In Academic Affairs and around the president's office—I don't think this point can be made too strongly—people work too hard, way too hard. The people that go into those jobs have a tremendous amount of energy and from my experience, all of them had a terrifically high, sort of almost idealistic level of commitment to what they were doing. But this place, at that level, just generates so much paper, decisions, crises, committees, and this and that, that I think a big mistake, a big problem, is people work too hard; so they are going on automatic pilot I think after a few months.

CAC: And you can't sustain this for longer than how many years then?

JW: Well, a certain level of people can sustain for a long time but with no creativity, no vision.

CAC: I see.

JW: I've talked to Mary Corcoran about this. She's been working with the Episcopal bishops who take these long retreats. [laughter] I may be influenced a lot by Mary about this; but my sense is that at other high level leadership levels in some institutions, they've been much more thoughtful about the problem—not the form of burnout that leads to a crisis and a crash. I mean that might be a blessing! It's the kind of burnout that's sort of chronic and it just has you running with your tongue hanging out all the time.

CAC: And even at your positions which were not at that top, you suffered that?

JW: Yes, I suffered it, and I wasn't making the tough decisions, and having people call and scream at me, and all the emotional stress that goes with those. I was pretty much insulated from those.

CAC: I talked to a faculty member yesterday who said that just automatically when he wanted to talk to Don Smith, vice-president for Administration, he called on Sunday morning at ten o'clock. Don was in his office and he expected that Don would be. Later, he said with a shock, "My god! I just expected him to be there."

JW: Yes. Yes. Yes.

CAC: The speed is so that we don't have time for thinking big, as they say.

JW: Yes.

CAC: Or long.

JW: Yes.

CAC: And maybe why there is a premium of someone who's a very quick study, as Ken Keller certainly was?

JW: Yes. Yes.

CAC: And for someone who's steady, like Al Link?

JW: Yes.

CAC: It's remarkable that people get matched to the job.

JW: [laughter] Yes, that's true.

CAC: And sometimes, I'm sure they don't, but yours is mostly confirming stories, so far, of persons who were doing good jobs in the right positions but suffered from the lack of perspective of standing back?

JW: Yes, I think so. If asked to say, How did it suffer? I think it's real hard to point to because the affect would be sort of defects on the vision, and the long range, and considering a broader range of possibilities; so it's a whole unknown world of things that would have been creative, and would have been a stimulus, and could have been a leverage for improvement, which no one ever considered because no one ever thought of them because no one had time to think. It's sort of hard to document.

CAC: You are describing what is sometimes called crisis management, that you're so busy doing that.

JW: Yes.

CAC: Would you care, or maybe you weren't in a position to observe, the pressures that came after a year or two with the Keller presidency in this regard . . . ?

JW: Oh well, I lived through those. I still try to process all of that from time to time because it was really interesting. Ken, as I've said before, was someone that I knew well and had a lot of respect for. Now, I can say there were real difficult deficiencies in just his political skill. At a certain level, he was terrifically politically skillful. His quickness in faculty meetings, the fact that he could talk faster and think of ten arguments while most of us can only think of five. [laughter] In that setting, it was great. I don't think it was so hot at the legislature; but in those internal settings, it was [unclear]. [laughter] It was effective. But in terms of courage, Ken had a lot of courage. The particular thing, I guess that was most interesting that I was real close to was when Ken was acting president. Isn't that right? Wasn't he acting? Yes.

CAC: Yes, as vice-president. That was about four or five months there.

JW: When Peter left, Peter Magrath. It was just before the legislative session and the governor came over. [Rudy] Perpich came over and gave a talk at the Campus Club to some group, senior regents . . .

CAC: He came over with Gus Donhowe.

JW: Yes. I wasn't there but apparently read the riot act. "I'm tired of these endless, every year more and more money for the university, same old thing, blah, blah, blah. I don't want to hear it anymore." I don't exactly what he said. Anyway Ken came back from that meeting absolutely galvanized because he saw it, I think, both as personal opportunity for him but also . . . I've said this, I've never met anyone over there who were just careerist people.

CAC: Okay.

JW: They were all idealist, and had a vision, and Ken did have this vision about the way the whole state higher ed system was currently structured. It was always going to be mediocre at every level [unclear]. It was a long story but then that Commitment to Focus and how basically the University of Minnesota would be a Berkeley kind of institution. Ken came back from that meeting and said, "Okay, we're going to pick this up and I'm going to write a kind of a manifesto." Several of us, Rick Heydinger and I and Al Link, I think—I've forgotten who all was involved—had several meetings with Ken. It was Ken's document but we really criticized the hell out of it—that is not the basic concept but a lot of details. Ken worked extremely hard on that. I don't know whether he realized the risk down the road and the political repercussions he would have if he really did try to focus the university and throw out whole segments of it. So, I don't know how courageous he was or perhaps stupid he was. Frankly, I thought he was a pretty smart guy. But anyway, he was very imaginative and very courageous.

