

AN INTERVIEW WITH CARL H. LANDE

Interviewer: Jewell Willhite

Oral History Project

Endacott Society

University of Kansas

CARL H. LANDE

B.A., Political Science, Ohio State University, 1948

Ph.D., Political Science, Harvard University, 1958

Service at the University of Kansas

First came to the University of Kansas in 1960

Assistant Professor, 1960-61

Associate Professor, 1966-1972

Professor, 1972-2000

## AN INTERVIEW WITH CARL H. LANDE

Interviewer: Jewell Willhite

Q.: I am speaking with Carl Lande, who retired in 2000 as professor of political science at the University of Kansas. We are in Lawrence, Kansas, on Oct. 17, 2000. Where were you born and in what year?

A: I was born 1924 in Tübingen, Germany.

Q.: What were your parents' names?

A: My father was Alfred Lande and my mother's name was Elizabeth. I was born there because my father was a professor of physics at the University of Tübingen.

Q.: Was he an American or German?

A: He was German.

Q.: Did you have brothers and sisters?

A: I have a brother, who was born in 1931, a couple years younger than I.

Q.: Did you grow up in Tübingen?

A: No, my father was invited to come to Ohio State University as a visiting professor in 1929. He taught there for a couple of years and then accepted a permanent post at Ohio State University. So I grew up in Columbus, Ohio.

Q.: This was during the time of the Depression. Did the Depression affect your family?

A: No, because my father was receiving a good salary as a professor. But, certainly, my parents were very much aware of it. They were very much aware of the role that Franklin Roosevelt played in trying to deal with the Depression.

Q.: Since you went into political science, was your family interested in this kind of thing? Did they discuss the political situation?

A: They discussed politics, but I really developed my interest in politics from another source, which I will talk about a little later.

Q.: What elementary school did you attend?

A: We lived in Columbus, Ohio, and I went to Upper Arlington Elementary School and High School.

Q.: Did you belong to organizations such as the Boy Scouts or things like that?

A: Yes, I was a very active Boy Scout. I became an Eagle Scout, as did one of my sons. We are a Scouting family.

Q.: My husband is an Eagle Scout too. You probably went to camp and hiked and did lots of things like that.

A: Yes, I did. I was very much interested in the out of doors and Indian lore and camping.

Q.: What do you remember about the World War II years? You would have been in high school then.

A: No, I had just finished high school, and what I remember about the World War II years is that I was in the Army. I joined the Army in 1942 or 1943.

Q.: I guess maybe I should ask you about high school first and then about the Army. So you went to Upper Arlington Heights High School. Do you remember influential teachers from those years?

A: Yes, I do. That is something I have always remembered. I remember several teachers including, Mr. McCoullagh, who was one of the few male teachers there. He impressed me by the fact that, in contrast to most of the women teachers, he was very much of a man. He had a good masculine sense of humor. All of the boys liked that.

Q.: What did he teach?

A: He taught history. So I really remember more of his personality. Then there was Miss Rosselot, who taught French. She was a Frenchwoman. She developed my interest in foreign countries. Finally, there was the shop teacher, Mr. Russell Glass. In those days, boys took shop and girls took home ec. Mr. Glass insisted on perfection in everything that we did in his shop class. That has had a lasting influence on me. I've always tried to perfect my work. It is kind of interesting that three high school teachers should have had such an influence on me.

Q.: Were you involved in extracurricular activities?

A: Boy Scouts, that was it.

Q.: Did you have honors in high school?

A: No, I didn't. I was a pretty ordinary student.

Q.: Did you have a job during the summers or after school?

A: No. In those days a lot of boys delivered papers, but my parents didn't feel that was something they wanted me to do.

Q.: As the political situation with Germany grew more tense, was this difficult for your family being German?

A: No, they were very antiGerman. They were very critical of Hitler and they were very proud of being Americans.

Q.: Then you graduated from high school in 1942.

A: Yes, and then I had one semester of college at Ohio State. Then I went into the Army.

Q.: You were drafted, I suppose.

A: No, I joined the reserve, something like what Governor Bush did. It gave me another semester and it also gave me the opportunity to choose my branch of service. Initially I

went into the Signal Corps. In my one semester in college I had studied Japanese because a friend of our family, Mrs. Anna Berliner, had lived in Japan and taught a course in Japanese. I thought that would be useful. So after I joined the Signal Corps and went into the Army, I indicated what languages I could speak, one of these being a bit of Japanese.

