

10-9-2007

Interview with Mojmir Povolny

Mojmir Povolny

Julia Stringfellow

Follow this and additional works at: <http://lux.lawrence.edu/oralhistories>

© Copyright is owned by the author of this document.

Recommended Citation

Povolny, Mojmir and Stringfellow, Julia, "Interview with Mojmir Povolny" (2007). *Oral Histories*. Book 7.
<http://lux.lawrence.edu/oralhistories/7>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at Lux. It has been accepted for inclusion in Oral Histories by an authorized administrator of Lux. For more information, please contact colette.brautigam@lawrence.edu.

Oral History Interviews with Emeriti Faculty and Retired Staff

Interview with Mojmir Povolny

Interviewed by Julia Stringfellow

Location: Lawrence University Archives

October 9, 2007

Could you please state your name?

I'm Mojmir Povolny.

What years did you teach at Lawrence?

I was at the University of Chicago teaching in 1956-1957 when I was offered a job at Lawrence. I was supposed to start in 1958 in the fall, but one day the president Doug Knight called me to see if I could meet him at the Midway airport because he was passing through before Christmas and he'd like to talk to me about my coming to Appleton. At the airport he told me, "We want you start in September, but would it be possible for you to give us in the winter term one course of politics, commuting from Chicago?" I had a full time assignment at the University of Chicago three times a week, but at that time you were eager to get a job anywhere you could get it, so I naturally enthusiastically agreed. So I started at the end of January or February, I don't know, it was still a semester system. I came to Lawrence once a week on every Thursday from Chicago. I took the train at 8 o'clock, by noon I was in Appleton from 1-4, and at five o'clock I took the train back to Chicago, and Friday morning I went to teach at the University. It was my first teaching job so I was writing my lecture from Chicago and going home, going to Lawrence. The class was meeting in the old Stephenson Hall, and it was packed with students. I had a letter from the students saying they often did not know what I was talking about. There was a young lady who took the notes, and I guess she was smart enough to tell them what I was saying. Then I started teaching regularly in September 1958 for the next almost 30 years.

And what were the subjects that you taught?

I had a degree in International Relations from the University of Chicago. The study of International Relations at Chicago was divided into four large fields that you had to take. One was American Diplomacy which also called for especially to have some American history and the Soviet politics and the Soviet system. Then International Law and International Economics, so when I came here, the department had only one member, it was Professor Riker. So everybody taught the Introduction to Political Science and then, I was encouraged to teach International Politics, International Law, International Organization, and Soviet Politics. At that time we taught six courses a year, so that pretty much filled my class schedule. Later, especially under a writer's influence, I began to work also in positive politics and theory, a fashionable subject at that time. And then of course there was Freshman Studies, and you were welcome to participate. That's what I did. And then the course of the year, you developed special courses. Literature or politics or literature of protest, special topics from time to time. And then later we introduced a

course in the Introduction to International Relations because we felt that even the students who majored in political science and having to take a course in international politics, preparation and encouragement. And that course is still in the catalog today.

I was going where you grew up.

I'm a Czechoslovakian by origin, a village boy. I was from southern Moravia, then went to the gymnasium in the second largest city in Czechoslovakia called Brno, about 150 miles east of Prague. For my first ten years I grew up in a village, I went to the elementary school for five years, I was the first one from the school who went to a gymnasium, I don't think the American high school is anything comparable, it's an eight year school with other interesting program in middle education. And then when I finished, we were in the war, we were occupied, and they closed the university. The gymnasium was usually for a certain group of people, a preparatory school for university study for things like medical school, law school, engineering, and what have you. Many of the students from the gymnasium finished their studies and then went into a sort of white collar profession. We were closed by the law, universities were closed by the Germans, there was no way except to become a German sympathizer and go to study in Germany. I didn't and I was saved from it, actually. So I ended up during the rest of the war working in a factory in what was then left of the Czechoslovakian republic. But when the war ended, I rushed to go to university. That's what you wanted to know, right? Where did you go to college?

Yes.