CAC: But it was not that that brought him down. It was a series of small—well, what one can say as far as academic policy and programs is considered—small errors, hmmm?

JW: Oh, well, that's the thing I puzzle about, Clarke.

CAC: Okay.

JW: I generally say definitively, I think . . .

CAC: Or did he have too much on his plate, John?—I mean to get back to your earlier point.

JW: I think the real resistance to Ken was over Commitment to Focus and then to grand policy directions that offended a lot constituents of the university.

CAC: I see. Okay.

JW: I think spending too much to remodel the house [Eastcliff] and the damned desk. . . maybe there are other things that I'm not remembering but these little scandal type things . . .

CAC: Well, the use of the Reserved Fund?

JW: The use of the Reserved Fund . . . Well, I could be wrong about this, my sense is there was so much resistance from different pockets. It made me realize what a complex coalition the university is.

CAC: Yes.

JW: It's really about as big as the state of Minnesota, 300 miles wide, and 200 miles deep, and in a lot of ways about an inch thick in terms of the really solidarity behind the coalition. But as the Vet School, and the Dental School, and Education was going to become very focused and highly professional, or whatever the details were, I think a lot of constituencies began peeling off, and that the big thing that sunk Ken was that when these crises hit . . . I was forgetting about the reserve fund but I guess my sense is if that had occurred in isolation, it could have been explained and defended better than it was. Anyway, the regents abandoned him. David Lebedoff who was the chair . . . I should say here I haven't really talked to Ken much about this and these are not Ken's perceptions. These are my perceptions.

CAC: Of course.

JW: The things that got so much publicity were substantively of some importance but certainly politically and perceptually, they were of terrific importance. Ken couldn't defend himself. There were several of them that had the character that he couldn't defend himself very effectively. The board had to stand up and it didn't.

CAC: Well, by the status of his position, he couldn't defend himself.

JW: Yes. Yes. I guess that's the question. Why didn't they? I think they'd gotten cold feet about the whole plan. That's just my take on it. I'll tell you one amusing story about the house. [laughter] After that all blew up, I was at a meeting with Stan Kegler and I've forgotten who all . . . Al Link or who all. Stan was the vice-president for External Relations for many years. "Why did Peter Magrath let the damned house get in such terrible shape?" Stan said, "This used to come up almost every year. 'Peter, we've got to repair the house.'" Peter would always say, "I don't want to hear about that house." [laughter] "That damned thing can fall down as far as I'm concerned. I'm not going to spend a dime on it. I don't want to horse with it." Peter was a much better politician than Ken in a lot of ways but this illustrates . . . [laughter]

CAC: Well, John, let's turn to your more recent interests. It's a long interest but in its concentration and focus to use that word, it's relatively recent. You come out of the experience in having the undergraduate experience and outreach, the two pockets, really committed to another kind of learning, and other settings for engaging students in service which then relates to their academic work?

JW: Yes.

CAC: Take it from there.

JW: This emerged, this interest in students doing service in the community, that is: they work as tutors; they work in homeless shelters; they visit senior citizens; and the whole range of things where there are human needs; also environmental needs that aren't being met. There was a resurgence of students doing . . . It's a long American theme for people of all ages, including

students to be involved in this but a resurgence in the 1980s which caught me at the right time. I was still then working, I guess, in the vice-president's office—yes—on trying to improve undergraduate education, and creating more active learning, and helping students see the relevance of their learning to the wider society. It struck me that this was a great opportunity, especially because of the location of the University of Minnesota in the center of . . .

CAC: The metropolitan area.

JW: . . . government and business but with the whole range of urban problems that we see around the country, maybe not as severe but severe enough. I was exploring this. This is very typical of my working with Ken. There was an article in the *New York Times*—this was the late 1980s—some leak of a defense department study saying that there was a down turn in the size of the age cohorts in the military age, eighteen to twenty-four, that was on the horizon, and some committee that the defense department put together, and was leaked to the *Times* said that the all volunteer force, that trying to fill the army—and this was before the Berlin Wall fell—by basically financial incentives, and paying the recruits these large salaries was going to break down; and we're going to have to think about going to some kind of conscription. I said, "Ken, look at this! This will change the whole youth policy, the structure of the country. They'll have to be combined with civilian service. It will become like Germany. We ought to look into this. We ought to prepare. We ought to start developing programs, so we'll be ready with this kind of civilian service stuff when it comes." This was before I met the group of young people that I'm going to talk about in a minute. Ken said, "Great! Figure it out." [laughter] The university had a lobbyist in D.C. at that time. I've forgotten his name; but I called him up and said, "What's going on about this?" He said, "Well, you know, god! there's been over the last twenty years, ever since the Peace Corps, a constant up and down, up and down, up and down on this topic but who knows?" He didn't think that conscription was very likely alternative. [laughter] And of course, he was absolutely right. I became interested in this from a sort of active learning point of view.