Q.: After just one semester?

A: I put that down and after I had received my basic training in the Signal Corps I was transferred to the Army Specialized Training Program. Anyone who had any kind of education was taken out of the infantry and was put into places where he could make a somewhat different contribution. I studied Japanese there briefly.

Q.: Did they send you off somewhere to study Japanese?

A: To the University of Chicago. We were there studying Japanese. After a couple of months I was transferred from there to an officers' candidate language school at the University of Michigan, where I studied Japanese for a year, as did Professor Grant Goodman, who is an active member of the Endacott Society (retirees' club).

Q.: Was he in the same class as you were?

A: He was in a different class. I think he was a half a year ahead of me. I finished just at the end of the war and spent a year in Japan, where I was assigned to Civil Intelligence. I had a very interesting time reporting on political events using my language to interview political leaders.

Q.: Did you find when you were meeting Japanese people that you could understand them when they spoke?

A: Well, I studied Japanese for a year so I learned to speak reasonably well. I never did

learn to write the Japanese language very well. I have forgotten most of my written Japanese because I have not been a Japanese scholar since that time. But I certainly still remember how to speak some Japanese.

Q.: Usually I would think it is the other way around. People learn to read and write a language but do not speak it as well.

A: We were taught spoken Japanese. That was the method that was used in those days, immersion in the language. All of our teachers were Japanese-Americans, so we spoke Japanese all the time. In the meantime, we were learning the Japanese written language.

Q.: They write with all those characters like the Chinese, don't they?

A: Well, they use those and also use a syllabic alphabet. So I spent a year in Japan.

Q.: How did you like living in Japan?

A: It is a fascinating country. I was very much interested in Japanese art and I collected some Japanese art at that time.

Q.: Like those scrolls?

A: Yes. My immediate superior was the son of Livingston Gump, who was the owner of Gumps in San Francisco, a store which has a very large Asian art collection. He taught me a lot about Japanese art and I also read a lot. That gave me a lifetime interest in Asian art.

Q.: Were the Japanese people friendly to the Occupation?

A: They were so happy. They didn't expect such a generous, benign occupation. They were very happy that they were being treated in a far better way than they had treated their occupied people. It is often forgotten how cruel the Japanese were in the countries

they occupied. They didn't expect that General MacArthur would conduct such a benign occupation and make such an effort to restore and establish democracy, which had existed for a short time in the twenties, and rebuild the country economically and liberate women from the strict laws that restricted their opportunities. So the women were generally pleased with the occupation. I think the character of that occupation explains why the Japanese are our best allies in Asia.

Q.: So you were there in Japan with the Occupation for one year.

A: Yes. Then I came back.

Q.: Did you return to Ohio State?

A: I went to Ohio State and got my undergraduate degree there.

Q.: Was it in political science?

A: Yes. That was very much under the influence of a political science professor, a gentleman named Henry Spencer, who happened to be a friend of my parents. I liked him and I liked what he did, so I became a student in his department.

Q.: Were you living at home?

A: Yes, I was.

Q.: Were you employed while you were going to college?

A: No, like all the other people who came back from the war, we had the G.I. Bill of Rights, which paid for my entire education. It didn't cost my parents a cent, which was very nice. My parents could have afforded it, but many other people couldn't afford it. They went to school, college, graduate schools, professional schools.

Q.: Were you involved in extracurricular activities as an undergraduate?

A: No. I spent most of my time studying. That kept me busy.

Q.: In what year did you graduate from Ohio State in political science?

A: It must have been 1948.

Q.: Did you go directly on for a master's?

A: No, I went on to the Ph.D. program at Harvard in political science.

Q.: Any particular reason for choosing that school?

A: I was accepted by Harvard and Yale and I asked Professor Spencer. He thought that between the two, Harvard would be even better than Yale. It turned out to be a fine school.

Q.: What was your area of research and study?

A: Comparative politics was my specialty.

Q.: Just what does that mean?

A: That means understanding the governments and politics of individual countries and foreign countries, in contrast to American politics. In political science we have several divisions. One is American government and politics. Another one is comparative. Another is international relations and another one is public administration. Now public policy is a major field.

Q.: What was your dissertation topic?

