

Interview with Theofanis Stavrou

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

Interviewed on June 22, 1998

Theofanis Stavrou - TS
Clarke A. Chambers - CAC

CAC: This is Clarke Chambers. I am conducting with Theofanis Stavrou, a beloved colleague for a third of a century, what I assume, Theo, is my last oral interview in this great project of 130 interviews. You may think that I've saved the best for the last and I hope it turns out that way.

TS: [laughter]

CAC: Today is the longest day of the year. It is the summer solstice, June 22, 1998. The interview is being conducted in my office in 1152 Social Sciences Tower. It's a beautiful summer day, just the right day to perform an exercise of this sort.

As I suggested before we turned the machine on, it's really useful to start with first things first: that's the historical point of view. Chronology is the only logic historians have. You were Cypriot born. Tell us something about your family and your early education.

TS: I was born, as you said, on the northern part of the island in the village of Dhiorios, D-H-I-O-R-I-O-S, in the District of Kyrenia, in a family of seven children. We were brought up in a mixed village: fifty percent Greeks and fifty percent Turks. One might say that I started out being part of a bi-cultural or an international kind of sensitivity. After I got my grade school education in the village, then, I went to the capital of the island to do my high school training. That took place at the English school in Nicosia, which was one of three or four major schools sponsored by outside agencies with the American Academy being one of them, the Armenia School being another one. There were a few Catholic schools sponsored by the French and Italians. The English School was started at the turn of the century in Cyprus and has trained a lot of Greek bureaucrats for the civil service of the colonial administration.

CAC: Was this a tuition school or a public school in the American sense?

TS: We called it kind of a grammar school. In a way, really, it was public because the British set it up to accommodate those, theoretically, bright people, where they did not have much money to go to the Greek schools, they could go to this one. But, the examinations were very stiff to get into this school. It was public, in one sense, as access was guaranteed to anybody who could pass the exams, who could be competitive.

CAC: That was lucky for your family because most of your brothers went there, too?

TS: I have two brothers who went to the Greek schools and one who went to another Greek school. Only Soterios and I were the English school boys or "old boys," as we say.

CAC: I thought you shared a dormitory room . . . just with Soterios?

TS: Yes.

CAC: I thought that your older brothers were there, too.

TS: No. My oldest brother was educated [unclear] English school but it really was a commercial school where the founder was educated in Britain and he always gave the impression, because he spoke such beautiful English, of being educated in the English school. I was the first one to go to the English school. It was a combination of factors that led to that. First of all, because I was very, very much interested, at one point, of getting out of the island and I knew the only way to do it was by mastering the English language. My parents really appreciated that and they wanted me to do that. Secondly, it happened to be at a time when my family fell on a very hard time financially. To go to the Greek schools, tuition was very high. The English school, on the other hand, was something like nine pounds a year and that included even the dormitory. It was very inexpensive, about twenty-seven dollars a year. Sometimes, they would even give us some books. It was a combination of factors. It was a happy choice for me. I loved it from the very beginning.

CAC: You spoke English when you went . . . somewhat?

TS: I had a little bit of English, which I learned in my village from, not a school, a person from Nicosia who was vacationing in the village. He was a doctor and he liked my curiosity and he offered to teach me English. That opened big worlds for me. The English school was really the next cycle for my getting to know the world, as it were. There I became acquainted with, what you might call, the British classics or British liberal art education.

CAC: Good. It was probably a better education than most American kids would get in their own high school?

TS: It was an excellent education from the very beginning and throughout the six forms. I went there when I was twelve and I finished when I was seventeen and a half. All of those years, English was a major lesson, every year, down to the last year, and translation . . . very, very important.

CAC: And spoken, too?

TS: Spoken . . . very much so. In fact, with the exception of the first term, all classes were taught in English, with the exception of Greek, which was taught in Turkish.

CAC: Ah! There were Turkish students there?

TS: Oh, yes. That was another wonderful feature of the school. We had Turks. We had Armenians. We had Jewish people who came soon after the problems in the Near East after the Second World War. It was really an international school, in many respects, even though it was built up by the British for the Cypriot population. Nevertheless, because of English being the common language, it attracted students from different parts of the Arab world.

CAC: We should probably get a date on this. You were born when?

TS: I was born in 1934. I started going to the English school soon after the Second World War and I was there until 1952 when I came to this country. The wonderful thing about the English school is it really fired my imagination. We had excellent teachers from Oxford and Cambridge. At a very young age, I was exposed to professors of literature who had been very well-trained, who had a very wide liberal arts education themselves. I think I read more books on literature, the arts, and things like that in high school than I did even in college or since then.

CAC: History?

TS: A good deal of history, as well. Now, I must say that that was not my first choice in high school. I really was thinking that I was going to go more into the area of literature and writing, poetry, essays. As you've heard me say many times before, at one point or other, I entertained being an actor. I acted in Cyprus in plays and things like that; but, then, as I always like to say, "All professors, at some point or other, are frustrated actors or Sunday School teachers."

CAC: And sometimes, they engage in *acting up*.

TS: [laughter] That's right.

CAC: You thought of yourself as going, probably, on to the UK [United Kingdom]?

TS: Yes. It's very interesting how, for me, it was not *if* I go to the UK, *if* I get out of the island but it was *when*. It was really a very clear path in my life.

CAC: Your younger brother had the same . . . Soterios?

TS: That's right. I would tell a story which is very emotional for me every time I think of it to this very day. I remember once I was with some colleagues in the yard of the English school waiting for the mail. The mail would be announced publicly and all the boys would come.

CAC: Like the army.

TS: That's right. I remember receiving a package of books from the states. It was a package of books from my uncle in New York City. In it, there was among other things, a dictionary which said, "Compiled by Professor So and So from New York University." I remember, as I opened the books and I held those books, I literally imagined myself holding it in my hands and walking down a university as a professor.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: And what is the most spooky thing of all is when I stepped, in January 1961 at the University of Minnesota to give my first lecture, on the mall of the University of Minnesota was the mall that was in my mind ever since I was a high school kid. Of course, the mind can play tricks on you; but, it's amazing how it seemed as if I'd been to this place before. It was one of the most natural things—the idea of going into academia as a chosen profession—where I thought I would have the most fun, the most enjoyable experience of my life. That's the way I viewed it going into the profession.

CAC: You were spotted at this school by someone who knew that you had to get out of Cyprus and be educated somewhere else; but, it turned out to be America. Tell that story.

TS: The story is that I was one of the first Cypriot young men to come to the States [unclear] England. I think a lot of it had to do with my uncle in New York, perhaps—but, I don't think so. I just somehow felt I had been on an island long enough and I didn't want to get on another island. That will happen, I felt, if I went to England. I wanted to get on a continent, so to speak. The other reason why I think I wound up in the States it because I was very fortunate when I met some Americans who became very excited about my curiosity and they wanted to help me come to the States. My uncle was very happy. He was hoping that I would come and get into business with him. He was a businessman in New York City. He was also my godfather, so he was very sensitive, you see. I made it very clear from the beginning that I was not interested in coming to the States to open a restaurant or to become a businessman. I just simply wanted to study and see where that was going to take me. That's the way it started out.

CAC: How did it happen to become Bob Jones College?

TS: I knew not enough about the American educational system, to be honest with you. I think I had a fairly good idea of what American society was about, partly from what I read. Partly,

my view of America was colored by the literature I read but also by the movies I saw. I was an avid movie goer in the 1940s and the early 1950s. I happened to meet a person who had been there and he felt that it was going to be a good experience for me because it was a small school. Secondly, he felt it would expose me to a part of the United States which a lot of foreign students don't get exposed to, the South, and to an environment whose religious atmosphere would give me an accent on American culture which most foreign students probably miss when they come and study at a big state university and then they return home. I think he was right on all of those points, I must say.

CAC: Bob Jones was accepting of your orthodoxy or were you beyond orthodoxy at that early age?

TS: I was beyond orthodoxy in the sense that I realized that there were limitations to the [unclear] of inquiry by the very highly structured, formalized religion. At that time, Protestant inquiries sounded extremely intellectual to me and freeing, you see.

CAC: [laughter] Eastern Orthodoxy being more dogmatic and doctrinaire . . . ?

TS: More dogmatic and doctrinaire in one strange way and I found out, later on, that it's really much more flexible than many other religions. But, at that time, it really was a form of emancipation for me to be able to leave all that ritual behind temporarily and to defy priests and everybody and to talk to people who would carry on a dialog about God, in a sort of personal and intimate way and not in the way that my mother was doing in a very mystical way.

CAC: Sure.

TS: My mother was a very wonderful spiritual person and, ultimately, it is her spirituality and her roots that are going to bring me back to where I started. I think Bob Jones, contrary to what many people usually think . . . It was, as you know, a very conservative institution. Nevertheless, it was no problem for me whatsoever. They never created any problems for me because I came from an orthodox background. I concentrated on my studies really. I was kind of an exotic flower there, frankly. They had a beautiful theater and wonderful art galleries; so, it was a very good educational experience for me, contrary to what most people might think when you have a choice to go to a small religious school as opposed to a state university.

CAC: It was there that you were introduced first to Russian studies?

TS: That's right. There was a wonderful man who had taught at Princeton, Dr. Brokenshire. After he retired, he went there. He just wanted to do something. He was a polyglot, a remarkable man. It was the first time that I realized that a person gave his personal library to an institution. He gave his library to the university down there at Bob Jones. I remember them sending trucks to bring it from Princeton. I said, "What a wonderful thing. Here is this retired scholar, professor . . ." Whenever I used to go into the small library, there would be the books

from Dr. Brokenshire's library. This man was truly remarkable, a man of great humility but great erudition. He was reputed to have known something like twelve languages and known them well. Whenever they needed somebody to teach on languages that were not frequently taught, he would teach it, even though he was a prominent philosopher. I was just absolutely mesmerized by the man. I took his classes and . . .

CAC: It was by chance that it was Russian. It might have been Tibetan or Chinese.

TS: Most people don't realize but I studied four languages there. I studied Russian. I studied French. I studied Italian and German.

CAC: Good grief!

TS: I had two or three of each while I was studying history. But, the most enjoyable was this esteemed professor.

CAC: It was he that taught you the Russian?

TS: That's right. Then, from there, I went to graduate school at Indiana. Indiana was just, at that time, making a tremendous transition from being really a good Midwestern school to reaching out and becoming a major and international [unclear] institution.

CAC: Now, this is the mid-1950s?

TS: This is 1955. That's when President Herman Wells determined to put Indiana on the map. He was an internationalist himself. He got the legislature to invest a lot of money in promoting international studies.

CAC: Including Slovak studies?

TS: Especially Slovak studies because that coincided with the coming of Bob Byrnes from the east coast.

CAC: They hired the Jelaviches from Berkeley.

TS: Soon thereafter, the Jelaviches. Really, the vision of making Indiana University as a major center for Slovak studies was Byrnes' [vision]. It was there before he had arrived, but, it was he who was able to see what it could do. He was able to bring money from the east coast, whether it was government money or foundation or Rockefeller money. I was the beneficiary of this wonderful tremendous upsurge in Slovak studies at Indiana. I was one of their first Ph.D.s. I know I was Bob Byrnes' first Ph.D. So, they paid a lot of attention to me. They made all kinds of contacts possible for me.

CAC: Your record at Bob Jones was good enough and you were exceptional enough that you got a fellowship to Indiana?

TS: Yes. Another very fascinating thing is I was accepted without the slightest reservation there. I was given a fellowship and a teaching assistantship. Later, of course, I was fortunate enough to get the Ford Foundation Fellowship, which enabled me to finish my dissertation very quickly. I started there in the fall of 1955—I'm sorry, it was fall of 1956—and the following summer, I wrote my master's and, then, by 1960, I got my Ph.D. So, it was a very quick going through.

CAC: You were soundly based in the languages, for one thing.

TS: Yes. The training in the languages helped; but, also, I was very fortunate. In those days, you could get jobs through the master's or ABD [All But Dissertation] very easily. I simply was advised by a number of good people, including one who was a graduate from the University of Minnesota, John Snyder.

CAC: Ah.

TS: He was teaching Ancient History there. He advised me, "Theo, do not, do not be tempted just when you are tired and you think you are going to be a teacher, to take a job because it sounds good." My wife, Freda, insisted, at the time, that she would rather work another year to see me through. I think that was the best thing that ever happened to me. I studied in the fall of 1956 and came into Minnesota in December 31, 1960, with a Ph.D. pretty much in hand. That was a fairly quick way to get through.

CAC: That was the other great advantage of Bob Jones: you found Freda—or she found you.

TS: That's right.

CAC: It was mutual.

TS: Here I went from Cyprus and she went from Indiana and we met there.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: We went back to Indiana, which is her home state.

CAC: When were you married?

TS: In 1955. That's the reason I had that little confusion there. Marriage in 1955. Then, we had Gregory a year and a half later when I started graduate school. Those years in Bloomington were really wonderful years, too. I must say, both my undergraduate years and my graduate

years, could not have been better. They were not only expanding my intellectual horizons and social awareness, but they were really also fun learning years. Now, I must say that I was married very young. I was twenty-one years old and I think that took a lot of the nostalgia, a lot of the homesickness out of my system. It did not, also, force me, either by inclination or by circumstances or by loneliness, to spend a lot of time seeking to fill my few hours with other acquaintances. I think you could say that there was a little bit more of a centrality to the mission all the way along in getting married . . .

CAC: A good focus.

TS: A good focus is a word, yes, that we might want to use.

CAC: How early did you know you were going to do Russian studies?

TS: That I wanted to become an historian became very clear once I got to college.

CAC: Why history instead of literature?

TS: I was doing both. Actually, I did both history and literature as an undergraduate and I continued that even in graduate school. When I arrived at Indiana University, the day I met Bob Byrnes . . . He was in Modern European History with an emphasis on Russian history, in eastern Europe. That's why unto this very day, I do still believe that teachers make a difference.

CAC: I'm thinking back now. There was in the English school in Cyprus someone who recognized you and supported you as kind of a mentor and encouraged you to get out, right?

TS: That's right.

CAC: When you got to Bob Jones, you had at least this language instructor; but, there was a woman that you'd mentioned before to me.

TS: Yes, a woman, Dr. [Leila] Custard, C-U-S-T-A-R-D. She was an English constitutional historian, believe it or not. She wrote one book [The Bill of Rights in America History]. She was extremely erudite. She would correct my papers very faithfully. She would ask me to read. Then, there was another man that we haven't mentioned. That was Jim Johnson.

CAC: Yes.

TS: Jim Johnson was an American historian who was getting his Ph.D., at the time, at Syracuse University. He came there. I must say, I credit him enormously. While he was getting his Ph.D., he was teaching there. To Jim Johnson goes a lot of credit for doing for me things that all of us should do with undergraduates. For example, I remember him calling me into his office

one day and saying to me, "Now listen, you certainly are going to go beyond textbook knowledge. I think you should get acquainted with the various *isms*." I will never forget that.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: "Isms," he said to me. He said, "Whether it is nationalism, liberalism, capitalism, communism . . ."