The European system does not the system of a four year college. You graduate from high school here, or in Europe, from a gymnasium. Because gymnasium was classical, where you were taught Latin or Greek, technical emphasis was on math and science. Then there was one in between, and that was the one I went to. It seems I lost personally or my generation lost four years during the wartime of being able to study at university. We were able to, I went to the law school and we were able to compress the program from five to two and a half years, so I finished the law school in two and a half years. This was some of the most pleasant and great law school post-war enthusiasm from liberation and freedom and the perspectives of the war which opened before you. I graduated in September 1947 so between Spring '45 and Fall '47 I finished the law school and was selected to get a job in Prague which I stayed until next year when I left the country.

Why did you decide to go to law school?

Especially in the central European tradition, in the university studies, law school was probably was the place which opened a variety of possibilities and opportunities for a lifetime career. So you could become a lawyer, which means after graduation you went to practice and tried to make it either in the law firm or on your own. The other route was the public administration, the public administration jobs, this is a pretty high level, this was filled by law school graduates. And one of the roots there was the root of the tradition to start working at the court and then become, you continue for life.

Oh wow!

No, I'm joking. It was a great career. And the third one was journalism. Journalism was a special level, not a reporter, but an analyst and moving in the political world. Another one was diplomatic service and every enterprise, every department, you could go into sort of business. There were no business schools in the American type at the time, it was not a European tradition. There were famous couple of schools like that, one in Vienna, one in Paris, but in the rest of the world there was nothing of that sort. In the bank you didn't count money, you just decided on what kind of contracts and who to persecute or whatever. And then of course there was to teach at the local school to be professor. But that was tough, because first you had to have brains. Secondly, you had to get another job because the university would not appoint you like here, you know. Assistant professor of school they did not exist.

At the same time, I had some connection at the local school where the professor would let you do exercises or seminars, and then you have shown your color, and then you were elevated to what would be an associate professor, private professor. And then you waited for ten years before you became chair. Many of us dreamt about that kind of a career, but I had only one half year left before I left the country, so I worked for a political party, the second largest party to the Communist party, for half a year in Prague after graduation and in general I was regarded as very lucky and on the roller coaster to a promising career.

Now, when you came to the United States...

That's a long way between when I left the country in '48, because the Communists took over. Could we talk about it?

Yes, absolutely.

When the Communists took over I was the executive secretary of the economic department of this National Socialist party. And when the Communists took over, the state secretary came to pick me up and had a conversation with me about the correspondence that they had confiscated the day before from my desk because I was in charge of the political party's executive contact with members in parliament, the planning commission, and with the three ministers in the government, and with the party's members that were highly placed in the business domain of the republic, chief executives of this plant or this office. I had been active since the end of the war in the youth movement of the party, probably with the Communist agents. So we decided there were two ways of fighting the Communists. One was to stay at home and wait for what possibilities there would be, in either the underground, or, in the Czech tradition of the 20th century, go abroad and work from abroad. My faith or the decision was going to be one of the several that were going to go abroad. I fled the country in April 1948, spent three months in Germany at a refugee camp, and by that time people who were well known had made it to Paris and they helped me get to Paris, so I did not have to wait for

2 or 3 years in Germany before I could emigrate to the United States. At the time you thought you were going home in 4 or 5 years.

What a journey! And when you got to the United States...

Well, there is Paris. When I came to Paris, we were put into a refugee camp which was worse than the camp in Germany; in Germany at least we were in a camp which before us was a camp for the Germans transferred from Eastern Europe in a small old factory. So we had barracks with cots. Whereas in Paris they put us also in a factory, but a terrible place in the suburbs in a small plant, I don't know what it was producing. And you slept on the floor on a blanket. But you were in Paris, and to be in Paris when you are 23, 24 years old, you put up with everything. A friend who came before me, a young architect, he somehow found a job in a big American dormitory in the university city in Paris as a handyman. He just got a job as a draftsman in French architecture, so he said, "Listen, let's go see Major King." Major King was the director of the dormitory, it was a huge four-story building with about 300 or 400 American students, packed with GIs and the beautiful girls. "Maybe he will take you." So I went to go see Major King, and he said, "Sure." This was August. "We'll have students coming from the United States in the next shift. At least how many we know, and we need the windows washed." So, he assigned me to wash the windows. Whenever I go back to Paris with someone who knows the city, I take them to show them the place where the windows are that I washed.