Then I met the young people who were taking leadership in this. There was and it still is, though it's struggling today, a student based organization called The Campus Outreach Opportunity League. The person who started it, a kid named Wayne Lisell, whose father was until recently the minister in the Westminster church, Presbyterian church in the Twin Cities. Actually Wayne wasn't from the Twin Cities; his parents had moved here, and he'd gone to school in the east. Wayne had started this COOL and he came through town. He was just going from university to university trying to stir up interest in universities and colleges sponsoring and creating structures that would encourage students to serve, and then also creating opportunities for them to reflect on, and learn from those experiences. This was a very exciting of young people. I began to work with them, and to coach them, and be a sort of mentor for them, and was able to arrange for the university—this was again with Keller . . . I said, "Ken they're looking for a place to hang their hats." At this time they were in Washington, D.C. and Wayne felt that wasn't a good place for them. They needed to be on the campus. "What about we invite

them here, give them some space, and give them local telephone service?" Ken said, "Great! Do it. Figure it out." [laughter] So, we did. For several years, until recently, COOL had an office over on the St. Paul campus. Just to mention, this has just led to a lot of stuff for me. One thing, the connection with these young people who are so energetic, and idealistic, and courageous, I think, has been an eye opener for me. I don't think any of us explicitly believed this rhetoric that was coming out in the 1980s about the apathy, and the selfishness, and so on; but if you don't actively believe it, it's sort of maybe not easy to disbelieve it. Boy! I can tell you there are lots of young people . . . I don't think that's anything but true. Then there's the whole question of getting faculty involved in this, and having faculty adapt their courses in order to bring in the students' service experience, and connect it with the study of the subject, whatever it is. I've had a lot of involvement in that. I don't know quite what to say about that. That's an ongoing interest.

CAC: Now that you're back to being a professor of philosophy, how do you work it into your . . .

JW: Well, I teach a course that's really on political philosophy. It's called "Social Justice and Community Service." All the students are required to be involved in some sort of ongoing service—this is at the 3,000 level—and I don't care what kind of service it is. In some kinds of courses you would want it to be focused; but in my case, the sort of hook or the connection is democratic theory, and especially that sort of arm of democratic theory that emphasizes the importance of involvement in small scale voluntary associations that have a commitment to a purpose. Virtually all the service sites that the students are in, they don't just spring up out of the ground from nothing. There's always a church or . . .

CAC: They're existing agencies . . .

JW: . . . civic club or agency, so it's not just the direct service and the experience with we'll say the homeless people that's part of what they're learning and seeing, but it's the organization. In order to give them something active to do, I say to them, "You probably see some things that are falling between the cracks in the organization, some kind of service, or something that needs to be done." One thing that always emerges is, "Well, I'm tutoring children but after school these kids have nothing to do. They go home and there's no one there and nothing going on." "Okay, things are falling between the cracks. Now, I want you all, students in the class"—there are different ones that have different interests; but there's always a team, a group interested in this and interested in that—to design a small scale voluntary association that fills the need.

CAC: Ah.

JW: That's a kind of practical thing that then brings . . .

CAC: But meantime they're also reading literature from community organizations, or philosophy, or literature?

JW: Yes. I steal from everybody including you . . . those articles by Jane Adams that you used in that course that we taught together, I now use all the time.

CAC: I was moved by that poem from Walt Whitman that [unclear] is part of. You could put in a two hour discussion around that?

JW: You sure could.

CAC: I mean, you must?

JW: Yes. No, and that's another feature of it. We talked before about the narrowness . . .

CAC: It's a close reading of text as well and it's spinning out into their experience?

JW: Yes. We talked at the beginning of our conversation about the narrowness of professional philosophy.

CAC: Yes.

JW: One thing I found in this course is somebody might look at it and say, "This is not a course on philosophy. It's a course on literature or it's a course on history." Because what happens is when students are out there and they see what's going on in the society, they need not just to sort of sharpen up their use of concepts like freedom, and justice, and equality, and so on—which they do and the concepts come to life—but they want to know, How did things get this way? And they want to know how to imagine people's lives and so you can use literature. I try to in my course just to respond to that, to think of it, Can I hold up my head for this as a philosophy course with my colleagues? Yes, I can but I also want it to be responsive to sort of the natural learning. The teachable moments that come out of these experiences are not just for philosophy, and they're not for just anyone [unclear], or they're not just for all of them in isolation, but it's the teachable moment for a kind of integrative development and nurturing, and giving them some structures and some standards, sort of all dimensions of their curiosity which include, How did it get this way? How do people [unclear] these lives? How can we analyze it?