A: My dissertation was on Philippine politics. Let me explain how that happened. It's a funny story. I remember attending a graduate student party and meeting a young woman from Puerto Rico. I didn't know where Puerto Rico was. I thought it was somewhere near Tierra del Fuego, the southern tip of Latin America. She told me rather indignantly, "We are one of your colonies." So in reaction to that, I took a course on imperialism taught by Professor Rupert Emerson, who had been the head of the Division of

Territories and Possessions, the unit in the Department of the Interior that administered the Philippines. I took his course. Rupert Emerson had a great deal of influence on me.

He was a descendant of Ralph Waldo Emerson. When I was ready to do dissertation research, I got a Fulbright grant to the Philippines. That's what set me off in that direction. I've been studying Philippine and Southeast Asian politics and writing about them ever since.

Q.: So you went to the Philippines. What specifically were you studying, about the government of that country?

A: Initially, my dissertation plan was to study labor organizations, peasant organizations and various kinds of interest groups. But when I got to the Philippines, I found there were very few of them. So I decided there was something more interesting. I became interested in the whole character of political organization and why there were no peasant organizations.

Q.: I don't really know anything about Philippine politics at that time. Was it a dictatorship?

A: No, it was a democracy. The Philippines had been an American colony since 1898 and had become a self-governing democracy even by 1935. After the Japanese occupation, that democracy was restored. But it was one that worked very differently from ours. Instead of political parties that stood for principles, say moderate left and moderate right, the political parties were identical. What I was trying to do in my dissertation was explain why the parties were identical. That was my dissertation. The explanation had something to do with relationships of leadership and followership. People followed leaders instead of parties that stood for policies or principles. All the leaders were pretty

much alike. They were wealthy leaders and poor followers. That led to the theory of political clientelism, patron-client relations. That's what my dissertation was about.

Q.: Were you talking to government officials?

A: Yes. I talked to politicians. I spent a lot of time studying the Philippine Congress. So there I wrote my dissertation.

Q.: How long were you in the Philippines?

A: I was there for two years. I was there initially for one year under a Fulbright grant. I stayed for a second year on my own. I needed more time.

Q.: Was this a fairly poor country then?

A: Yes, it had been devastated by the war, as were all of the countries that were occupied by the Japanese. They were recovering.

Q.: Was it difficult to live there? They wouldn't have as much as you were used to.

A: No, we were Fulbrighters and we were housed on the campus of the University of the Philippines and could buy food at the U.S. Embassy commissary. Fulbrighters always lived much better than the local people.

Q.: So you went with some other students.

A: The other Fulbrighters were all assigned. There were three of us staying in one cottage.

Q.: When did you get your Ph.D.?

A: I got my Ph.D. in 1958.

Q.: Did you have honors as a Ph.D. student?

A: I won the Chase Prize for the best dissertation in the department of government in 1958. I guess that was honors.

Q.: Were you married by this time?

A: No, not yet.

Q.: What did you do after you left Harvard?

A: I taught for one year at the University of Kansas, which was from 1960 to 1961.

Q.: How did you happen to come to Kansas?

A: I was in the Philippines and I got a call from the chairman of the department, who was Ethan Allen at that time. He had apparently heard about me, probably from Harvard. He had made an inquiry there. So I was invited and I came and I taught at KU for one year. Then I was invited to teach at Yale as an assistant professor. I taught there for several years, but I didn't stay on, as I didn't get tenure. So then I went back to the Philippines and taught for two years at the Ateneo de Manila University.

Q.: What sort of courses were you teaching during this time?

A: At Yale I taught a course on Southeast Asian politics and other courses on comparative politics. Yale has a Southeast Asia program.

Q.: Were you teaching that here also, that first year you were here?

A: No, the first year I just taught comparative politics, actually East Asian politics. They were looking for an East Asian specialist. In the Philippines at the Ateneo, which is a very good Jesuit institution, I taught American politics and comparative politics.

Q.: Is the language the same?

A: Everyone in the Philippines who is educated speaks English. There is compulsory education, and English is taught from the first grade on. Most Filipinos in those days spoke English. Then I got a call again from KU and was invited to come back. I understand that the two people who were influential in having me invited back to KU were Francis Heller, who was then associate dean, and Grant Goodman, who knew I was

there and whom I had met in the Philippines again after having first gotten to know him at the University of Michigan.

Q.: Was he teaching in the Philippines?

A: No, I think he visited the Philippines. But he knew about me and knew of me, of course, so I came back in 1966 and I have been teaching here ever since.

Q.: Were you married when you came back here?