CAC: Fundamentalism.

TS: That's right. "All these isms," he said to me. Then, he encouraged me to go to the library and check out as many books on these various isms that I could get.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: That was really beautiful. I remember his lectures. He was a very good lecturer, a very good teacher, who later on, as you know, happened to wind up in the Twin Cities about the same time that I started teaching here.

CAC: At Bethel College, St. Paul.

TS: Yes, Bethel College. It's nice to be able to count him as a friend and colleague all these years from the 1950s to the late 1990s and to know them well. He really was remarkable in encouraging you. I remember that he introduced me to monographs, the value of monographs. Really, this is just the survey courses in American history, you see. He introduced me to books on American diplomatic history and things like that. When I went to Indiana University, [unclear], the diplomatic historian, couldn't believe that I had read so many books on diplomatic history, [unclear] Pratt and all these other . . . That's the reason why I say that my experience there was a good one. I guess I always operated on the principle . . .

CAC: But everywhere, a certain serendipity is operating here but also they recognized in you someone who would take a hold.

TS: I like to call it intellectual curiosity.

CAC: You bet. It's an inquiring mind. As teachers, both of us, we know that that's the distinguishing mark of our best students, that they know how to ask questions and are engaged and want to raise those questions. Oh, boy! that's it. I'm going to comment for posterity—this is for posterity, you understand, what I'm doing—that in a large number of interviews that I've done, three or four persons along the line of an individual's career were of crucial importance. You're italicizing that.

TS: I can trace it very beautifully that in every crucial turn in my life, the right person appeared to make the difference or it may be that the right person actually helped me make the right turn . . . any way you want to put it.

CAC: Beginning with a mother who loved you and supported you.

TS: Beginning with a mother that loved me unconditionally.

CAC: Yes. [laughter]

TS: And a father who was a disciplinarian and who believed in education very strongly.

CAC: But neither of them were formally educated beyond . . . ?

TS: No. My mother was illiterate, as you know. She could not read or write. She only learned how to do the letters of the alphabet so she could teach us that the first [unclear] to school. My father, however, was quite well-read and he spoke Turkish fluently, as well as Greek. He was a successful businessman, a merchant. He worked with both communities. He had an incredible obsession with educating us. He was to say, "Even the last shirt will go just so you can go to school." Needless to say, like other parents, giving their children the best education possible was a very high priority. You can imagine what a great sense of satisfaction it was, say, when people like you would come to Cyprus and visit my family and I'd say, "This is the chair of my department." Or you can imagine what a great satisfaction it was for them when I had the opportunity to play a small role in building the university on the Isle of Cyprus.

CAC: We will come to that.

TS: I'm very grateful to both of them.

CAC: For listeners—not that I'm the big deal in this—in 1973, I'd won a small prize for a monograph and invested it in going to Greece and meeting Theofanis there and, then, to Cyprus. I spent three weeks in Kyrenia.

TS: Yes.

CAC: I still dream about, conjure up at night, some of those scenes there.

In your Russian studies, you were also attracted early on to Eastern Orthodoxy in the Russian setting. Say something about that because that really comes to be a heart of your studies and of many of your graduate students.

TS: That's right. I remember when I first met you, Clarke. You said something once, whether it was in personal conversation or whether it was in a private conversation or whether it was in

a public statement, "History is highly autobiographical, whatever history we do." In many respects, I think this suggests the route I took as a student of history. I could not really have abandoned all that rich heritage that I had on the island, even though I made the choice to leave the island when I did in 1952, arriving in New York City on Christmas Eve of 1952.

CAC: Ahhh.

TS: That, in itself, is a memorable happening. I could not, anymore than anybody can really, have got rid of their past. Going down to Bob Jones again, I became much more sensitized to the power of religion in society.

CAC: Of course.

TS: I might have had some reservations about the power of religion in society. Some of it can be negative but, nevertheless, there it is, a very real historical presence. For me, when I went to graduate school and I started studying Russian culture, I was shocked to hear my professor say how important the Byzantine heritage of Russia was or how important orthodoxy was for the Russian culture. That would be it. They would not really dare get into . . .

CAC: Yes.

TS: One of the reasons is they didn't know very much about it or, perhaps, they didn't think it was a good investment of their intellectual energy . . . this topic.

CAC: Well, there is a secular prejudice, is there not, in the scholarly world?

TS: I was finding it intellectually unjustifiable to exclude this big chunk of the history of the world because any society has had its myths. Any society has had its religious ceremonies or liturgies or cults, whatever you want to call them. The idea that we sort of put it on the side just, for me, struck me as leaving a big rich aspect of the human experience out of the picture. So, I started bringing it in. When I started teaching, many people warned me in the 1960s that if I did not concentrate on more traditional ways like colonialism and [unclear] of Lenin or something like that, you might know, there [unclear] the profession as much. I never felt lonely really in the 1960s; but, I do remember when I came back from my first year to the Soviet Union and I made my first professional presentation to the American Association for the Advancement of Slovak Studies. It was a fairly bold statement telling them that, in my estimation, I was beginning to see some very interesting stirrings of religious developments in the Soviet Union and that I thought we had an obligation to study it a little bit more carefully and systematically. Some people thought, yes, you're right; but, are you sure you want to take that kind of a risk? Well, it was a good thing to be at a place like Minnesota where I was able to develop the kind of a program that, indeed, was pioneering in those days and which, now, has become so terribly fashionable. Most of our students from the 1960s and 1970s are really controlling the field in many respects.

CAC: It may amuse you to know that one of my colleagues, early in my career, said, "Clarke, you'll never amount to anything if you don't do Franklin Roosevelt." See? It's the same thing.

TS: Yes.

CAC: You do Lenin. I'll do Roosevelt. [laughter]

TS: Except, here I must say, Bob Byrnes was Catholic and he had done his first book on French history on anti-Semitism in France on the [Alfred] Dreyfus case [*Anti-Semitism in Modern France*]. His research was dealing with the Russian Orthodox Church and, especially, the overseer of the Russian Holy Synod. He was very critical of the Orthodox church as a Catholic and also because the Orthodox church was always, as I say, a conservative institution; but, at least, he was working on that. When I wrote my dissertation, I chose to do it on an aspect of religious and educational, [unclear] Russia, that incorporated all of these things, the social and the political.

CAC: But, it was a risk. You had no idea where that was going to take you in a scholarly fashion—I mean in the profession. You knew it would take you intellectually where you wanted to go.

TS: That's right, many people thought it was a huge risk; although, when my dissertation was published and it was reviewed by Professor Cincloski in the *Russian Review*, he said, "It is refreshing, after reading so many books on communism, to have a young scholar direct us to another important and rich part of Russian history." That really encouraged me a lot. The first book . . . you wonder how it's going to be received—everybody does. They went beyond just pointing out that it was nice to have this book. They pointed out that it's wonderful at a time when there's so much emphasis on communism and things like that there is somebody who is pointing a different direction.

CAC: Minnesota was hospitable to this interest of yours when you got here?

TS: Minnesota was extremely hospitable. I realize that in the 1960s, there were a few people at the university, especially in our department, who were very critical of people who would display too much interest in religion, but I never really never became engaged in what you might call confessional scholarship.

CAC: Of course not.

TS: I must say also that colleagues were extremely respectful of my own convictions and of my wife's convictions in our private life and that is something that I valued because they didn't try to either make a case of it, to bother us, or to marginalize us. We were very much included in the social life of the department when we came. That was done because I think it was the style of the department. Somewhere down the line, I think, it's extremely important that we reflect

a little bit on this importance of mentoring young colleagues as they come to the department and the university is going to renew itself. I was extremely sensitive and aware of the fact that almost everybody who was in the department at the time who was a little bit longer here than I have really attempted to play a role in some kind of mentoring from D[avid] H[arris] Willson, for example, who said to me, "Don't send this article until you're sure it's ready to go." That's really a way of protecting you, telling you, "Don't rush to publish unless you're sure it's ready to go" To Harold Deutsch . . .

CAC: Oh, yes.

TS: . . . to John Wolf . . . all these people were remarkable in bringing you in. Maybe they patronized you a little bit. There were the old guard; but, they did it with a style. They were telling you, "Listen, we have you here because we got a good letter from your adviser and we read your dissertation but also because we observed you for a year and we see there is a future for you here." They were building you up. That's remarkable. I always like to tell the story of when I went to Deutsch's office. I had been here six months and I had an offer already to go to Tulane University and I chose to stay here. I told Harold, "Obviously, my wife and I like it here and we'd like to stay here. I want to know if there are some things I ought to be watching for . . . that I'm sure I'm really meeting the requirements of the department." He said to me, "We have watched you. You're obviously a good teacher. You have a lot of energy. We expect you to do your best." That was the most liberating kind of a statement. "We expect you to do your best." There is nothing like that kind of a sense of mission to strive to do your best. I always remembered that.

CAC: [laughter] I'm laughing because John Wolf, after his retirement, looking back on his career here . . . He was a brilliant and ornery son-of-a-gun, right?

TS: Yes.

CAC: He confided in me that he liked you and he liked me best of all those young folks because we fought back, which is a kind of respect of younger people. [laughter] I never got along with John until I said, "John, that just isn't right!" Oh, he loved that.

TS: It's very interesting about John . . . John, one day, came and said to me . . . He thought I was a TA [teaching assistant] when I first got here.

CAC: You were so young.

TS: Yes. He came and said to me, "You don't mind TAing for me. Of course, you don't!" By the time I had a chance to answer, here I was signed up [unclear] as his TA.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: Speaking about mentoring, it was great because I watched his style of lecturing . . . full of inaccuracies but very engaging. I remember the first lecture when he made a statement when he was talking about somebody whom he killed—in the words of John Wolf, he killed him . . . in other words, he died at a certain time—and he was off by about fifty years.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: Afterwards, very gently, I said to him, "Professor Wolf, it's true what you said but, you know, this gentleman died fifty years . . ." "Well, he died, didn't he?" he said to me.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: But, he had an incredible style of lecturing and engaging the students.

CAC: Oh!

TS: I have one lecture, which I still give to this day, and I borrow approximately three or four sentences from the lecture that I listened to him give when I first came in 1961. He was a kind of mentor.

CAC: Did you ever see his lecture where he starts bayoneting soldiers?

TS: No, I didn't see that.

CAC: He has no artifacts with him; he just is moving his arms. A girl in the front row screeches and faints. [laughter]

TS: [laughter]

CAC: He was something.

TS: Clarke, I tell you, it's wonderful to reminisce . . . so beautiful. They were all in their own ways difficult but they were mortals even in their own unique . . .

CAC: You're describing the department in the 1960s?

TS: I describe the department of the 1960s. I'm describing also people like yourself, who in addition to being good colleagues, later on chaired the department. To me, this is very important. I can say without any doubt that with you and Stan[ford] Lehmborg, I think the department had reached its high point in terms of spirit and collegiality and an atmosphere in the department which really encouraged interaction, even at a time when things were falling apart.

CAC: Oh, we had the Vietnam thing. You bet.

TS: Even at a time when things were falling apart. We were getting into a different generation. Many of the old timers were beginning to feel a little bit alienated; but, even in that alienation, you are very much a part of the enterprise, you see. As I reflect back on some of the unkind things that were said by younger people of the older people, I marvel at the capacity of the older people almost to ignore it. They were upset on occasion, but they also had the capacity to just move on. I think one of the reasons is because they, themselves, had a fairly happy experience.

CAC: They knew who they were and they were secure in their own scholarship and personhood.

TS: That's exactly right.

CAC: Now then, Theofani, a lot of that went out in the 1980s and 1990s; but, we may pick that up later.

Say something about the college. You've commented on the supporting and challenging environment here in the department in the 1960s and 1970s. Do you think that was a college quality as well as a departmental quality?

TS: I think so. For one thing, Clarke, I think the deans were really part of the larger college family. Maybe they were not as dynamic, some of them, as you'd like to see them; but, in a way because of their close interaction with the faculty, some of whom they had known all their lives, they really were both accommodating each other but also getting [unclear] cues from each other. What I'm really suggesting is that there was not the dichotomy or the alienation which developed later on between teaching faculty and administrators who were former colleagues.

CAC: And in the 1960s and early 1970s, they had the money, right?

TS: They did have the money but we have money now, too.

CAC: We doubled our faculty size in ten years.

TS: Clarke, correct. I'll accept that. But, right now again, we're entering into a situation where we have surplus in the state. We have surplus nationally. We are getting more money from the private sector to invest in the foundation. I do not buy the idea that the university is in financial crisis. I think it's the vision that has changed. Also the separation, it seems to me, between the . . . It's amazing. The Greek poet Sappho said once, "I marvel how quickly some of my classmates, when we finished the university, made the transition into becoming bureaucrats."

CAC: Ah ha!

TS: I am saying, "I marvel how quickly many of our colleagues made the transition into being university bureaucrats."

CAC: Yes.

TS: It seems they are really operating a totally different ship.

CAC: [laughter] We're out of tape. Your next sentence has to be on the other side of the tape.

[End of Tape 1, Side 1]

[Tape 1, Side 2]

CAC: Now, we are on the second side. This is going fast and beautifully. I think your point is well taken.

TS: I wanted to comment a little bit on that because, to me, philosophically speaking as a person who has watched the university go through . . . This is thirty-eight years of teaching, almost four decades, as the story goes. I think, for me, this is at the heart of the matter because the reason why things functioned differently in the 1960s and 1970s is not only because we had the money but, also, because the university, as the idea of the university in our days, was really undergoing a very radical transformation—some of it for the better, some of it, however, undermining the very foundations of the idea of a university as it was originally conceived. Since I am [unclear] to literary allusions, I would like to say, I am for destroying part of the house but not for tearing down the entire house. If you destroy only part of it, then, you have a capacity to expand and build better wings and everything. To destroy it and start from scratch, you have to look for foundations if you want to make it really solid again and foundations just do not occur overnight. I am a little bit concerned, not really worried. You know, universities are so much larger than individuals, either faculty or administrators. At a certain point, I think, a major university like the University of Minnesota [unclear] a conclusion sometime [unclear] a conflict in feeling. They take on their own life. It's like the Mississippi [River]. The water is in the base and it goes, you see. There's only so much you can do to divert it but the purpose is really going to continue as it were.

CAC: But, people along the river can pollute it.

TS: People along the river, indeed, can pollute it and, sometimes, even block a little bit of it. That can be done partly by beavers as well as by humans. The fact does remain that all of us, at some point, or other can [unclear] with reality that this institution is going to be here longer after we are gone. The library is going to be here longer after we are gone. That's one reason why we all like to contribute to it. It's a way of perpetuating our own existence in the association with the place after we are gone. It also is really a very humbling experience to realize what an integral part of the state a major university is. It belongs really to the average person in Minnesota when you think of it and not just to be contributors who are very welcome and we're very grateful for what they do but to the average person on the farm and in the city.