So I washed windows for about a month, and one there was an announcement on the bulletin board from the [?] for International Peace which at the time had its historical headquarters. There was an international student conference to discuss the big issues of the world. So I went to Major King and told him, "Mr. King, could I take off and go to this conference?" So he said, "Sure," so I went to the conference and the headquarters at that time were in Paris right in the Sanjev play area. That is a classic neighborhood, American would never choose anything that was not. There were about 60 people, and I must have said something, because two days later I had a call from Madame Secretary Genatol, a French lady who was sort of the boss in the sort of running of the house because American directors kept coming and going. She said Dr. Wilson, the director, would like to see me if I have time. So I ended up asking for permission and I went to see him and he talked to me and he said, "What is your plan?" And I said, "As I see it now, I have to get a foreign degree, because the Czech law degree is absolutely no value. I would like if possible to do it in the United States." He said, "That is exactly what I was going to tell you. It will take some time. Would you like to work for me? I'll pay you \$110." That is what the American GIs were getting. So I didn't say no, and I worked for Wilson for a year before I got an immigration visa to the United States with the Displaced Persons Act and before I got entrance to the United States and fellowships to the university, I was selected to get one in Chicago for 4 years, room and board and not tuition. Tuition in Chicago at that time was \$900 a year.

Wow, that's a little bit different than how it is now!

I had a single room in International House until I graduated. It took almost a year and Dr. Wilson and three other people in the endowment were very kind and very helpful, and they got me to the United States. I spent four years in Chicago.

What a journey. When you came to the United States, were there any things that really surprised you about American culture?

We came on a liberty ship. Liberty ships carried soldiers and nurses back during the war. We got out of Raymond Harbor just before Christmas in 1949 and landed in front of New York harbor in the middle of January 1950. Our ship was full of refugees. You got on the ship and already had the American treatment, it was manned by people who probably served during the war, black and white sailors and they were terribly, terribly good. Of course I had that experience with the American, so-called upper class with the Carnegie endowment. There were people coming from the embassy, from the State Department, and from the endowment. The treatment that you got was a kind of gentleness, but not forced, you know. The kind of friendliness, respectful distance for your own sake, and then the welcoming that you got on the ship. When you land for the first time in the new world, the sun setting and the Statue of Liberty is sitting there, it's a very moving moment. And then you stand there for as long as you can, because you don't want to go to sleep and you look at the Brooklyn shore and then you see the line of cars never stops. And this was 1950. All of a sudden you being to feel the size, the bigness of the country, maybe you imagined it, but it's already there.

Then my school was going to start in September, so the Carnegie endowment let me work for them in the Paris office, so there was an introduction to the kind of active American life and the working day life. The other impression was that everything was so new. Today I'm just coming from New York, we spent a weekend in New York and Philadelphia. At the same time it was huge and gentle. One Sunday I walked from where we lived with a friend who gave me a bed in his apartment to George Washington Bridge from 79th street, the whole Sunday I crossed the bridge on foot to so called Fort Lee. You stepped from the bridge, and you were in the wilderness.

All of a sudden...

Not only that, you stepped off the bridge and cars were going this way and there was not a foot path.

It just abruptly stopped.

Today it is all built up with condos for a million dollars! Then of course I took a bus from New York all the way to Chicago when my time came. What is so different and so impressive? The size, the bigness.

Now when you started at the University of Chicago, what were some differences between going to school there and going to school in Czechoslovakia?

At the university you went off, didn't go to lectures. You got the books or the professor's lectures, and you went whenever you wanted. I honestly went very frequently or most of the time. You didn't take examinations until the end of a particular article. So we had three state examinations in those two years, one was in the History of Law, one was in the Civil and Penal Law, and what they call Political and International Law. Public Administration, Public Finance, that kind of stuff, you did an oral exam, with three or four professors. They asked four questions. But also you had time to go to another faculty, another department or school, that was a very famous site. I had some work with him. In the United States, you had a lecture, midterm, blue book, final. So you do it. But the problem was in the first course, I was sitting next to someone and he was filling in the blue book, and I had hardly a page of answer. In another six weeks, I was able to fill the little book. So that's how I learned the American style of education. But I had a great professor; I had very great professors back at home, even though the Nazis killed about four or five of them. Those who survived were terribly good. In Chicago, I had a great professor. So two men to this day who are simply famous because they founded this school of thought in their field, in International Politics, or the realistic study of international politics, comes from Milton Friedman, who produced himself as a Nobel prize winner and five Nobel prize winners. Friedman economics, I did not know what he was talking about, but I had his course in money and banking and international finance. Then I wrote a dissertation in two years.