A: Yes. I was married while I was in the Philippines, but I married someone I met at Yale, Noblessa Asuncion, who is now professor of Communication Studies at KU.

Q.: Was she from the Philippines?

A: She was from the Philippines but she was teaching Philippine language at Yale. We were married in the Philippines.

Q.: Since you came back here in 1966, you were here in the late sixties and early seventies when so many things were happening.

A: Yes, indeed.

Q.: How did that affect you, your students or your department?

A: Except to those who were ideologues and committed to political activism, it was a very disturbing thing. One of the characteristics of universities is that we traffic in ideas. It is not very difficult to move from ideas to ideologies. Some people have done that. I have always been very critical of ideologies. I have tried to be open minded and to understand all points of view, but it did, certainly, do a lot of damage to the university. On the one hand, the disruption of classes. At one point the students, just before final exams, demanded that final exams be canceled and we had a chancellor, Larry Chalmers, who acceded to their demands.

He finally left the University of Kansas. His wife discovered that he was taking a girlfriend along in the university airplane. That led to his dismissal. I was unhappy with him because when he came in he said that his plan was to, in effect, make an alliance of administrators and students against the faculty. He didn't put it quite that way. But that was the clear implication, that he was going to be a students' man and not be too responsive to the faculty. And so that's perhaps why he caved in when the students wanted the exams canceled.

Q.: Were students of political science involved a lot in the demonstrations and things like that?

A: I don't remember which students were involved. These were the days of the SDS and student radicalism and it was fashionable among many students. Others were not happy with it. It had other consequences for the university. This was the time when some students thought they should trust no one under 30 and didn't to like to have faculty tell them what to do. Some faculty felt they should learn from the students and sit on the ground with their legs crossed listening to the students. That was not something of which I approved.

Q.: Then more student representation came on various committees at that time.

A: That began during this time. But it was usually the radical students who ran for these positions. So people were sitting on the floor rapping instead of learning much. At this time, many requirements were dropped. The faculty in general were in less of a position to guide the students. For me, a turning of the tide came when the faculty elected Captain Joe Marzloff, the Navy ROTC commander, to the University Council or SenEx. That was a sign that many of the faculty didn't approve the radicalism of the time. What

had proceeded this was real violence, the occupation of the ROTC building, the fire in the Union building, the explosion in the computer center, which was then in the Economics Department building. I thought it was amusing that when the new computer center was built, it was built like a fortress, so it would be well protected. It still has big barriers in front of it, so you can't drive a truck into it. Another thing that showed the tide had turned was when a student came to me and asked me to give him a reading list. He wanted to know what he should read. I thought, "Well, that's a sensible fellow. Things are getting back to normality." This was the worst time, certainly. It led to the departure of Larry Chalmers. Do you know the story of Chalmers?

Q.: He went to the Art Institute in Chicago, didn't he?

A: He went to the Art Institute in Chicago, for which he was totally unqualified. I remember once a painting was stolen, a Degas or one of the other impressionists. He was on TV and was shown a picture of this painting and asked, "Tell us about this." He said, "It's a painting." So what happened? The next thing we knew he was running museums in Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Q.: I didn't know that.

A: That was kind of funny. So, again, it taught me that bad administrators always go to higher positions. We had a chairman—I digress, but why not—who turned out to be a dictatorial type who played the faculty off against each other. We finally threw him out. So then Chancellor Chalmers promoted him to a higher position in the university, and pretty soon he was running international programs at the University of Washington. And the next thing we knew he was president of Northern Colorado University. Finally the faculty there rebelled because he had favored one of his friends, had given him a

semester off. So he was forced to resign. As his reward for resigning he got a distinguished professorship. The last thing I heard he is up in New England in a very high educational administrative position. That's what happens to bad administrators. My conclusion was that administrators should be elected by the faculty. A good university should elect its own chancellor, should elect its own deans. Faculties know the character of their colleagues. Regents are not in a position to do so.

Q.: Do some universities do that?

A: I think the East Coast universities, the Ivy League schools do that.

The disruptions of the sixties did not end the role of ideologies. On the one hand, there was the Pearson College Integrated Humanities Program. Have you heard of that?

Q.: Oh, yes.