I learned to appreciate the dynamics of a university when I started working and helping put up the university in Cyprus.

CAC: Ahhh.

TS: I learned an awful lot about the dynamics of my university here in Minnesota when I started helping [unclear]. You think basic questions, all the way from intellectual questions to operational questions to making the whole thing work. It acquires its own personality, its own strength, its own roots. It continues and survives all of us really.

CAC: Survives a lot of mistakes.

TS: Yes.

CAC: You speak of the centrality of the university to the people of the state of Minnesota, which is a theme that many people have commented on. You, yourself, have done a great deal of that reaching out to the community. This might be a good time to say a bit about what you did and what you learned from that.

TS: Clarke, the best way to start is to give you an idea of how central this university has been to the lives of so many people and also to the state of Minnesota. Last Thursday, I heard that there was a woman in town. Her name is Dr. Rorke, R-O-R-K-E. She's one of the nation's leading neuro-pathologists. She's an Armenian lady who came from "Czechi" here, along with her family. There were a number of sisters, three of whom still live in Minnesota. This woman now is at the University of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, one of the leading neuro-pathologists in the world and she also happened to be a SPAN [Student Project for Amity Among Nations] student in 1950. She went to Germany. I simply wanted to find her and just have a cup of coffee with her. I went down and found her and we started talking. I said to her, "I want to know a little bit about your life story. I see your name here and there." It was clear by the way that everybody who would see her at this conference would come up really deferring to her that she was very well-known, had researches on the cutting edge. She said something to me there. I asked her how she started on this. She said, "First of all, I had good training at Minnesota." Then, she said to me, "There was, in 1950, this organization, SPAN, that the community supported and it did miracles for me. It was the first time that I got away from here. I went to Germany. I met a leading psychologist." She was trying to see how the Minnesota Multiphasic [Personality Inventory] was applied in Germany or it could be applied in Germany in the post war years. In connection with that, she met some leading psychologists, psychotherapists, and other scientists. She said, "I came back and I said, 'Only here in Minnesota, I could do this sort of thing.'" It's really amazing. I'm using this as an example of how central the university has been to the lives of so many people from all over the world.

In Cyprus, there is a leading clinic, a transplant clinic, which is considered to be the Mayo [Clinic] of the Middle East now. It was started and is operated by a man who was trained here

at Minnesota by Dr. [C. Walton] Lillehei. We come out [unclear] experience on a global scale; so, the university has been central to many lives.

To be sure, it's been central to me. Now, I always appreciated the University of Minnesota precisely because of what I sensed from the very first day I came here: the interaction between town and gown as opposed to town versus the gown. Maybe it's my personality or maybe it's the opportunities; but, when I came to Minnesota, I was giving almost as many lectures downtown as I was giving on campus.

CAC: How did they discover you?

TS: They usually took the initiative, Clarke; but, I was teaching classes in Russian History in those days. Don't forget those were the Cold War days. I was teaching my advanced course in Russian History with 250 to 300 students. I think it's one of the lovely things about the Twin Cities that it's like a small village, in a way. Word goes around very quickly. Many of these people did attend my lectures and, then, they would invite me give neighborhood seminars in the homes that you would recognize: the Daytons, the Hartwells, the Phelps, the Pillsburys. It was going at every turn. Here again, some of it was done by being invited directly. On other occasions, it would be done through what we called Continuing Education. The university provided a wonderful mechanism to interact with the community. I believe I was contributing a little bit of my knowledge from what was happening in Russia because, in those days, there was not as much flow of information and not very many people were going to the Soviet Union as are going now. I used to go there faithfully, as you know, every year and, sometimes, twice a year.

CAC: Later on, you took groups there . . . citizens.

TS: Took groups of citizens there, yes. I think these were ways by which I shared what little information I had from my field; but, then, I was enriched by learning about the community from these people who are either the pillars of the community as businessmen or even people who are . . .

CAC: Often their wives?

TS: Often their wives.

CAC: Or their children?

TS: Or their children, that's right.

CAC: How many young people, do you think, went through the SPAN programs from the late 1940s to the present?

TS: Clarke, before we get into the SPAN program, let me say something else.

CAC: Sure.

TS: All of us had a chance to teach our classes at the university. Then, we also had a chance to teach Extension classes. Then, we also had the opportunity to do these other things downtown. I operated in all these three levels. I taught Extension evening classes continuously from 1961 down to 1997 . . . every term, every term.

CAC: That takes a lot of energy, my friend.

TS: It takes a lot of energy; but, it also provides for you an opportunity to address the high school teachers that were taking evening classes.

CAC: You bet.

TS: Somebody took a survey about two years ago, when there was a conference on Russian history or Russian studies, of where did you take your first course in Russian history? Ninety-nine percent of them, "From Stavrou in the evening class at the University of Minnesota." I'm only using this as an example of tremendous [unclear], the number of ways that you could interact if you wanted to with the community. Taking them to the Soviet Union . . .

CAC: How many trips did you do with citizens?

TS: With citizens from Minnesota, about twelve.

CAC: Twelve! Good grief.

TS: This included academics, sometimes, with some graduate students; but, most of the time, it was lawyers, businessmen, or other community persons.

CAC: High school teachers?

TS: High school teachers and, oftentimes, people to whom I would give that series of lectures or a seminar on Russia. Then, they would say, "Would you lead us to Russia to see what you've been talking about?"

CAC: You did this also to Greece?

TS: I did that to Greece. To Greece, I liked to combine it and go to Russia first and, then, come out through Greece and Cyprus. Then, later on, I started doing it with undergraduates, as you know, to Greece because it was really very difficult to take undergraduate students to the Soviet Union and allow them time to start the independent research that we like to encourage our

students to do and especially through the program of SPAN that we were talking about awhile ago and I interrupted you to finish this.

CAC: That's good. Let's talk about SPAN for a moment.

TS: As you know, SPAN is Minnesota's oldest study-abroad program. It was created the same year, coincidentally, as Fulbright . . . 1947.

CAC: Do you know something about its origins with this wonderful man from journalism?

TS: Charnley?

CAC: Yes, Mitchell Charnley.

TS: Oh, yes, I know a great deal about its origins. SPAN was put together in 1947 by a group of students.

CAC: Oh! a student initiative? I see.

TS: It was a student initiative. That's the unique feature of it. When you compare it with things like Fulbright, for example, which was government—of course, correctly so—initiated. The students started thinking after 1945 . . . We simply knew a little bit more about what was going on in other parts of the world, maybe [unclear] the Jews and prejudice. Maybe, hopefully, we can avoid another confrontation, a holocaust, that kind of stuff. Idealistic, to be sure, but nevertheless, that's why Student Project for Amity in our Nations and [unclear] it's better to light a candle than curse the darkness . . . all that kind of stuff. As our friend Mark Twain said, "There's nothing like travel to damage one's prejudices."

CAC: [laughter]

TS: The more you expose yourself to other cultures . . . Last year, Clarke, we celebrated the fiftieth anniversary. We have sent students to over seventy countries.

CAC: God!

TS: We have alumni—over 2500 now—that went through this program alone which has cost the University of Minnesota almost zero pennies. The only thing that they really pay is the faculty salaries, which is usually paid by the tuition, which we raise to give a little bit of financial help to the students. In fact, I believe, one of the reasons why it has survived so long is precisely because it was student managed and manned or womanned and, also, because we really did not depend very much on the administrative whims of the college or the university. We'll come back to that in a minute because I think it bears on the future of this international study at the university. The important thing to keep in mind is that out of our alumni, we have some

distinguished diplomats, journalists, bankers, atomic scientists, historians—including your lovely daughter Sara—and some important local business people . . . Joan Mondale. I don't know whether [unclear] to her but Judge [Diane] Murphy was a SPANer. Mrs. Carl Pohlad was a SPANer. Some of the advisers have been people from the university and the colleges. Saul Bellow was an adviser of SPAN. I mention this because for fifty years, this program has survived and I have yet to meet a SPANer who has not told me that that was a turning point in their life. This Dr. Rorke attested to that.

Last Friday, at Eastcliff, we had President [Mark] Yudof and the President's Club. One of those people who made some contribution to the University Foundation was a SPANer who went to Turkey in 1954. When he came for the fiftieth anniversary, he came up and said to me, "This thing has been so revolutionary in my life. Is there anything I can do?" I said to him, "You can create a fellowship that would perpetuate itself." So, he made a \$10,000 contribution to go to a SPANer who will be interested in any aspect of agriculture anywhere in the world and it will perpetuate itself. As a matter of fact, one of my accomplishments before I leave this program, with which I've been identified for so many years, is to have enough sizable scholarships for every student to be able to participate. I, myself, have been very lucky because, as soon as I came to Minnesota, a SPANer happened to be in my class. He liked the way I lectured and my interest in students and he invited me to go to a board meeting of the SPAN program just to observe. That's when I first met Dean Charnley.

CAC: I see.

TS: They invited me to take a group to Greece the following summer. I had a wonderful time then working with the students, preparing them. I've taken twelve groups to Greece in my life here. In addition to that, I have been the executive director, administrative official, [unclear] of the program since 1964-1965. I can honestly say, "SPAN has been the single-most important intellectual and social experience of my life at the University of Minnesota."

CAC: And for those 2500 kids.

TS: It's been wonderful really.

CAC: Let me make a comment here and, then, you can modify it or extend it. It's my sense that, unlike a lot of programs from other universities where you have a spring quarter in England or a spring quarter in Italy or what have you, that SPAN had the quality you're speaking of but if it did not insist, it strongly encouraged that any participant have a working, speaking knowledge of the language before they went to the country that they were going to. Is that an accurate statement?

TS: That's very accurate.

CAC: This would be not unique but rather unusual with study-abroad programs around the country?

TS: Yes.

CAC: Was that because Mitch Charnley knew that would be crucial?

TS: I would like to say that the founding members of SPAN, the forty-seven, forty-eight, forty-nine people, thought of everything. It's an incredible document, the constitution of that program.

CAC: That was written in as a premise from the very beginning?

TS: In the bylaws, from the very beginning, that there would be careful preparation, which would include the study of language, in some cases a minimum of two years, and also the history and culture of the country to be visited. That still makes this program unique. Interestingly enough—this is something that ought to be researched someday—most of the foreign languages at the University of Minnesota were introduced into the curriculum because they were first tried out by SPANers on an experimental basis because SPAN groups, when they were going to go to Bombay or whether they were going to [unclear], they needed to have at least one year of this language. Especially in the less taught languages in Africa and what have you, they were introduced into the curriculum through SPAN. Modern Greek is a very good example, as well.

CAC: This younger brother, Soterios, picked that up, did he not?

TS: That's right. I would like to say that the preparation year was very important. You also touched on another very important point. Instead of going on a semester abroad, which really disrupted, in some respects, the continuity, we chose to do the preparation here, instead of taking our students there and putting them in a classroom building. Who wants, really, to go to Greece or to another country and spend the summer studying? If you did your work here, when you were there, the idea was to do the kind of research that would bring you into contact with human beings there and physically experience the country.

CAC: These were mostly field research projects?

TS: Most of them were field research projects. In this way, they would visit the country and they would be exposed to the country and to the people, the culture, we like to say, without being shut up into classrooms or into rooms all day long.

CAC: Are there any models elsewhere that other universities picked up . . . these two things that you're talking about of basic importance?

TS: I think they have tried. Iowa wanted to do it. The University of Miami almost did it. Dean Russell Cooper, who was one of the founding members, tried to introduce it down there; but, it didn't work. Do you know it didn't work?

CAC: Why?

TS: First of all, there has never been the commitment by the community to this kind of a student project. Secondly, because, very quickly, the program was absorbed into the bigger bureaucratic structure of either international studies or the college or the university and when they had to be cut down, they would go.

CAC: SPAN was able to maintain its autonomy?

TS: Because it's not the University of Minnesota. It's a Minnesota SPAN Association. That's an extremely important distinction.

CAC: You had students from other colleges?

TS: Indeed! and some of the finest ones came from other colleges. We have advisers from some of the other colleges, as well. As I was explaining to the dean recently . . . They are very interested in integrating us into the college a little bit more and I think there is something to be said about that. Nevertheless, they couldn't figure out why we have our bank account outside the university.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: I reminded them that this is not a University of Minnesota project. In fact, I reminded them that in 1947—get this, Clarke; you speak about university administration—I found a letter from the dean of the college, at the time, who said, "This is a wonderful program. We are going to support it academically; but, we do not want to assume any responsibility financially for it." The first year, SPAN's office was downtown in a business office. The college remained true to making no contribution to SPAN, not even a supply budget. So, all this, in the beginning, was supported by the community. This year's students, once they came back, were going to raise money for next year's students from the community. The community leaders love to get these letters from these students around the world saying their experiences. Now, of course, with all the businesses looking for new projects to support, you have to show innovation in why you deserve their support; but, now we have our alumni. Our alumni are contributing either \$100 or \$50 or \$200 a year or \$5 or \$10 or \$20 but also some of them now are putting us, SPAN, into their estate. It's very moving. This is something I started about ten years ago. We inquire of them very gently, "If this has been meaningful to you and if it's possible, you might want to remember SPAN in your estate." Just three months ago, one of the early SPANers who died, left us as one of their beneficiaries. We are [unclear] of \$125,000. What we're going to do with that money is we're going to put it into the University of Minnesota Foundation, earmarked for

SPAN. Every year we'll have about eight or ten scholarships for approximately \$1,000 to be available for a student. My dream is, before I am through, is that there will be forty scholarships for SPAN, approximately \$1,000 each, which we endowed. My philosophy has always been that no student should be discouraged from studying abroad because he says, "I can not do it." That would be enough for an incentive. Of course, we encourage the students to apply for other grants beyond that, you see.

CAC: This is all done in the summertime?

TS: Right.

CAC: The study is during the year or two.

TS: When they come back, they write their papers.

CAC: How many different places do you go in a summer, three, four?

TS: Four.

CAC: That means about eight or ten or twelve each place?

TS: Right.

CAC: Then, you have a faculty member who goes along?

TS: The faculty member trains them, accompanies them to the country and is available to help them with their work and research, not to be a hen mother, but just to be there as a mentor and helps them write their papers when they come back, supervise the writing of the papers.

CAC: But, presumably to protect them in case of illness or other . . . ?

TS: Yes. Knock wood . . . [sound of knocking on table], we did not lose a single SPANer in fifty years of operation. They all came back and they have been very active. It's a good question: this preparation under the guide of one individual.

CAC: Excuse me. I'm going to interrupt there. The students, early on in 1947, 1948, 1950, were part of the governing to set up these standards?

TS: That's right. They set up the governing board along with advisers. Then, there is now the SPAN Governing Board, which is made up of students, some former advisers, some community consultants. I am simply the liaison officer between SPAN and the college. The college now [unclear] internationalize, expanding the international experience of the university taught here

with Dean [Steven] Rosenstone, who became very excited about it. Now, he's learning a little bit about SPAN.