CAC: You know, elementary school teachers work with the concept of reading readiness, yes? That there is that moment you're talking about; and I always thought that would be a nice metaphor to apply to what you're talking about now, that the actual engagement in service helps to create a readiness, and then that moment just whew! goes many places.

JW: Yes.

CAC: At least that's what I was seeing in some of the written material you gave to me. I make a statement now that you can spin off of. You're able to get away with this, to put it in those terms, in a philosophy department because the word you've used earlier is in place; that is there

is a trust that if you're engaged in it, it's not going to be silly fuss and feathers. It's going to have a real authentic bite to it.

JW: Yes, I think there's . . .

CAC: You've earned that trust which I think is essential to make these things work, otherwise it's mickey mouse.

JW: Yes.

CAC: Tap dancing, tomfoolery. Remember that?

JW: Yes. I don't disagree with that at all. There's also just a large degree of tolerance. I mean a lot of my colleagues wouldn't do this kind of thing themselves in a million years.

CAC: Sure. Well, when I became an adjunct professor of social work, they said, "Well, if he wants to do that . . ."

JW: [laughter]

CAC: But now you find this is an engaging moment for yourself?

JW: Oh, yes.

CAC: It is a learning opportunity for you?

JW: Yes.

CAC: And it is in fact changing how you respond in other teaching situations?

JW: Yes, yes.

CAC: So it's not only this one course, John?

JW: Yes, that's right.

CAC: How do you get colleagues? How does this then insinuate itself into a larger . . .

JW: Because of the Clinton and National Service Program which is now putting a lot of money into this kind of thing—into civilian service not so much for college students but before college or after college—it's given additional sort of prominence and credibility, etcetera. But there's been quite a lot of work even before the Clinton stuff of little pots of funding encouraging faculty and universities across the country to adapt their teaching in this sort of way that we've

been talking about in every subject area. There's lots to dispute. This has to do with citizenship and so it should be on course in citizenship and so on. Well, yes, that's true but in the chemistry course, if kids are working on some environmental waste kind of a project—vandalizing—that can bring chemistry to life, just as sort of democracy aspects of it can bring political philosophy to life. There's really a healthy discussion going on around the country. It's sort of [unclear] the discussion, about maybe this can be done . . . maybe it can't. Then in every possible subject, people are doing it. Here's the chemistry professor at Portland State and here's the geography professor at the University of Wisconsin or wherever it is.

CAC: And you're trying to get this networked so that this information and the models can be known?

JW: Yes. We've gotten a little funding to create something called the Invisible College, that's bringing together professors from around the country who are doing this kind of teaching, and also the concept of a free space which is also one of those articles that you've used, and which is associated with this idea of small scale associations.

CAC: Yes. [unclear] Harry Boyd's term.

JW: Yes. All twenty of us in the Invisible College are going back to our home institutions, and casting down our buckets where we are, and try to create a space for our colleagues to come together and discuss this kind of education. I wanted also just to throw in, in terms of our development as educators, getting to know the Highlander Center in Tennessee has been a tremendous experience for me. Here's this off the wall, off the radar chart, adult education, popular education, all these phrases that are no credentials, hardly a library, no buildings . . . You know when the history of this century is written for this country, Was there a school that made a difference? Let's list them. [laughter] Well, I don't know what historians are going to say but a case could be made that the Highlander Center will be . . .

CAC: I was mentioning earlier before we had the tape on, the Lower East Side Settlement House gave, in a sense, some of that.

JW: Rosa Parks and the whole Civil Rights Movement.

CAC: Yes.

JW: They didn't do it at Highlander but they provide that kind of intellectual spark. I've become associated with Highlander and visit there. This Invisible College has its regular meetings there. It would be good for the academy. It would be good for graduate students just to have a broader sense of what education can be. That doesn't mean that they would all go off and sit in circles with their students in rocking chairs though they might do it a little. The sense that I have now at the age—I guess I connected there at the age of fifty—here's a great educational tradition. The whole Scandinavian Folk School . . .

CAC: Yes, that's the Danish.

JW: The Danish Folk School that no one told me about . . . I didn't find out about.

CAC: That's a good point to kind of bring temporary resolution to our conversation in any case. We started in 1957 and it's 1994. We've covered a third of a century in two hours and twenty-two minutes, approximately. That was some journey! I mean this was really interesting.

JW: It was fun for me to have a chance to talk it out. [laughter]

[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