A: That was a well-meaning attempt by three faculty members, who were co-religionists, to establish a special humanities program in which there would be tremendous immersion in the humanities. The problem was that it turned out to be basically a college dedicated to one particular sect, which should not happen at a state university. They were all Catholics. They were reading the Catholic classics and left out a great many other things. It was mainly early and late medieval literature, and they didn't do much about the modern world. So the university finally abolished that program. I have something here you might be interested in, a report, which I found some years ago, written by three highly regarded members of the faculty, Cliff Griffin, William Gilbert, and James Seaver. It is a critique of the Pearson program, which you are welcome to keep and put in the files if you like, about what was wrong with that program. The amusing thing was that

among the greatest defenders of that program was another faculty member, who was a radical. I always suspected he supported Pearson because if Pearson survived he would be able to create a Karl Marx College of his own.

Q.: Was this someone in political science?

A: No, political science never was affected.

Q.: But you thought this man was a Marxist.

A: He was one of the radicals. I had the feeling that what was in the works was an attempt to create a group of ideological colleges. I didn't like that at all. So then after that came political correctness, under which we have suffered, and multiculturalism and critical studies.

Q.: I read an article in your file that you had written about a requirement that Liberal Arts students take a course in another culture.

A: You are right. The background is that there is a very fine Western Civilization course that is required of all undergraduates. For many years it was directed by Prof. James Seaver. But under his successors, largely as a result of pressure from the teaching assistants, who were allowed to choose what was to be taught, the course began to change. Some of the teaching assistants, who didn't believe in Western Civilization, began to prune the program and took out the readings of John Locke and John Stuart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville.

Q.: What did they put in instead?

A: Feminism, racism, colonialism, post-war liberation movements and anti-Semitism. They changed the curriculum. But still it is a very fine program. It is an excellent program and some of these things, John Locke and John Stuart Mill, but not de Tocqueville, have

been put back. But then there was a movement among a very small number of students to establish a diversity requirement, which, if it had been adopted, would have required every student to take a diversity course. There is already a non-Western culture requirement. Everyone must take a course on some non-Western culture. So there is the Western Civ requirement, the non-Western culture requirement.

Q.: Is that still in effect?

A: Yes. My courses were always listed as qualifying as non-Western culture courses. But I have found—and this is one of my arguments against the diversity requirement—that some of my students take my course because they want to. But there are always a substantial number of students who sit there, are not interested, and just take the course because they have to fulfill this requirement. Therefore I was against this.

Q.: Is the diversity requirement different than this multicultural requirement?

A: Yes, that is a third. There is the Western Civ course, which is the great classics of Western civilization. There is a non-Western culture requirement, which means something like my course on Southeast Asia. Then the diversity requirement would require people to study a course on some minority tradition in American, such as Black studies or women's studies.

Q.: Is that a requirement?

A: It was hotly debated for a year. There were a number of us who fought against it. The College tried to push it, insisted, put it up repeatedly, and clearly felt they were expected to do this. But last year there was a vote. It finally came up at the College Assembly. The vote was two to one against. That, I think, put an end to the diversity requirement. To me, it was simply too much. I felt that students shouldn't be forced to take courses,

particularly courses of an ideological nature, because I think often such course tend to be advocacy courses. I don't think students should be required to do this, although I think the Western Civ course is fine. I think highly of it.

Q.: And the multicultural requirement? Do you think that is okay?

A: No, I don't. Even though my courses fit under it, I just don't think students should be required to take such courses. It is my view that the task of a university is not to indoctrinate. So much for that. If I may, I'd like to read something. I retired last year, as you know. I'd like to read into the record something my chairman said at my retirement dinner. He talked about various things he remembered about me.

“A third thing I will remember about Carl is his role in University governance. He has been, I think, a sort of watch dog often showing up at College assemblies and other sorts of meetings when issues have arisen where he sees that fundamental principles are at stake. When I first arrived here, I remember hearing Carl speak out against the proposed Pearson Integrated Humanities Program. Just last year he was an outspoken opponent of the diversity requirement. There have been dozens of other matters that have aroused Carl's concern. And just what have been Carl's principles and concerns? I've concluded that Carl is simply a good, liberal Democrat understood not in a partisan but in a philosophical manner. He hates centralization and abuse of power. And he has a disdain for any programs that will privilege a particular point of view. So if you have conservative or radical views, either right-wing-or left-wing agenda, and if you have tried to give your views a privileged position in the educational experience, you have to watch out because Carl Lande has been

there to remind everyone that universities are places of academic freedom and for a genuine marketplace of competing ideas.”

That’s very nice. I am very pleased with that.

Q.: What was your chairman’s name?

A: Paul Schumaker.