CAC: It takes awhile.

TS: He said to me, "Maybe, we can expand the number of countries to be visited. Maybe we can give you some scholarships." I said to him, "Anything that will enhance opportunities for student study abroad, I think we are for. We want to make sure that we keep the quality of the program." You cannot expect to have a program which is accustomed to running four groups . . . It's like a department without a budget. It's going to require more, at least out of expenses. So far, Clarke, we are the only program that really provides whatever [unclear] scholarship we have for the students. We announce, "You are SPANer, you're going to get some help." We pay for our administrative stuff out of our little contributions. Of course, I have always, very happily, volunteered my services for the program because it's so important.

CAC: You will forgive me if I am skeptical of expanding the program. It loses something of coherence if you were to double it, for example. Then, it becomes bureaucratized, I'm guessing.

TS: I think you're guessing right and that's my main concern. Rosenstone said, "I think I'd like to see it institutionalized so it would be here after you and I are gone." I said, "But, it is institutionalized."

CAC: That's right.

TS: It all depends how you define institutionalization. The students are very mindful of that. Also, it's been a mentoring, an apprenticeship ground, for the students.

CAC: Think of the good experience for the advisers.

TS: Excellent, excellent really.

[break in the interview]

CAC: Often in these interviews, we have to shift gears because we can't spend two days at this—although, I would spend two days with you and have on other occasions exploring some of the same subjects. [laughter]

I'd like to come back, briefly at least and maybe it will take us longer, to what I have perceived from many, many other interviews, and that is a growing tension, as others have expressed it and I'm expressing my own perception as well, in the scholarly world, not uniquely at Minnesota, between the generalist and the specialist, the increasing specialization. Certainly, I've seen it in our department and so have you. We take smaller slivers and segments of slivers to be our field.

It's not only in history but in so many other disciplines. You've observed that, as well. Why don't we talk about that for awhile?

TS: I shall begin by saying that we know very well that the specific excites.

CAC: The concrete.

TS: The concrete excites; there's no doubt about it. Interestingly enough, when we go through our training, all of us are not allowed to get our certificate, Ph.D., without, first of all, showing some kind of mastery of a concrete subject. That's our dissertation. Again, to use my own example, I wrote the dissertation on the Russian Palestine Society. I found, in a footnote, in William [L.] Langer's history of imperialism [*Diplomacy of Imperialism*] where he said, "In the meantime, the Russian Palestine Society began to do its job." I said, "I want to know what kind of job it did and what was this thing known as the Russian Imperial Palestine Society." It was a very specific topic, 1880 to 1914, on a philanthropic organization that was set up in imperial Russia. But, because I had a good mentor, I took a very specific topic and I was able to see tremendous dimensions of this period. I learned about philanthropy and about social history. I learned about imperialism. I learned about cultural . . . I used the expression "cultural imperialism" in my dissertation in 1960. I learned a great deal about the various classes in Russian society that were supporting it. I also learned a great deal about ideology and the way ideology wanted to utilize this institution and I also learned an awful lot about the Russian peasants, who were pilgrims that were going to the Holy Land through the service of this association. So, this is a perfectly good example, in other words, of how a small topic, guided correctly by a good mentor, can enable you to explore all kinds of possibilities. I think I became both a specialist and a generalist with my dissertation. Of course, I couldn't have done that dissertation if I didn't have a good background.

CAC: And a good adviser.

TS: A good adviser but, no, also, you had to have had studied literature, as well as political science, as well as history. I think you can see these connections much easier. I never really saw a conflict between the specialist and the generalist, in this sense. Like, given, our limitations, you have to set the stage in your life. You have to concentrate to be able to master a problem or an issue and make your contribution or you have to really do it on a broader subject by interpreting things differently instead of [unclear]. You know what I'm talking about. I never really saw a conflict between being an [unclear] specialist and a generalist. This can also be seen, first of all, in my teaching. I was dealing with the Near East. I was dealing with Russia. I was dealing with the orthodox commonwealth. I was covering a great deal of geography as well as chronology and interaction between these parts of the world and western Europe and so on. I just never felt that I could be a good specialist without being a good generalist and I could not be a good generalist without really having some command of certain basic things. At least you begin with assurance [sound of the clap of hands] of something concrete of specific and, then, you begin to grow from there or to make generalizations.

Now, I can say that honestly as well as I can say, "I never saw a conflict between teaching and research." Research, by the way, doesn't necessarily always translate into published work. Ideally, it should.

CAC: That is our expectation.

TS: It's our expectation but a man who is involved in research . . . a good deal of it could translate more into more exciting teaching, you see. Someday, hopefully, you can go back and incorporate it again. I think that's a very big question in itself. I really believe that the more research you endeavor to have under your belt, the better teacher you will be and the more pleased with yourself.

CAC: Do you have a sense, however, that the college and the university, or Mr. Stavrou, have written large on those points? Many people have shared that perception, as I do; but, they also have seen that some kinds of specialization are fragmenting rather than having a holistic possibility of moving sideways and in the curriculum, we chop it too fine. That's the issue.

TS: I had a section there that we want to talk about: the fate of the curriculum, [unclear] of the curriculum, as I like to call it. You are right; it has led to fragmentation of knowledge. Worse than that—it's not the fragmentation that bothers me—it's that a student can go through college and take an excellent specialized course in an area and the student really gets out and is not able to relate it to other bodies of knowledge. For me, Clarke, the most exciting thing that I experienced was when somebody would take a course in Chinese History or American Intellectual History or even from IT [Institute of Technology] and, then, they come and say, "The presentation you made today on the manipulation of culture by Stalin [unclear] to see certain things in another course I'm taking." This transfer of knowledge from one class to another is really fantastic if we give students a chance to experience different kinds of knowledge and, then, draw their own conclusions; but, I don't think we are able to do that anymore. First off, because their courses will all be too specialized and, then, because the students do not have as much choice. Despite all of the attempts to make them take [unclear] courses, the students really come out amazingly narrow as undergraduates and even more as graduates.

CAC: More so now than thirty years ago?

TS: More so now than thirty years ago.

CAC: Why? Where did that come from?

TS: I think a lot of it has to do with the structuring of the university curriculum in the ways that we think we should be competing in the marketplace. It's the core polarization, if you want to say it, of university life. I think we should be relevant; but, I don't really think that social scientists and humanists need to use the same language as business majors to justify our existence in the twentieth century. I think there are other ways by which we can do it. I think another

reason is because our own teaching colleagues have narrowed themselves to the point where they are incapable of going beyond their own specialization.

CAC: Some . . . many.

TS: Many. I think, in a way, it's humanly understandable because if they would be rewarded by specialized research in their field, that's where they put their efforts. They would not read anything outside of their field. They would not read poetry. They would not read literature. They would not go to museums because it takes time out of writing that one article, which may be, indeed, a contribution and which may be read by five other colleagues who articulate its significance as a contribution. That's fine but I'm explaining why I think we have moved more and more in that direction, in other words, not sufficient recognition for work which does not translate into a measurable contribution to the field.

CAC: You spoke earlier with enthusiasm and passion of the collegiality that you found in the History Department and the college here when you came in the 1960s. Again, I'm going to play devil's advocate and say that some people I've interviewed have said that this trend toward intense specialization in many disciplines resulted not only in the narrowness that you're speaking of—not invariably because there are those of us who can move sideways as well as up and down—but that it resulted also in a fragmentation or a separation of faculty and a kind of erosion of collegiality among colleges. Does that match your perception of the last thirty years along these lines?

TS: Very much so. I must say, with the exception of a couple of colleagues in the History Department with whom I really can exchange ideas over lunch or by reading books and talking about it, there is really very little. It's part of the tragedy of university life. The ideal university was to be a place where there would be fermentation of ideas and the sharing of ideas. I think we have been preoccupied with a lot of things that would fill our time but there is very little interaction and there is very little intellectual interaction. Now, I will say here what has been my salvation in this whole phenomenon. My salvation has been my graduate students.

CAC: Ah.

TS: I have been infinitely more stimulated by my graduate students than I have been by my colleagues. One of the reasons why I want to emphasize this is because, again, it bears on how you approach even the training of your own graduate students. If you want to train them just simply to write another footnote to your own dissertation—I think there is excitement there—then, that's fine. But, I have made a point that since I took modern Russian history from Peter the Great to the present, any field in that is fair claim by any student to write his dissertation in. Hopefully, I can be a personal [unclear] all the way; but, if I cannot be that person, provided I have enough confidence myself up to a certain percentage, if I've done my job right in the profession, there are many other people who will come to my aid, like I have come to their aid

when they were training their own students. I am supervising a dissertation now on brothels during the Second World War in the occupied part of the Soviet Union.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: That gets me into the question of the abuse of women during the Second World War, for example. I have studied with my students. Now, you have trained a lot of graduate students, Clarke, and you know very well what a tremendous challenge it is for us when we try to keep ahead to guide some of these bright and inquiring minds. I think the twenty-eight or thirty Ph.D. dissertations that I've supervised and the many, many M.A.s, or what have you, have really kept me going intellectually speaking.

CAC: With your inspiration and that of colleagues associated with the work that you do, they make their own choice of what they want to do?

TS: Right.

CAC: I've had forty-four Ph.D.s in American studies, social work and history. I was looking at that the other day and, at the most, six or seven were close to the kind of scholarship I do in welfare history. The rest were all different kinds of things, but related enough so that I wasn't a stranger to what they were doing.

TS: I can second that and say that has been the part I have chosen and it's been rewarded intellectually. I'm also very pleased to say that all these people have gone on to publish their works, either as monographs or . . . then, all of them being employed. I think part of the reason has to do not only with the dissertation they wrote but also with the way you train them as graduate students to have their specific focus but also have a broader context in which they put that focus, which enables them to be useful on the college level or the university level, a place where you are very specialized and, at the same time, while they want to do some general course. Here is a paradox now. We speak a great deal about specialization in a major university, like the University of Minnesota. At the same time, within our own department, they speak so much about world history, while at the same time, we are not training world historians. Some of the people who are teaching these courses are, unfortunately—I'm sorry to say this—poorly trained to do that sort of thing. They know very little about the other parts of the world. This is not world history. They're really dealing with a particular, local, historical phenomenon which they interpret in their own methodological way and they believe you can project it to the world at large. It works, sometimes, being who they are, human processes [unclear], or what have you; but, it's not world history.

[End of Tape 1, Side 2]

[Tape 2, Side 1]

CAC: We're now on side three continuing a conversation about tensions and ways to overcome tensions within the trend toward specialization and generalization.

TS: I think, in the final analysis, we are victims or we are trapped into a race for time. We like to think of ourselves as being broad and understanding languages and history and literature and we, also, like to think that we are keeping up with all the trends in theory and criticism.

CAC: It's not easy. It's a big assignment.

TS: It's a very big assignment; so, instead of either admitting our ignorance and simply try to move toward it by reading as much as we can, we shrink and we draw into our shell and the security of a specialization. I think that is really sad. If there was a graceful way by which we could all be encouraged to engage in the process from the new developments, then indeed, that would prevent most of us from arteriosclerosis and from really not feeling passive or un-renewed, as the story goes. Indeed, if we accepted learning as an ongoing process and not as something that we use to prove to each other that we are there and, therefore, we deserve the award for it
...

CAC: Ahhh, we're back to reward systems.

TS: We are coming back to it. Ultimately, that's what had determined the whole phenomenon.

CAC: We'll come back to this in different ways. You were talking of students in your own college of graduate students. They have a sense of collegiality, a shared experience, and a shared interest and passion. Is that different in the 1990s from what it was in the 1960s when you began?

TS: Yes, it is. Again, I'm not really sure how much of it can be attributed to the change of faculty attitude to the training of students. I think a lot of it has to do with that. I remember in the 1960s that students had clear expectations of how much could be expected of them by the time they took their general exams. In the 1980s and 1990s, that's not really all that relevant as long as they know how to do certain things. It's not really very important how much they should know. I have sat in some of the most miserable Ph.D. exams in the last ten years. In the words of a colleague from another department who said, "He is a flat exam. I wouldn't pass an undergraduate if he or she were taking this exam." We say, "She's well-read. She didn't do very well today. But, in fact, she has written some good papers." Maybe that's true. I think a lot of it has had to do with the demands that we have on ourselves as faculty members and the demands we have on our students. About ten years ago, Professor [John] Munholland and I made it very clear to students in European History that if they wanted us to be on their committees, there are certain basic things they better be well-acquainted with and we don't care how good they are in the field, under whomever adviser they're working. That eliminated a lot

of potential people; but, at the same time, it made those who wanted to have us on there committees [unclear] and they knew what to expect from us and what we would expect from them. I really think it has changed dramatically and I believe very strongly that . . .

CAC: Not only here but nationally?

TS: Nationally, of course. It's a national thing. This is very closely connected with this abominable, phenomenal inflation of grades which, to me, is really something that we cannot control anymore.

CAC: Historically, when do you think that set in and why?

TS: I think that began to set in more in the early 1980s.

CAC: Why, do you think?

TS: I think, partly, because there was a lot of attrition in many classes, like consumerism. It was all the ways of giving people what they wanted to make sure you attract them. Secondly, I think it was very closely connected with this business of rights.

CAC: Ah.

TS: You come into my class, taking my class . . . "I want to know why I sat in the class for a whole year. I did the readings. Why should he get an *A* and I get a *B* or a *C*?" Given the possibilities of so much complexity that could result from this, people chose the easy way out. Then, it also, I think, on the graduate level, reached the point where if you gave a student a *B*, there was no way that they could be competitive for grants or what have you because the objective criterion was—the most measurable—the GPA [Grade Point Average]. Anybody who was below, say, the 3.9 would not count . . . 3.9 was used, sometimes. After awhile, everybody starting edging up and if you would dare to give a *B* to a student, who is not [unclear], you [unclear] can be accused of either undermining a college student or maybe you have something personal against me and things like that. I think we really, while talking big about standards, we have undermined our own profession without realizing it and we have come to the point where—as much as I love students . . . I don't think there are many people that have given as many hours of their time to the students—as a profession, we have become hostages to the whim of graduate students on trivial issues. I'm not talking about major issues where I think they have every right to, you see. Sometimes, I think we're making things even more difficult for our students. When you have a student for three years who has an incomplete when you expected other people to do it on time . . . then, it comes three years later and if do you dare give them a *B*? "Don't you think this is an *A* paper?" It may very well be a publishable paper but it's three years down the line.

Then, there is the question of challenged students, the mentally or physically challenged. You have to deal with them. I think that's a very legitimate issue but there has to be . . . Some of these students are remarkable. For example, I have a student right now who made it very clear to me, "I don't want any [unclear]. I simply want more hours to finish my project." All right, that's a different thing. When they use that in order to force you to adopt different standards, otherwise, then, you're not a good human being or a concerned teacher . . . instead of being concerned in other areas, in other words, we are really [unclear] around these things. My feeling is that the inflation of grades is really pretty bad. Nowadays, as you know, on the one hand we say that we do not want a lot of graduate students. On the other hand, we know that we cannot justify our existence without graduate students. President Yudof even said, "In the final analysis, what counts is our students." Of course. You don't have to have President Yudof to tell you that to know that. We all come here to teach people. If we don't have them to teach, you cannot teach them.