Q.: What classes have you taught at KU?

A: I have taught a variety of classes. When I first came here I taught a general course on Asia. Later on we hired another Asianist, who is a specialist on East Asia. I began to teach courses on Southeast Asia. I’ve continued to teach those. In fact, my last class last year was a course on the politics of Southeast Asia. Then for many years I taught a course on the problems of developing countries in general. I compared all kinds of developing countries, not focusing on any region. Then I taught a course for a few years on Ancient and Premodern Political Institutions, which I kind of enjoyed. It was anthropological. I taught a course on Britain, Austria, Canada and New Zealand, or the Old Commonwealth, the old English-speaking countries in the Commonwealth. I taught a course on comparative public policy in developing countries. So I’ve taught a variety of courses.

Q.: Did you originate some of those courses?

A: Yes, I devised them all. Well, the Asian course had been taught before, but the others are courses I developed.

Q.: Because they didn’t have much of an Asian emphasis before you came?

A: Yes, and that brings me to another topic. One of the reasons I came to Kansas is because Kansas in the mid to late fifties had been one of the universities that developed a series of

area programs. The person who was most influential in developing these programs was the dean of the College, George Waggoner, whose widow still lives here and is quite active. George Waggoner, sadly, died some years ago. He will be honored tomorrow at the Waggoner Symposium. He was very active in developing and establishing at the University of Kansas a number of interdisciplinary area programs, a Latin American program and a Soviet and Eastern European program and an East Asia program. Later we offered an African Studies Program. These are the major programs.

Q.: Are these within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences?

A: They are all within the College of Liberal Arts. Since Waggoner's time, the university has always maintained these programs. I was a professor of political science and East Asia studies.

Q.: Has your research been mainly on the Philippines?

A: The Philippines and Southeast Asia in general. Like many comparativists, most of us who are in comparative politics begin with one country and then after we have studied that country we become more broadly comparative. Nowadays comparative politics is very broadly comparative. It is highly statistical and very sophisticated. Perhaps I can say some things about my department too.

Q.: Sure

A: When I came to KU in 1960-61 it was essentially a teaching department. Very few members of the department had produced significant publications. Most of them did their Ph.D.s and there was very little in the way of publication. Since then the department has improved tremendously. We now have a superb young faculty, all of whom are doing a lot of active research. That's been one of the pleasures of being at

KU, seeing this department grow and improve itself.

Q.: So it has grown in numbers too.

A: Yes, and in quality. The profession has changed. We simply expect more of young scholars. We expect them to continue to do research after their dissertations and to publish. They don't get tenure and they don't get promoted unless they do, so the quality of education and scholarship has improved.

Q.: Do you have children?

A: Yes, we have two sons.

Q.: What are their names?

A: Our oldest son, James or Jim, is a civil servant in the Department of State in Washington. Our younger son, Charles or Charlie, who is just about to be married, is a lawyer in Chicago.

Q.: I believe you said that your wife was a professor when you met.

A: Yes, she is a professor also. She has been a professor in the department of Communications Studies. She is still teaching there. I have retired.

Q.: I believe you have continued to make trips to the Philippines.

A: Yes, I have made quite a few trips, research trips and teaching trips.

Q.: Were these sabbaticals?

A: Some were sabbaticals and some were summer trips.

Q.: You were talking about publications. I suppose you have had publications. Any books?

A: I have quite a few publications. I wrote a monograph called *Leaders, Factions, and Parties*, which grew out of my dissertation and really made my name in Philippine

studies. I have written lots of articles since then and a number of other books. More recently I have written more comparative things.

Q.: I suppose you have been on University committees.

A: I have been in the University Council several times and have been on several committees.

Q.: Any particular issues you remember, other than the ones you have mentioned?

A: Those are the most interesting ones. The most difficult, the most painful one was when we were asked to eliminate some departments. That was some years ago.

Q.: Were these within the College of Liberal Arts?

A: Yes.

Q.: Did you eliminate some?

A: Yes, a number were eliminated. We all regretted it but the University felt it was necessary.

Q.: Was this because they didn't have enough students?

A: I think so, yes.

Q.: Do you remember what some of the ones were that were eliminated?

A: Something connected with Classics.

Q.: I supposed you belong to professional organizations.

A: Yes, the usual professional organizations.

Q.: Have you held office in these organizations?