CAC: With incentive management, monies go to departments that increase their enrollments. That's kind of the incentive to move toward different standards.

TS: How many students do we know who move from one department to another because the departments, for example, do not require senior papers? Some people are not very good at doing that sort of thing. I think you're right. There is this consumerism, I like to call it.

CAC: Ah ha.

TS: Consumerism is the word. In other words, it's just like buying a camera. You can return it if you don't like it.

CAC: Our colleague, Tom B. Jones in Ancient History, used to say, at the beginning of his classes, that there was one grade he would not give and that was *I* for incomplete and students completed his course first. If they had to take an incomplete, they did it with someone else. [laughter] That was a very rigid standard; but, it worked for him.

TS: That's true. I don't think we have much of that anymore and that includes myself. If you get a group of fifteen or twenty students and you are not willing to entertain that thought, I can assure you that four or five will drop. The question is, do you let them go at the end of the term or do you try to see them through?

CAC: This may lead to a comment or two about what you have chosen in this little memorandum to call a volatility of university curriculum. What do you mean by that?

TS: I am trying to figure it out really. It's a much broader category than you may think. I'm thinking in terms of whether the future of universities, especially in programs and curriculum, is the result of careful planning or the result of accidents because of certain strong individuals, faculty or administrators, who happen to be in a position of authority. I tend to think it's more

the latter. In other words, there hasn't been much systematic or programmatic development. Some things developed through the years because certain fields grew and so on; but, ultimately, people decide that we have another very important professor and he'll develop his own field and that's fine, too. Then, we begin to suspect that certain programs are costly; therefore, they have to be eliminated and requirements set in. I go back to the days when you wrote your report about undergraduates or the curriculum. I don't really know exactly what your motives were in the recommendation that you made at the time.

CAC: I think Mr. Stavrou is referring to the 1979-1980 curriculum for the Arts College, undergraduate?

TS: That's right. Thank you. At that time, you were still operating within a certain canon and you were redistributing them, you see. You were simply trying to make sure that undergraduates were exposed to a big variety of the menu on that language. One of those was language, if I remember correctly.

CAC: Yes.

TS: Now, what has happened to language since?

CAC: You tell me.

TS: It has almost disappeared. First of all, the number of languages available at a major university like our own is pathetic. With the exception of Spanish and German, every other language, since I've been here, has been reduced. Russian Language . . . there were twelve people when I came here. There are three now.

CAC: I didn't know that. Then, there was some contest over Chinese language just this year?

TS: That's right.

CAC: I'm guessing that one quarter to one third of the people in the world speak Chinese?

TS: Yes, that's right. The teaching of languages . . . the requirement of learning a language is a great experience because you learn your own language better if you study another language.

CAC: Oh, yes.

TS: Just like studying another culture helps you to reflect on your own culture. Why did it go away? Did this go away because of another report, like the Chambers' Report, which was advocating languages?

CAC: We also advocated at least two or three quarters of study in a culture or civilization other than Anglo-American. [Actually, it was Euro-American.]

TS: That's right, that's right. So, why are those, suddenly, either being modified or being removed from the curriculum? Is it because of economics or is it because of ideology?

CAC: Or because of consumer demand?

TS: Or because of consumer demand, yes. These are all very legitimate questions. But, whatever the reasons are, they have dealt a very telling blow, not only to languages but also to International Studies.

CAC: In a global society—I would guess all disciplines equally—in History, our students have to have those languages and in some other areas, perhaps, not; but I think that's probably not true. Everybody should know the languages now.

TS: Let me give you a little example. A good business executive will hire, should hire, a person to direct their Brussels' office, for example, who can move comfortably in another culture with the use of a language or an appreciation of another culture. He can always learn the specifics.

CAC: Of business.

TS: Of business. There's no doubt in my mind that all of us need that—maybe not all of us, after all, can master many languages. Stop and think what a tremendous travesty this is.

CAC: Language teaching improved with the NDEA [National Defense Education Act] programs in the 1950s and 1960s. The language I had, Theofanis, at a good liberal arts college at Carleton, 1939-1942, was just perfectly awful. I took French and German and I didn't know those languages at all.

TS: That's the travesty I'm talking about.

CAC: In the 1960s, I think that language instruction—I talked with Gerhard Weiss about this—just took a jump upwards and forwards; but, now, it's fading again, you're suggesting?

TS: I am suggesting it is fading. I'm suggesting, also, that the language teachers, because they are caught in this unfortunate dilemma, again, of method versus content, are going to be talking an awful lot about how to teach the language not teaching it. This is just my own view. It's writing about how to teach a language that's going to get you, again, the rewards and not the actual teaching of the language that will get you the rewards, you see. This is all part of what I call the volatility of the curriculum and how it is affected by so many different factors. I am very much alarmed by the decline of languages at our universities. I call it a travesty because how can you really speak about globalization and how can you speak about internationalization

when you do not have the languages that will enable our training of undergraduate and graduate students to do research in those fields? That's very serious. It really is a joke when all is said and done.

CAC: Area Studies was meant to be a way to provide a larger context, right?

TS: Yes.

CAC: There was a Russian Area Studies program?

TS: Yes, there was.

CAC: East Asian?

TS: There still is East Asian.

CAC: Latin American?

TS: Latin American, yes.

CAC: You're more familiar with that than I am. Say something about those programs and where they came from. Of course, they had good money from Ford, and Rockefeller, and the federal government, and the NDEA.

TS: Russian Area Studies, Clarke, the way I remember it, developed during the 1950s especially. That was part of an attempt to understand the cultures, and the economy, and the political institutions of these countries with which we had to deal and which we did not understand. Language was considered to be a fairly integral part of that. I think a little money was put in this country and I think it was one of the most beautiful experiments in international education in the 1950s and 1960s. I was really deep into it. However, from the very beginning, area studies received a lot of criticism in some universities, especially at Minnesota where they were more theoretically oriented and where they believed in what they called problem solving instead of concentrating on an area. I still do not see the conflict between problem solving and area studies. But, I think, when you get down to pushing very hard, you'll find out what the problem was. Many of the people who advocated, especially at Minnesota . . . these are [unclear]. You have people who are really very poor in foreign languages. Why did we not have the same hostility toward it at other more prestigious universities in the country? Even nowadays, area studies, of course, if you conceive it as just simply language and literature without making the connections with other institutions, it's kind of traditional; but, still you cannot really make these linkages, and you cannot interpret, and you cannot interrelate if you do not know something about these various disciplines. So, I see no conflict whatsoever between area studies and model building and theorizing; but, I see the problem when people feel insecure, when they did not have either the good fortune to study languages or to be brought up in the areas from where, say,

Slovak languages or East European languages was part of their upbringing and education or they didn't have enough time or willingness to invest time to learn the language. I've heard people say, "If I have a graduate student who can go with me as my interpreter, I don't need to know the language."

CAC: I see.

TS: If I may be so bold, at Minnesota, we have done the university a great disservice because we have repeatedly crippled the development of international studies by using the Area Studies as a scapegoat. We have never really allowed Area Studies and, consequently, International Studies to develop on an institutional basis. Yet, remarkably, the University of Minnesota has had international visibility and this is thanks to the profile of the faculty, individual faculty, who, I must say, were always supported on an individual basis by the college or even by Central Administration but never, never on a programmatic basis. That's the reason why we have never had really a visible international studies program at Minnesota of any kind. We can build it up and really change mirrors to make us look more than we are. Now, we're at a crucial point again. We are reinventing the wheel. We are trying to institute the Center for Global Studies to replace the Institute of International Studies. Our current dean puts a lot of stake in this. He even wrote the brochure which was distributed at breakfast when Secretary [Madeleine] Albright was here. I wish him well and I think it could be an extremely imaginative thing; but, it can only be that to the amount in which we put things into it.

CAC: I have some persons on tape saying, "Oh, well. The Ford grants ran out and that made it difficult to sustain these programs."

TS: Ridiculous. Ridiculous. This university could still, at this point, attract funds here if the university showed the minimum of commitment to international studies, the minimum. In fact, there was somebody who came from Washington not too long ago and was talking to one of our administrators and she was shocked when the administrator simply started talking a language that we have heard many times, "But, area studies went with the Cold War." Are you talking about an ideological area studies? The best area studies programs in the 1960s and 1970s were not telling people to fight the Soviets. They were not teaching people how to fight the Soviets. They were teaching people how to understand that system. Admittedly, we oftentimes came to certain presuppositions. I'm amazed! Even some of the old Cold War trained historians . . . how terribly, terribly understanding they were in their efforts to understand what makes them tick.

CAC: Why did Columbia and Indiana—just to cite two examples—pull this off and we ran into trouble with it in the 1980s?

TS: Because there was an institutional commitment and because Herman Wells, for example, would say, "The state of Indiana has a responsibility to support this," and that, of course, attracted . . . Money attracts money, as you know. In the case of Columbia, Averell Harriman and other people realized how important it was. They put money into the enterprise, you see.

Minnesota has never done it for international studies programmatically. Indeed, as I said, they would do it on an institutional basis. They would do it for individual scholars or individual projects. I must underscore that. They have been good about supporting individuals but not on a programmatic basis. Maybe it has to do, again, with the amount of money it takes to set up a bureaucracy to run such a program. I don't know.

CAC: Let me make another suggestion and, again, I invite you to modify, correct, or reject it. I've seen in the Geography Department, for example—they used to have area folks: Africa, Latin America, Asia and so forth—it seems to me, that when those persons retire, they're replaced by someone in methodology.

TS: Yes.

CAC: You're agreeing with that?

TS: Yes, yes.

CAC: That would suggest that it's very difficult to maintain an Area Studies program in Latin America, for example, if there's not a Latin American geographer.

TS: That's right. That's right.

CAC: Decisions are being made at the college and even departmental level not to do that at the same time that the nation and societies everywhere have gone global. I don't understand that.

TS: It's a matter of definition of what people call global. What's global to you is not global to me and vice versa. I think you're right. I think that's an area where we may pay a very big price. Let me deviate and give you this story.

CAC: Please.

TS: In 1968, in a special van outside Novosibirsk [Soviet Union], I was there with a group of distinguished colleagues from the University of Minnesota.

CAC: This was the Hill?

TS: That's right. That's when the Hill Foundation sent us there . . . a wonderful, wonderful opportunity we had. Inevitably, we were waiting to go to Lake Baikal and we were discussing—I will never forget this as long as I live—when a colleague from the Economics Department said, "Historians are very narrow." That surprised me a little bit because I always thought that historians with all their problems, one thing that they cannot be is, is be narrow. I said to him, "What do you mean by that?" He said, "You speak about particular cultures and particular national histories but we speak of our *models*, models, which are global." I said, "Fine. I

understand the global. Now, how do you build these models? I know you have the theory and you have certain assumptions and what have you. Where do you get your information, the blocks, the mortar to build this model?" He said, "I ask my students to read a history book."

CAC: [laughter]

TS: Now, I said to him, "Who will write that history book?" Philip Raup, I must say, to his credit . . .

CAC: Oh, yes.

TS: . . . who was present there, said, "Theo is right. The way we continue to train students, pretty soon there will be nobody who will be capable to write the kind of book which is so terribly indispensable so that you'll be able to build the mortar intelligently." I think that we have dealt the Area Studies program and International Studies a very serious blow. We have used Area Studies as a scapegoat and I think it's unfair to the area studies concept as originally put forth and I am amazed to find intelligent people who say . . . It's almost a liability to mention the word area studies, nowadays. The other day, I was part of a committee here at the university and I said to them, "Let's change. If it's going to create so much problem, let's not use the word area studies anymore. Let's just use the word global studies, anything that would just take away this excuse that people have to torpedo any attempt of internationalizing our educational curriculum.

CAC: But, my friend, if the figures you state are approximately accurate and I assume they are precisely accurate, a reduction in language and literature in Russia from twelve to three, makes it much more difficult for you. You have to take some of that burden of teaching, if not elementary language at least the literature language part of it?

TS: Our three colleagues over there are generously over-worked. They are wonderful, all three of them that are there, now.

CAC: It throws the burden back on you.

TS: It throws a lot of burden on us. I think more than that, it just simply deprives of us of that critical mass that you need. Not that there necessarily has to be that much exchange of ideas between professors but their very presence. The presence on a campus of a good political scientist in your field sharpens you when you speak about Perestroika or Glasnost, to be responsible.

CAC: Do we have a Soviet expert in political science now?

TS: After Mr. [John] Turner retired . . .

CAC: But, he didn't have the language.

TS: He didn't have the language. After Mr. Turner retired, he was replaced by Evelyn Davidheiser, who is a very good political scientist, trained by Jerry Hoff—she's also author of a book—but is a perfectly good example . . . I don't really want to get involved in the private politics of departments.

CAC: That's all right.

TS: It is a perfectly good example where, I think, they felt that she was not theoretical enough. So, she has no tenure anymore. That's their decision. But, we do not have a political scientist. We don't really have an economist. So, Russian Area Studies has been reduced to history and literature.

[break in the interview]

TS: I want to be very clear here. Departments have their right to follow whatever path they want in making the department the most visible department and what have you; but, I think in the long run, it's the trendy thing. These things are trendy; I really must put it in that category. Some of it is intellectually stimulating; but, in many [unclear]. Why, for example, I ask, Harvard doesn't have the need always to be on the cutting edge in some of these fields? Is it because they have good professors? Or is it because they don't really need that as a way to make their presence in the larger academy?

CAC: I'm going to make a statement that to make one's way in the national academy is more important now in 1998 than it was in 1960 when you came.

TS: Correct.

CAC: Why?

TS: I guess one of the reasons is what you, yourself, have said. There was that explosion of opportunity in the 1960s. Fields were growing. Everybody was welcome and encouraged to make a contribution. I think there was a greater degree of tolerance in which way one could go. Nowadays—you can tell me this more than I as an American social historian—the academy has gone through a phase where certain specific fields have managed to dominate it, to dictate what is a correct way of doing things and some of those correct ways are, indeed, correct, I must say; but, it has been done in the most incorrect way sometimes of having the tendency of discouraging broad inquiries, even those which might disagree with one's particular ideological bent. At our own university, for example, we had a certain person who taught a crucially key course—by that I mean a course that all graduate students have to take—and the first day you meet with a graduate student, you tell them, "This is not the way to do history. This cannot be done. It's

passé. It's gone." Especially when it is a person who himself had not been actively engaged in research in the last few years—he is a good student of the trends, to be sure, of what is happening—that, to me, is almost worse than if, in the 1960s, many people were forced to go into certain fields because of availability of grants by the national government because you are really, in many respects, narrowing and creating for a malaise in the academy and for an hostility in the academy which, even nowadays, runs the risk of splintering even the American Historical Association.

CAC: Splintering professional associations and corroding or eroding collegiality.

TS: Clarke! I have to say this. We have deviated from our hope for outline; but, I must say, that if I were to reflect on the atmosphere of the 1960s and the 1980s and compare and contrast, I would put it in these very single terms. Most of us joined the academy—academy in the broad sense, university teaching and scholarship—partly because we had a sense we would enjoy it. We felt it was almost a privileged profession.

CAC: And did!

TS: Thirdly, it was looked at as a mission, a calling. I really have to say—you were my chairman and I can check—never once did the idea of salary matter to me. I never, in all my years of teaching, did I go into my chair to complain that I did not get the right raise. Somehow I felt, in the words of St. Paul, "Those who preach the gospel, shall live by the gospel."

CAC: [laughter]

TS: I felt I was going to make a decent living. It was a wonderful international forum, local, national, international forum. I had all these wonderful associations; but—to paraphrase one of our presidents—I really believed in the 1960s and 1970s that all of us were not asking what the university will do for you but what we could do for the university. I really believed very strongly that that was at the heart of the enterprise. By the time we reached the 1980s, the process had been totally reversed. We became what I call "merchants of learning." The conditions that we put on the college is really very interesting. Who started the process will be the thing that someday historians will have to arrive at. Was it really the professors themselves or did the administrators bring it on their own head? I don't know at this point; but, it's very interesting how a form of—I don't want to use the word corruption—mutual . . .

CAC: How about the word subversion?

TS: Subversion is the word. Seduction is the word I might say. I remember that there was a problem with some of our senior colleagues for \$200 and problems of that sort in the 1960s and 1970s; but, I also remember that some senior professors . . .

CAC: Not until the 1970s when we opened the budget. They didn't know who was getting more or less.

TS: That's right. I also remember that, one year, the senior professors chose not to get a raise in order to give some of the younger people a break. Now, what we see then happening in the 1980s is tremendous pressure on the academy to subsidize them to an inordinate level. There is no university professor in the social sciences that's worth the kind of salary that some people are getting. I'm saying it not out of envy for those who have been able to get it but because of what it has done to the whole spirit. I am not really sure if I would want every colleague to make \$120,000 even if they could. Most of them don't need it, anyway. There is never enough money anyway to meet our wants. The whole thing became very commercial, the whole enterprise. I think that's the bottom line.

CAC: And a lot of ego involvement.

TS: A great deal of ego involved. Then, after awhile, the discrepancies became huge. [unclear] really \$120,000. We have some professors, even in our own department, who are making about \$50,000. I refuse to believe that the person who is making \$130,000 is three times as good. I remember when I came here that I was the beneficiary of changing times, too. Once, my salary jumped from \$11,000 to \$20,000. That was a big thing. That was a time when I think I was the third highest paid member of the department—which is not the case now. I'm sure there were people who were feeling upset because of the way I was favored by the changing times. I think the whole thing has gone so much out of line that it has affected the other people who are still a member and make their contribution.

CAC: Yes.

TS: I always maintain that a major university like ours should be imaginative enough to find ways not just to reward people for their services but to encourage them—that's the word I want—to continue in the enterprise and not just simply marginalize them so they withdraw.

CAC: If I were to suggest to any historian who may be interested in higher education the last third of the twentieth century that they look at the disparity of salaries between hot departments and cold departments and salaries within large departments between those who were hot and, as we always say, on the cutting edge and those who are performing other services, I think statistically one could see—in some places that I know the facts, it would be the case—that the gap between the lowest and the highest has grown the last twenty-five years . . .

TS: Yes.

CAC: . . . both between departments and within departments.

TS: The tragedy is really that sometimes within a particular department—I'm not talking about people who, either because of a personality or idiosyncrasy, have not performed to the best of their capacity but I'm talking sometimes of people who have rendered a real service to their profession and the institutions—because of all these changing times, let's put it, the discrepancy, again, is so dramatically huge.

CAC: Let me make the suggestion that it comes from other interviews and from my own perceptions that it was in the mid 1970s when budgets were tight that orders came down from Central Administration and, then, through college administration that the smaller sums that were available for merit increase should go to those who had proven published scholarship. That became the criterion. When things were tight, I think the reward system shifted, consciously. These were not just things in the air but they were directives or strong suggestions at least, right?

TS: Yes.

CAC: I saw that coming myself in the mid 1970s.

TS: In a way, that was good because it sent a message that this a major research institution and we cannot really afford to pretend that we can get by by simply doing the minimum.

CAC: We wanted to be the Harvard of the . . .

TS: But, on the other hand, what it did, Clarke, is that in the 1960s and 1970s, we suddenly changed the rules in midstream and people who were encouraged to be good teachers and [unclear] the languages . . . I remember writing a letter to Vice-President [A] Linck in connection with three of my colleagues in the Russian Languages who were not allowed promotions precisely because they were not . . . I wrote a letter and I said, "It's unfair for these people. They have invested their time. They are excellent teachers. Two of them are publishing scholars and they will publish more. It's unfair." I was very happy that Vice-President Linck reversed the decision of the dean. They were all promoted. They are the ones who are still here and they're holding us together, you see. Rules changed in the 1970s, as you said. Up to a point, I think the directives, were good; but, after that, once they gave us the [unclear], then, there was too much fragmentation. In other words, on the one hand, [unclear] teaching. You wanted to be a good teacher but teaching, on the other hand, is not as much rewarded as research.

CAC: And it's more difficult to measure.

TS: It is more difficult to measure. In a very perverse way, I must say, the old system, when I first came to Minnesota, where the old boys used to sit around and say something like this—I remember the first time I saw these associate professors and heard their deliberations—"What about this particular individual?" I remember the professor who made this statement, too. He said, "Shall we give him average or less than average or more than average?" Somebody would

take on the responsibility and say what the average should be and the average would be that. You know, it's too general a way, to be sure, but I'm not sure that the precise measuring of later years was any fairer than that.

CAC: Yes. [laughter] Mr. Stavrou is referring to a point system that many departments developed.

TS: That's right.

CAC: A weighted point system. I tell you, my friend, we've been at this quite awhile and I'm hungry and you're hungry. Why don't we stop and go have a bowl of soup?

TS: Are we going to spend a little time on a concluding statement?

CAC: Oh, we'll come back. We're coming back! We just need a little nourishment.

TS: If we're coming back, that's great but if we are not coming back, I certainly did not want this wonderful occasion to reminisce to end on a low note.

CAC: I agree.

[End of Tape 2, Side 1]

[Tape 2, Side 2]

CAC: Mr. Stavrou and I had a little lunch, a little salad, a little soup and, now, our energy level is back, I hope, to what it was at 9:30, 9:45. There's always a problem in catching up the tenor, the direction, of an interview after there's been a break; so, we'll try very hard to pick up and move forward again. You get a certain momentum going and it's hard to break it, artificially like that.

We had agreed to talk about this notion of—it is an ambiguous notion but it has very concrete meaning to you and to me—the intellectual or cultural climate. We are, after all, a community here of very diverse staff, administrators, professors, students, undergraduates, graduates, and, then, the community that surrounds us, both the intellectual and the physical environment. That's not even a question. That's just a subject. Go ahead.

TS: It's an important subject for me, as it should be for anybody who has devoted an entire life. This is my thirty-eighth year and if health permits, I intend to retire in the year 2005. That means I will have taught forty-five years at this university. To have survived for forty-five years in any environment and to have enjoyed most of it, the climate is extremely important. The spirit is extremely important. I have had occasion to reflect on how good my fortune has been here, first of all, in the number of excellent colleagues I have enjoyed to have and the opportunities

I have had to develop a variety of courses in a variety of fields and then, the number of good graduate students and undergraduate students I have had. As you once said to me, before I learned how to phrase these things well, "Well, you are performing at all levels," you said to me once, undergraduate, graduate . . .

CAC: Oh, I see.

TS: . . . and the community. That was what you were really talking about.

CAC: There is a layering, sure.

TS: Of course, there have been a few difficult moments and difficult years. We put ourselves in a form of disappointment and isolation and things like that. Sometimes, we are to blame and, sometimes, factors are beyond our own control. Having said all of that, nevertheless, it seems to me that we have a double obligation here to create an atmosphere so we can be able to train people who are entrusted to us the best we know how.

CAC: Ah, trust, there's a good word.

TS: Others are entrusted to us and they are trusting their life and their career into our hands, you see.

CAC: It's like being a parent, in a way, right?

TS: That's right. It's important for that and, secondly, it's also important that you create an atmosphere for yourself because if you don't do that, if you are not appeasing yourself, you cannot really be effective. You cannot help but pass this sense of malaise or cynicism onto your students—and who wants to do that? Historically, we are that which we are because of the experiences which we have had. I've been fortunate to have good advice and good advisers; therefore, I almost took it for granted. That's the way I have tried to behave toward the people whom I would encounter. I'm saying this because, oftentimes, we get disappointed either from our colleagues through certain misunderstandings or, sometimes, as a result of administration who see things differently. All I'm trying to say is that the poem by Cavafy called *The Walls* is really terribly to the point. He refers to it in the following words—I'm paraphrasing now in this very brief poem—: "Without shame, without consideration, they have built walls around me." Then, he says, "Where was I when they were building those walls?"

CAC: [laughter]

TS: In other words, very gently allowing them to do that. We're contributing to the building of those walls and the self-imposed isolation and what have you. I guess the big question is, how does one go about creating the best possible environment for himself and for his colleagues and for his students? I really think the most important one is to be yourself. I really do believe,

above all, that there is a certain commitment of integrity when you say you're going to be yourself and you're going to do your dead-level best to make a contribution to this particular place. If you're not willing to live with that, whatever you do and how successful you are, you're contributing less [unclear] to a climate which will make your colleagues, and your students, and yourself be a pleasant learner or, as we used to say, a good citizen.

CAC: Yes.

TS: It seems to me that there is enough good material to wrap onto all of us to neutralize the negative tendencies that come along in life, whatever they happen to be and in the university of all places. This almost sounds like too much reminiscing right now; but, it's one of the few places where a person can afford to be optimistic. This is the thing that saddens me, when at the end of a career as people reflect, they can think of the bad things more than the good things of those forty years. Then, you ask the question, something must have gone wrong somewhere along the way? Some things have gone wrong; but, I think the things that went well and right outweigh the things that have gone wrong.

CAC: It was partly with you, Theofani, that I was introduced to existential thought through Nikos Kazantzakis; although, I had another friend who was leading me down [Albert] Camus' path, at the same time. I'm uneasy with that optimism or hopefulness. You remember what Mr. Kazantzakis wished upon his gravestone—which I gather is there—"I have no hope."

TS: That's right. "I wish for nothing. I hope for nothing. Therefore, I am free."

CAC: Yes.

TS: I guess, really, Clarke, what that was saying is that whatever you do, however noble it is, if your motives are not right, ultimately it enslaves you. I always said, "There is one thing that I constantly check myself with: what are your motives for doing something?" I really put that as a basic test to my life, whether it's in preparing a lecture, whether it is staying in the profession, whether it is writing a book or an article. I always say, "What is your motive for doing it?" Of course, there are some things we cannot control; but, basically, if your motive is one that has, above all, an ulterior motive for getting something in return, you're going to be disappointed—therefore, you're not free. My feeling has always been, "Cast your bread upon the waters" or do your very best and move on in life. I think, especially in the teaching profession

...

CAC: And take your risks and your chances.

TS: Of course, there were a few moments when we thought that we would be shown more respect and deference by graduate students for whom we have done so much and they don't show it immediately. Stan Lehmberg told me, once, told me at lunch, "I have learned never to expect gratitude for the things I do."

CAC: [laughter]

TS: That's really very wise, you see. Basically, you do things not because you want people to thank you but only because either the things are important or because we enjoy doing them or things of that sort. I think checking yourself and your motives, for me anyway, has been kind of a nice device to get me back on the road of why I got into the profession to begin with.

CAC: You may have introduced me to Cavafy's *Walls*. I don't remember that you did. You know Robert Frost's *Mending Walls*, right?

TS: Yes.

CAC: The tension there between some walls make good neighbors, on the one hand, and on the other hand, there's something in nature that doesn't like walls. It knocks them over. [laughter] That's a wonderful metaphor. I like Cavafy's . . .

TS: He's very good at that. He has a very economical style. He is not too flowery, too wordy, and with certain symbols. He carries certain imagery which is unforgettable, like with his window, for example, when he said, "Here I walk in this dark room looking for the windows but the windows are not to be found. Maybe it is better this way. Who knows what horrible truth the light may reveal?"

CAC: [laughter]

TS: The very opposite, in other words, how people sometimes are really afraid to probe all the way when you are inquiring about something—which is another aspect of the climate of an academic environment.

CAC: And you [unclear] to go where you must.

TS: That's right. But, Clarke, listen now, we are talking here and we made references to a couple of poets, a couple of writers. I remember very well when I first met you that I was telling that when I first came to America I was reading [John] Steinbeck. I had read Steinbeck through and through. The very fact that we could be at a university, in addition to the courses we teach because they are expected of us as a minimum way of fulfilling our contractual agreement in a center of learning, we had the opportunity to learn by reading widely, by discussing widely, by going to lunch with somebody who could share ideas. That's what I mean by creating an atmosphere, which is not realized to its fullest, I think. I'm kind of putting a little plug in for future generations as they are entering into a much more . . . Who knows what the electronic age of the twenty-first century will do, the computer age, in terms of [unclear] every experience even more or bringing us closer together, at the same time, in a formalistic, mechanical way? Who knows, in other words, what these things will do for us? It's important that we seek to create an atmosphere in ways that really count if we are to be the most effective.

CAC: Sometimes, it's called friendship, isn't it?

TS: Yes.

CAC: I was thinking in the 1960s when I was troubled that my two closest friends introduced me to Kazantzakis on the one hand and Camus on the other.

TS: And for the time, they saw you through a little bit . . .

CAC: You bet.

TS: [laughter] . . . until we all outgrow some of these experiences.

CAC: Onto different things . . . that is true. The other image you were using here from Cavafy, the windows, in what direct way does that bear on academic freedom or the freedom to pursue, even when you get to the point that you don't want to know that next thing? I've had that happen to me when writing a biography. I got to a point in the subject's life when I kind of hesitated. I really didn't want to intrude on that aspect. I did but . . .

TS: I'll tell you what, Clarke, that's a personal choice. If one chooses to stay in the dark, that's all right. If the dark softens them and they don't want to open too big a window and they're satisfied with a small flashlight kind of a ray . . . If that's all they are capable of doing—although, I like to hope that they can be stretched beyond that—that's fine. What I am really concerned about here is, sometimes, directives have a tendency to encourage people to stay in the dark . . .

CAC: To stay safe.