A: No, I have not. But in Philippine Studies I was the editor, really the founding editor, for a journal of Philippine studies, which I edited for a number of years. I resigned from that some years ago and it has now gone somewhere else. My main professional

organization was the Association of Asian Studies.

Q.: Have you had honors?

A: Not since I won the Chase Prize at Harvard.

Q.: Do you remember outstanding former students who have gone on to greater things?

A: Yes, Jim Curry, who the last I knew was chairman of the Political Science Department at Baylor. Linda Richtor, who is a professor of political science is at Kansas State University. She did her research in the Philippines. And I had a large number of foreign students, particularly Asian students.

Q.: From the Philippines?

A: From many Asian countries, Japan, Taiwan, Korea.

Q.: Do they come here to study the politics of their countries?

A: No, they come here to study American politics, but they usually take me as their mentor. Then they write dissertations on their own countries. I am usually the one who is their dissertation advisor.

Q.: Do most of your students go into academic settings?

A: Yes, most of them do. Some don't. I'll tell you a funny story. I had a Taiwanese student who went back to Taiwan a few years ago. I visited him there when I was in that part of the world. I spent a few days with him in Taiwan and he told me that he was trying very hard to decide whether he wanted to teach or go into politics. So to make his decision he decided to consult a fortune teller. He took me along to this fortune teller, who was a blind fortune teller, although I noticed that he was wearing a very nice gold watch. I thought that was amusing that this blind fortune teller should be wearing this gold watch. He asked the fortune teller what he should do, and the fortune teller

basically said, “Do whichever you prefer.” So his money was wasted, but at least he had the fortune teller’s advice. Afterwards I told him, “Look, politics is not a profession. You have acquired a profession. You can teach. Politics is a game, it’s a gamble. Don’t waste your skills doing something you may or may not succeed in.” He wrote me later and said he had decided to teach, rather than go into politics.

Q.: So people who study political science don’t go into politics?

A: Most of them are pre-law. Most political science majors go into law.

Q.: And then maybe go into politics?

A: Then maybe go into politics. So these are some of the students whom I remember. But the Asian students in particular are very grateful and stay very close and keep in touch. It is one of the pleasures of teaching.

Q.: Have you been involved in community activities?

A: No, not really. I’m more interested in international affairs.

Q.: You are retiring a little later than most people usually do.

A: I enjoy teaching. I didn’t want to quit. Oh, I could still do it but I did finally retire. I did it at the right time. I shouldn’t have stayed on any longer. It’s time to quit.

Q.: Will you have continuing involvement with KU?

A: I still have an office, together with my colleague, Janoslav Pickalkreviez. We are allowed to keep our office for a year, which is very nice. But I think we will have it only for a year because the department is hiring several new people and needs the office space.

Q.: Your department has grown quite a bit since you have been here, hasn’t it?

A: Our department has grown and our office space has not grown.

Q.: What building is political science in?

A: Blake Hall.

Q.: What are some of the things you are doing in retirement?

A: I'm doing a lot of reading. I'm reading lots of books I always wanted to read and didn't have time for. I am auditing a course on Western Civilization.

Q.: How interesting.

A: I never taught it and I never had to take it, so I am sitting in on one of my colleague's classes and enjoying it very much. I'm doing the reading, together with the undergraduates, although I don't participate in the discussion section.

Q.: I would think that would be what would be interesting for you.

A: No, that would be inappropriate. I am doing a lot of reading and I go to a lot of concerts. Again, one of the pleasures of KU is a wonderful school of music, a College of Fine Arts with a music school. I do enjoy that. So I have lots of things to do.

Q.: Do you have grandchildren?

A: Not yet. Our younger son is getting married, so we hope that will come.

Q.: What is your assessment of the political science department at KU, past, present, hopes for the future, that kind of thing?

A: My department, as I said, has improved tremendously. It's really a superb department. It is a very collegial department too. So is East Asian Studies. It has always been able to maintain its faculty and maintain University support. I think it is a good university. The main problem is inadequate funding. We've lost many good faculty members we would love to have kept because they get more attractive offers elsewhere. As long as the state of Kansas is unwilling to fund this university adequately, and get its education on the cheap, we will always have difficulty keeping our faculty.

Q.: Is there anything else you would like to add?

A: No, that is all. But we certainly will continue to live in Lawrence, not only because my wife is still teaching but because it is a nice city. We have good friends here. There is lots of culture here, lots of music and art.

Q.: Lawrence is a special place, I think.

A: It is an exciting place. I think that is all I have to say.