TS: . . . because they're afraid of what the light will reveal. If you have a political agenda, if you have a clear definition of how the universe functions, if you really think you have the answers to the world's problems, you do not really dare to look over God's shoulders. I think you may not see everything you want to see if you look over God's shoulders—but, I think you should aspire to look over God's shoulders.

CAC: I was thinking of what came to me—I won't say it was a difficult moral problem. An historian has to take all human activity for his or her concern, analysis, investigation. You do that with biography, right? Then, there's an intrusion upon personhood, right? That, to me, was the greater risk. As an historian, I could, I think, go where I thought the evidence was taking me; but, with biography, there was a kind of moral problem of intruding upon the viability of another person, dead to be sure but one for whom I had respect, and I had to respect his integrity. Have you ever run into that?

TS: We run into it, it seems to me, all the time, whether it's in writing letters or writing a diary, as well as writing a biography. I really would say and I will lament that one of the things the historical profession has robbed itself of is the writing of good historical biographies. Recently, we have discouraged the writing of good biographies and I think what that has done, because it was really done in a certain way . . . a certain person was born, such and such a date. While, in fact, there are very imaginative ways to write a good biography. I really think what that has wrought for historians is, precisely, the opportunity to enter into this [unclear] of where does a personal experience really enter? Without violating the objective too dramatically, nevertheless, you become part of this whole historical moment. I really believe those who have not read biographies and who scorn biographies are not, in the final analysis, the students they could be. It's one thing to analyze the whole society by using statistics or things like that; but, it's quite a different thing to come to grips . . .

CAC: With another human being.

TS: . . . with another human being. Exactly, and a biography does that for you.

CAC: It requires a level of respectfulness, however. I've heard my colleagues . . . In American History for example, it's very easy to make fun of [President] Theodore Roosevelt. There are lots of good jokes for sophomores. Somewhere, very early in my teaching career, I could be critical of one aspect of his career and what the consequences were of this or that; but, it seems to me, the past had to be approached with a certain basic respect for someone else's life or doing social history, the lives of many different people.

TS: Correct.

CAC: It isn't always present. We talked in the 1970s, I think, about academic freedom and *responsibility*. It seems to me that's a good balance that the institution came to—not that we all saw it the same way. That balance of freedom and responsibility, to me, is a central part.

TS: It's something to strive for. Since we're talking about spirit or climate, I would also like to say that part of creating your own spirit, in the final analysis—really I don't care how much money you make and I don't care how prominent you are in your field—you have to create your own atmosphere. It's as simple as that. Certainly, in any department, in any unit, there must be at least another human being with whom you should be able to commune or communicate. The older I get and the more I'm coming toward the end of my career, I'm thinking seriously of what a great responsibility it is not only for yourself, for your students, for the university community, but, especially, for mentoring the young faculty who will be coming in.

CAC: Ah!

TS: I really think our own department, right now, is going through a very, very real crisis because we are going to be hiring a lot of young people, I hope. I think what we need is really

important people who, I would say, are between fifty-five and sixty-five who would be able to serve both as good administrators, if possible, to see the department through this period of transition, but also mentoring these young scholars in the way we were mentored. I use that word and I'm serious about it.

CAC: When I came . . . Ernest Osgood. I was an apprentice to him for three years in the basic sophomore survey. By example, much more than the spoken work, he did that.

TS: Yes. I believe we have an obligation toward these people. If we are part of this institution, we are part of it through our particular unit, which is our department. We do really, I think, have a commitment to keep the continuation of the department in as good a shape as possible.

CAC: You used the word entrust. We hold in trust a lot of things. Indeed, we do.

This bears on the same issue of academic leadership at every level. Chairs are important. Deans are important.

TS: From my point of view, Clarke, the most important leadership position at the university is out of the chair. A good responsible chair, besides providing leadership, also provides good representation before the deans, and also will provide wonderful ways of facilitating a young colleagues 'work or even gently reminds people where they should be headed for and that there is some danger along the path if they don't watch. There are ways that this can be done. Above all, I think a good chair can relieve an awful lot of anxiety on behalf of the faculty members, which is very important.

CAC: Yes.

TS: People don't like to admit it but anxiety and . . .

CAC: Ohhh.

TS: . . . what is my place in this department, what is my place in this university . . . ?

CAC: It goes far beyond tenure. Persons with tenure for fifteen years can feel insecure.

TS: It can literally demoralize a person. I always believe that a good chair is the most crucial position of leadership that most of us have to deal with. I frankly never worried very much about the deans as long as I could trust my chair.

CAC: Yes.

TS: Even recently, I made a statement in the department in which I said, "I don't really worry what the dean may think about this or that item, provided my colleagues here have an

understanding among themselves what they're really after." If they have that understanding, ultimately, no dean will be able to object if it has reasonable unity behind it. I still believe that the chair is very important. The deans are also important.

I think I have watched six presidents of this university since I came here.

CAC: That's right. You came with [President O. Meredith] Wilson.

TS: I came with Wilson, so six presidents, and several deans, beginning with [Errett W.] McDiarmid, when I first came, and now with Dean Rosenstone. Most of the people who served as presidents, I had the good fortune to get to know personally and, I would say, most of the deans until Julia Davis came. Julia Davis was the first case of an outsider who never really managed.

[telephone rings - break in the interview]

TS: I was talking about the significance of administrative officials and especially the deans, in this case. I was saying that of all the deans since I've been here, the only person who was an outsider was Julia Davis. My feeling is that I think she never really managed to integrate herself into the academic community. One of the reasons is not because she was not capable of doing that or she was not bright enough or whatever, I really think it takes some time. It's a different thing when you grow up with a university body than when one just simply has it superimposed on them. Inevitably, what you do then is you identify a few contingents of individuals hoping they're going to see you through, [unclear] identify with all kinds of problems. What we started out talking about is that the university really is much bigger than one or two individuals. I think, ultimately, she did herself in, precisely, for that. The new Dean Rosenstone is, obviously, a much more [unclear] individual and I think he's going to ride or fall—if I may use that [unclear] expression—depending on how successful he integrates himself into the faculty community beyond just a few key power individuals who may look as if they're indispensable to him right now. Therefore, theoretically speaking, I have always been in support of the deans coming from within. Just like the department heads, I always thought it was not wise to bring in an outsider and pay a lot of money just to take care of department problems. I think Frank Sorauf was absolutely correct when he came to our department when he became dean and he said, "I'm not going to just dole out a few thousand to get you a chair from outside if you cannot generate enough leadership from within the department to take care of your problems." I remember that very distinctly. I'm a diarist so I have a lot of details about things that I have watched at this university.

CAC: [laughter] Oh, but you have a diary in crypt . . . It would have to be . . .

TS: No, it would be useful. I think on the presidential level, I would say that it is quite a different story and it's perfectly all right if you bring somebody in from the outside.

CAC: But, they have a lot to learn very fast.

TS: They have a lot to learn very fast, yes. Leadership is very important, right? You know, Clarke, since we're on the question of leadership, I think leadership better learn that a good deal of morale can be built up not just by the size of salary—even though that's very important—but frequently, it's by a very genuine expression of interest, and support, and giving the impression to people who work that you at least realize how significant that work is in which they invest their lifetime.

CAC: If that impression is authentic.

TS: I'm referring only to that kind of impression, not just simply making polite talk.

CAC: Yes, what my mother used to call "speaking from the teeth out" . . . polite talk . . . didn't really mean it but it sounded fine.

TS: In other words, no necessary [unclear] one's way . . . all right?

CAC: Ahhh. All right.

This is a sprawling institution and it requires management. You've thought about that, too . . . the whole problem with managed learning, right?

TS: Yes, I have. I think the wonderful thing about the University of Minnesota, I must say, sprawling as it was, is that there were islands within this vast sea where, even in a rather highly impersonal environment, students could make their learning experience very personal beginning from the very year when they came in. I'm talking about programs such as the Honors Program but also the accessibility of faculty is much better than most people would think in a big university. In fact, I always tell the students, "Persist. Make sure you knock on faculty doors. You'll be surprised how pleased and flattered they are when you approach them. They want to talk with somebody, too. They're just as lonesome as you are in this environment." There are other items, too. One reason, I guess, the SPAN program has meant so much to me is because, in addition to giving me a group of able people that I worked with for two years, it gave those students a chance to develop an intellectual and social camaraderie with another twelve or fifteen students over a period of two years. There have always been these kinds of little islands or opportunities to kill the loneliness of a big university, so to speak.

What I am beginning to see, now, in the new management of the university is that all these things which have proved themselves or surviving through these years, either on a shoestring or whatever or it may be partly because they have been successful, it will be nothing short of a tragedy if they try to institutionalize them and bureaucratize them to the point where they lose that wonderful spontaneous autonomy that I'm talking about and not really administrative, all that kind of stuff, but also the spontaneity of giving of themselves into the learning experience,

getting out of it as much as possible and simply say, "It's another program run from this office or from that office." In my estimation, that would be unfortunate.

CAC: Now, Theofani, a very good illustration of that would be your experience in creating the Basil Laourdas program?

TS: Yes.

CAC: Say something about that. In the universe of this sprawling place, it's a modest program and, yet, I think, of enormous significance. Say how you got that started.

TS: I'll be very happy to say that, Clarke. Also, I would say that I'm delighted that the new librarians are really renewing their interest and strengthening that collection.

CAC: Good.

TS: Basically, it started out—again, look, everything goes back to these wonderful opportunities that this big sea provides us if we want to swim gently, I guess—when I was in Greece with a group of SPANers and I met Mr. Laourdas.

CAC: Say, for posterity, something, just very briefly, about Basil Laourdas.

TS: Basil Laourdas was a wonderful Byzantinist and Hellenist cultural historian from ancient times to the present. He had been at the [unclear], then, later on, he was the founder of the Institute of Balkan Studies in the Salonika. He was extremely generous to American scholars who were visiting Greece. One summer, I was going there and, of all things, Dimitri Tselos told me, "Please, look up this gentleman." I looked him up and that really was another one of those wonderful turning points in our lives. Meseva Ladina Nebotoff once said that our life really hinges on small details. This was one of those small details which became a huge hinge, nevertheless, and carried big doors, so to speak. Basil Laourdas became involved in a big discussion about Kazantzakis. I was just beginning to read Kazantzakis. His *Report to Greco* just came out, at the time. I was absolutely fascinated. I met one of my students from the 1962 group. She was going through the Twin Cities. She lives in California now. She asked me and Freda for lunch. She said, "I'll tell you what I remember. In 1962, you are reading this new book, the autobiography of Kazantzakis, that came out, sort of an autobiography, *Report to Greco*." And she said, "I remember how you were identifying the agonies that you were going through with those that he had gone through as he was going on his intellectual and emotional journey. It shocked me because I came from a very close family but they would never discuss their emotions and here you were discussing all these things."

CAC: Ahhh, yes.

TS: "I never forgot that," she said. She was a member of this group that I was discussing with the Laourdas about Kazantzakis and I was so obsessed with Kazantzakis that everything Kazantzakis did was excellent and right. Laourdas had been there before. He was a mature scholar. He had returned the first critical essay on Kazantzakis as the *Odyssey: [A Modern Sequel]*. He listened to me and he was very understanding, even though I think I misbehaved during the discussion.

CAC: You were carrying this on in Greek, of course?

TS: In Greek and in English. He spoke English very well, yes. We exchanged a few letters and he told me before I left, I remember, "Obviously, Kazantzakis is a great writer, otherwise, we wouldn't be discussing him so passionately; but, as you grow older, you will understand my position, too." We became good friends and when in 1972, he died, that's when I delivered a series of lectures in one of the neighborhood seminars at the home of Walter and Helen Silha on the intellectual and cultural history of modern Greece.

CAC: He was a member of the Board of Regents, among other things.

TS: That's right. I dedicated those lectures to the memory of Laourdas. When Mrs. Laourdas heard of that, she was very touched and she offered his personal library—in the beginning to me. Then, I said, "I think it should go to an institution." Then, I came to you and, then, you went to the librarian, Mr. Hopp.

CAC: I was chair.

TS: That's right, chair. Then, we went to see the librarian whose name was Ralph Hopp, as I say. They agreed to accept that collection as part of the special collections. Now, that was a remarkable collection of literature, literary criticism, cultural history, and history. We used it as the nucleus for the development of our Modern Greek Collection. Most of those books were inscribed by writers famous, long gone. Then, as a result of that, when we dedicated the library, Mrs. Laourdas came.

CAC: I remember that.

TS: Among other things, if you remember, we also started the Basil Laourdas Fellowship, which, now, is approximately \$100,000 strong. Of course, more important, is that it has enabled several graduate students, in the field of Greek studies and Greek Slavic relations, to write their dissertations. This is a very important detail because many people cannot figure out how I jump from Russian history into Greek history when, in fact, my interest was always in Eastern Orthodoxy. In this Greek Slavic cultural relationship, Eastern Orthodoxy was a very important ingredient and, to me, it was the most natural thing to move into this world, as it were.

CAC: Sure.

TS: After that, we started the annual celebration of Greek letters.

CAC: You and I visited the minister of education in the summer of 1973, precisely on this subject.

TS: Right.

CAC: Yes.

TS: We started the annual celebration of Greek letters honoring a distinguished Greek writer, bringing in a distinguished lecturer here and one thing led to another.

CAC: A lot of these monies came from philanthropic grants, so to speak, from the community.

TS: The Modern Greek Collection, right now, is valued at, approximately, \$1 million.

CAC: Heavens!

TS: The university, I think, did buy a collection once on their own initiative of approximately \$4,000 or \$5,000; but, the rest of it has been gifts. It's not just books; it's also manuscripts. As you probably know, we are the only place in the world that has two copies of the original edition of the *Odyssey* by Nikos Kazantzakis—not even in Greece—and they are inscribed, one to Angelos Sikelienos and the other to Basil Laourdas. This is what we call the incremental value of spending a lifetime in an institution instead of playing musical chairs. For me, this was an extremely important decision. Your friend Peter Charanis said to me, just before I came to Minnesota, "Listen, young man. I have a feeling you're going to get some offers and unless you get them from a decidedly better institution or unless you want to go, don't jump every time they offer you a couple of thousand dollars." You know, every time we had an offer—I think we had four or five offers in my lifetime here to go elsewhere in the 1960s and early 1970s—Freda and I reflected and we never wanted to leave Minnesota. Staying here not only made us citizens of the greater Twin Cities area but it really did give me an opportunity to develop my field, to develop the library sources to create the atmosphere to train students.

CAC: We started out three hours ago talking about your work in the community. That commitment, that engagement that you had with the community also gave you resources to do some of these things.

TS: It did. It did. It's really a wonderful lesson of how town and gown should work together, as you know. I really want to backtrack and say how the one incrementally led to the other, as I started talking about. Out of this thing, we started publishing the Modern Greek Studies Yearbook. We are now publishing the thirteenth volume. It will come out now. Stan Lehmberg, who followed you . . .

CAC: After an interim. Stuart Schwartz was there for a term [of three years].

TS: Then, Lehmberg took over and he went to Fred Lukermann and he told him that this was a significant enterprise and Fred supported us with the first volume. Then, after that, I assumed the responsibility to do it. We engage approximately sixty scholars from around the world, every year, in the publication of that journal. It's considered the leading journal in the field and there are two or three others.

CAC: It's really a yearbook?

TS: Yes, it's a yearbook. Then, we also started the translations of Greek literature [unclear] books. We have twenty volumes in that. Along with the yearbook, we also have, now, the supplements to the yearbook, monographs. We have seven volumes in that.

CAC: Ah, I didn't know that.

TS: All this started out with what? With a trip with a SPAN group to Greece in 1962, and these connections which then . . . and out of this, the library here that we call the Basil Laourdas Library, which is extraordinary. When we have an event on a particular figure, we've got everything he published in different editions, everything written on him, and whenever possible, all the works translated in foreign languages so it really became a research [unclear]. What many people don't realize is how many Ph.D.s came out of the program, out of that collection. If you go to the exhibit, which is there right now, you'll find a book like the one by Theo Prousis, called *Russian Society in the Greek War of Independence*. That could not have been written without our collection and without SPAN because Theo is a SPANer. Steve [Stephen] Batalden's dissertation started out as a SPANer and, then, it became published by Columbia University Press. Greg[ory] Bruess is now at the University of Northern Iowa. He went through the same process. In other words, I can give example after example where these dissertations were fifty percent researched here and, then, they went on to Greece or Russia to complete them. It's another one of those wonderful things that one could develop only in a place like Minnesota. That's the reason we started out in the beginning saying that this has been a wonderful place to work.

CAC: Or Indiana or Columbia?

TS: Or Indiana or Columbia; but, at a place like Minnesota, I felt particularly free. Maybe, I was really working under some hallucinations in the 1960s; but, I never really felt intimidated or that I might be a failure if I didn't do certain things which might fit a little bit more. I remember, once, one of the librarians asked you—I remember this . . . He is no longer with us, unfortunately. This young man was in charge of collection development. He died. He had been on dialysis for sometime.

CAC: Yes, yes.

TS: What was his name? [James Kingsley] He came and talked to you once, "I don't know what to make of Stavrou. One day, we get a big order of books in Russian and the following day, in Greek." I remember you telling me, Clarke that you said, "I'll bet my life on what Mr. Stavrou tells you to do."

CAC: [laughter]

TS: That kind of a thing, you see, is extremely encouraging when people are viewed as being important; but, more important than that, it gives you wings and when you start out as a young academic, wings is what you need. I really honestly can say that I felt . . .

CAC: There's an old saying, "What can you give to your children? Roots and wings."

TS: Roots and wings. I got my roots in Cyprus and my wings in Minnesota.

CAC: [laughter] It's the same story that I have with the Immigrant Archives and the Social Welfare History Archives. It's the same thing. The university was willing to front for a year or two or three while we got it going and, then, it becomes the same kind of building.

TS: I remember that wonderful story that [O. Meredith] Wilson said about the Immigrant History Archives. You can improve on it for me, of course. When we went to, I think it's called this now, the Shepherd Room. We were gathered together one lunch to talk about it and Mr. [Gerry] Shepherd was sitting next to me and the president of the university who wanted to give his blessing to the project said, "Well, there was an argument about what to do with these things and somebody said, 'Send them to hell. Send them to Minnesota.'" [laughter]

CAC: [laughter]

TS: Certainly, it's here now. Clarke, with the big hole now on the West Bank of the Mississippi, which is going to give us more space, it's very encouraging for these special collections.

CAC: You bet.

TS: Mr. [Thomas] Shaughnessy is very supportive of making good use . . . By the way, we are working on a project now to put the Modern Greek Collection online, in other, all the titles online so people will know.

CAC: Some of my Welfare Archives are online already, parts of them. The whole thing would be too much right away. Yes, it's remarkable.

TS: Yes.

CAC: It is remarkable. Are there any other particular stories or can we go to reflection? You've been reflecting all the time but are there other good stories?

TS: I want to backtrack a little . . .

CAC: Go ahead. All right.

TS: . . . and say a word or two about international studies.

[End of Tape 2, Side 2]

[Tape 3, Side 1]

CAC: We're on a fresh tape. You wanted to pick up on something that we had touched upon but wanted to explore. Go ahead.

TS: We were talking a little about international studies and how I think it has received a fairly bad shake at the University of Minnesota. I did say, if you remember, that there has always been a sense that we, as individual scholars at the University of Minnesota, belong to the international scholarly community and we maintain our contacts and our [unclear] interests. I do want to say that even though I believe we would have done better in the 1960s . . . Indeed, when I was brought here, I was brought here with the understanding, told that I was brought here to rejuvenate Russian Studies because my predecessor, Mr. [George] Anderson, had not really done much with it. People tell me that I did inject some enthusiasm into the field when I came here. However, the Area Studies, as such, including Russian Area Studies, have not flourished as they did elsewhere. Of course, the end of the Cold War and our changing relationship with the former Soviet Union has contributed further to a certain amount of negligence, or indifference, or disinterest. Let me point out that I believe we are such a major university and the only university really that does not have a structured international outreach program. I think we cannot be making the kind of claims that we ought to be making as a university, which, indeed, does have a global impact, without taking care of this problem—specifically with Russia, which is my concern. I hope that when I leave, I will be replaced by another Russian historian. I think what we should realize is that it's even more imperative now that we study that part of the world than when it was the Soviet Union. We don't even know the geographic names, the capitals of the new states that have emerged out of that former Soviet Union.

CAC: Right.

TS: We don't know their political leaders. We don't know the language. We don't know anything. The challenge is enormous. It's enormous not only for its own sake as a body of learning that we all have to become acquainted with; but, it's important because I hear people say that our money is in Asia and the way Asia goes, so our country goes. How do you get to Asia? We are going to have to get to Asia through Europe somehow. How does Europe get to Asia?

Europe is going to get to Asia through that part which was referred to as Eastern Europe and Central Asia and what have you, in other words, even along these very practical aspects, the Eurasia part that used to be the former Soviet Union, which now we refer to as Russia and the states of Central Asia and things like that. It's an extremely crucial part of the world that we need to understand in terms of people, in terms of mineral resources.

CAC: [unclear]

TS: It's all there. Therefore, what I am saying is—I'm making a pitch here whether it's at Minnesota or elsewhere—that there are very few things we can afford to sacrifice and be able to survive as a major global institution in the twenty-first century as international studies. I am not really talking just a lot of beautiful phraseology that will make something look more interesting or more crucial than it is. I am talking about finding, perhaps, ways to redefine so that we can be communicating but, nevertheless, address the biggest, the basic issues of understanding other cultures so we can understand ourselves.

CAC: We may be talking to someone thirty years from now who is listening to this.

TS: I am willing to bet that thirty years from now, as I used to tell my students when I started out my career, Clarke, teaching the Soviet Union in 1960—and the century has grown longer and longer and the Soviet Union became what it is today—"You cannot understand the Soviet Union without its Czarist heritage" and in the year 2050, I hope somebody teaching will be telling them that they cannot understand the post-Communist world without understanding the seventy-two years of the Soviet experiment. It is incremental, as you say, the acquisition of knowledge.

CAC: It accumulates and builds.

TS: Yes.

CAC: You've been reflective all the way through. Should we become really reflective now?

TS: We can. I would say for the sake of my dear colleague, Mr. Lehmborg . . . he knows most of these things better than I was able to incorporate . . .

CAC: He's heard them from you at lunch many times!

TS: I think he can really put the right footnotes to what I've been saying. [laughter] And it will be fine.

CAC: Stan will find it useful. I hope many people, subsequently, will. Implicit in many things that you have explored just this morning and this afternoon is the sense, the idea, the reality of a university and how it has changed. Many things you have commented upon, comment upon that. Are there further reflections on that larger issue?

TS: I would say something that maybe everybody has expressed an opinion on already. You know, Clarke, in the 1970s when they were even telling us not to take any more graduate students because things were tough and how will we place our students, I used to say, "We cannot afford to talk that kind of language because the university is the most indispensable part of our society. We cannot really even think of abandoning this enterprise. The position will open because we cannot function without the university as a society." That's what distinguishes really a free society is a good university. A good free university is the heart of a free society. I always like to tell this story, how in the 1570s the Turks tried to capture Malta and they failed. In 1592, the University of Malta opened. In 1571, the Turks captured the Isle of Cyprus. They succeeded. The University of Cyprus opened in 1992.

CAC: [laughter]

TS: The year 1992. Therefore, I think it is an incredible accompaniment, so to speak, of people who are attempting to improve their tasteful life, to get a sense of a certain intellectual self-reliance. The university is extremely indispensable and the idea of the university even more so.

CAC: One of the dangers, it seems to me—I'm speaking for myself and not for you—is the application of the marketplace criteria to the university. What you're describing is that there is not a felt market now. You have to create a market for an understanding of Russia?

TS: That's right.

CAC: This notion that a university can respond, as you were saying earlier, to consumers, it seems to me, subverts, in very important ways, the kind of idea of a university that you're talking about, that you and I share.

TS: But, Clarke, the strange thing about it, even in terms of demand, is that there is greater need for people now who know Russian than there was before, back and forth, back and forth. The trouble is we don't use those criteria as we used to do . . . the Cold War threat. Somebody used to say, "There is nothing like moderately bad relations between the United States and the Soviet Union to do wonderful things for Russian Studies." Yet, in fact, the relations between these two major powers now are infinitely more fragile than they were before.

CAC: Oh, yes.

TS: I think there is a market there but I . . .

CAC: But the university has to have a kind of autonomy to make those principled decisions, to hold to certain basic disciplines, and areas, and subjects.

TS: That's right. Yes, it's a tough call. It goes back really to the early business of curriculum. Right now, for example, at the University of Minnesota, the people who may have the ears of

the dean or the ears of the president will determine certain fields for the next twenty years. Some of those decisions, I'm sure, will be fine. Some of them will be catastrophic for some other fields. All I'm saying is that the international field deserves very respectful study of how we are to deal with it because we are all part of the international field, just as we are all part of the local/global, as they like to refer to it.

Now, Clarke, let me tell you something. I have not been as articulate as I would have liked to be; however, I would like to say that I toyed a great deal with how I should title the concluding remarks. I used the word "sunset years," which usually, everybody knows, are those reflections of . . .

CAC: Oh, mellow.

TS: Mellow or what have you. Then, I switched to the term "twilight." That word twilight, that expression twilight is very important to me because usually when people refer to twilight, they think of that time between sunset and darkness, right? That's usually what most people think.

CAC: Yes.

TS: I never thought that's what it meant. Years and years ago, I looked up the definition in Webster's dictionary. That served me very well because, then, I used the expression "the twilight of Imperial Russia" to give a slightly different interpretation about Russian history between 1880 and 1914. This is the definition from Webster: the light from the sky between full night and sunrise or between sunset and full night. Twilight, for me, has always carried a significance in other words that it could go either way and that Imperial Russia, depending on the leadership, was on the verge of really a dawn or a it was really on the verge of an abyss. Well, the same . . . I'm really thinking now about our individual lives as scholars at the end of a long career at this very important institution, about the university itself. I really think all this transition into the twenty-first century, important and exciting and frightening as it is . . . Sometimes, I think we have spent a little bit too much energy, frankly, preparing for the twenty-first century.

CAC: It has involved explicitly what is very popular and that is technology transfer.

TS: That is right. My feeling is that as we go through this experiment, I would like to go for the first definition of Mr. Webster, that the university is really now going from early dawn to the possibility of full day where light will radiate the state of Minnesota, the country, and the world at large. I like to think that those of us who have given a lifetime to this institution and those of us who care to and who have the energy and the willingness to continue to contribute in some way to help in this institution make this transition into this brilliant beyond, will be given the opportunity to do so. It touches on one of the most important points that I feel university administration needs to address. People live longer. They stay healthier longer. They have the opportunity to continue to make important contributions much longer. I really don't think universities have been very imaginative, or very sensitive, or very graceful in their way of

dealing with citizens who have given a lifetime to this institution—however nice they have been to us as we were coming through. I like to hold that among the great different types of capital that every major institution requires in order to keep functioning is the human capital, a good deal of which rests in some of the distinguished people who have served the institution well and who have, after all, a great deal of experience in them to utilize.

CAC: And still have an agenda of their own.

TS: That's right. And maybe we should all remind ourselves that Cavafy—it's the third time we're using him today— . . .

CAC: Fine!

TS: . . . when he wrote his wonderful poem, *Ithaca*, knew what he was talking about when he said, "When we set on our journey to Ithaca . . ."

CAC: You have this on your wall.

TS: I have it on my wall. Basically, what he is telling us to remember is that we have a destination. We have an objective. What counts really is the process, getting there. Basically, the university is really the mechanism, the vessel that gets us there, stopping at different ports and buying merchandise, rich merchandise, and perfume and learning at the feet of the learned. I think this is basically what the whole enterprise is all about.

CAC: And the final punch line of *Ithaca*?

TS: "And if you find you're poor, *Ithaca* has not deceived you. She has given you a splendid journey. Then, you will know what this *Ithaca* means." I think that we ought to send a copy of this to Stan. I think it's a wonderful, fitting epilogue of an educational institution and an individual.

CAC: Stan may use it for his peroration at the end of his volume.

TS: Perhaps . . . perhaps, his own better poem.

This has been a lot of fun talking and reflecting on this wonderful place. I like to think that I will be able to stay as active and as happy in the next four or five years that I have here—and I will live to read Stan's book on the history of the university.

CAC: You're sixty-five?

TS: I'm sixty-four. I will be sixty-four this July. I hope to teach, as I said, until the year 2005, health permitting and feeling that I am still enjoying it. I really have promised myself that the moment I reach the point where it's viewed as a burden, I will not continue.

CAC: It's clear from our interview and it's clear from all I've known since 1960 that your engagement and your commitment here has built that kind of momentum and is likely to continue—against many obstacles. You haven't talked a great deal about the hazards and the downsides, but I know they were there. I think it's a wonderful affirmation of what the idea of a university is, and should be, and must be.

TS: Clarke, if I didn't believe in it, I would not have invested from 1989 to 1992 and 1994 almost going to Cyprus every month in order to help set up the University of Cyprus, which gives me such a great joy when I go there at the end of every year and I watch four or five hundred young people graduating from that university and that's going to be there. That's what I meant when I say, "These institutions are way bigger than we are" Their impact is going to be infinitely more than what we can do singly. It becomes a lever.

CAC: You have two universities on your conscience and your soul.

TS: That's right.

CAC: Bravo!

TS: We were talking at lunch, if you remember . . . I still identify very passionately with the University of Minnesota because I care for it and I really want to keep doing my best to contribute in any way I can between now and later.

CAC: That's a good closing.

[End of Tape 3, Side 1]

[End of the Interview]

Transcribed by:

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