What was your dissertation on?

The United Nations or the Soviet Union in the United Nations. He was not my advisor but he was my best sort of, almost friend because he was a Viennese Jew who ran from Vienna when Hitler occupied Austria to Czechoslovakia and the Czechs gave him and his wife and family protection and then he escaped from Czechoslovakia just before Hitler occupied Czechoslovakia. He came to the United States and taught the modern field of economic development and said it's not scientific enough, it has to be a role of the United Nations in Soviet foreign policy. So that's how I became a scholar in this field.

When you finished your degree at the University of Chicago, and you began teaching...

I didn't begin teaching; it was a terrible time to find a teaching job. It was about ten years before the tremendous expansion of higher education took place in this country. So the jobs were taken either by the generation of our fathers, I was 30 at the time, or by the American GIs who came home in '45 and finished in the ten years, '54, '55, and got the jobs. By the time we graduated, even they had a hard time already finding teaching jobs. For American citizens, there were jobs in the Foreign Service, not surprisingly, especially in CIA, because they were building up those institutions in the Cold War two or three years too late. From the group that I graduated with in 1954, probably three or so got teaching jobs immediately. I had friends who went into CIA, several friends who ended up in the Foreign Service. I was in a great seminar during the vacation at the University of Chicago, and they invited me to be an assistant to the Director of the International Student Program. It was basically a program that organized international seminars in this

country and in Europe, and for American and foreign students, so they could bring together the young generation of, let's call them budding intellectuals, university-educated people, working on international reconciliation and international peace. I got to work in Philadelphia for two years. It was not a career job, it was a service group, it depends very much on people who have a lot of money and can volunteer their time, except for executives. So I had to look for something else.

We got married two years after I came, we came from our honeymoon, and they asked me whether I would be willing to take one more year and go and work in Japan in a program. So I went home to my wife and told her to sit down and said, "How would you like to go to Japan for a year?" She nearly fell from the chair, but we did go to Japan! And from Japan, Professor Hosewich, of whom I spoke, the Austrian, came to a conference in Japan and said, "What is your plan?" I was writing letters to every college in the world, telling them I was available. And he said, "What are you going to do next year?" And I said, "I'm still looking for a job." And he said, "You'll get that job." A week after he came home to Chicago, he sent me a wire that he would like me to come and teach at the University of Chicago for a year. So this time I fell from the chair, and we went to Chicago for a year.

And by that time Lawrence expressed an interest. I think it was due to the fact that the president, Mr. Knight, was a member of the board of one of the other Carnegie, Carnegie has a lot of other libraries. At that time, Carnegie had an endowment for a region in international studies, and the Quakers were represented on it, and Chicago was represented on it, and Mr. Knight was on it. Somehow, somebody told him that I was available, so he offered me a job. I came to Appleton for an interview, and in December slept in the president's house, it was a good omen. They offered me a job, and asked if I would like to come and teach.

What were your first impressions of Lawrence and Appleton?

My wife was from the Midwest. She was born on a gentleman's farm in the suburb, went to college in the East, and was very happy to return to Chicago. When I got the job, it was something. I liked it, I feel at home, this is where I hang my hat. She was already expecting our first baby. So her brother drove us here. I think she was very impressed by the president and Mrs. Knight. The school at that time, there was a report where 2,000 colleges were graded. *The Chicago Tribune* named the ten best colleges in the United States for education; Lawrence was about fifth or seventh. I talked to people and I knew that Riker was already a very budding, promising scholar. Mr. Bober was here, he was an economist who was probably one of the best students of Marx who could not get a job at Harvard because he was a Jew at that time. You could only go there as a visiting professor. At the time Joyce (his wife) wasn't sure if she was going to like it here. Today she says she would not want to live anywhere else. But it was very gentle, Lawrence was very hospitable, at that time it was probably 1,000 or so students. There was a ROTC, a very distinguished program and the student body at that time was pretty much graduates, Minneapolis, but great kids.

I was going to ask you about the Select Committee on Planning that you were the chair of, and the group put together the Lawrence Difference which is still in use today?

I was here for about 10 years by that time, you know. The president was President Tarr, he decided the last report had been written about fifty years ago. The president wanted to make it smart, and for some reason he asked me to chair the committee. I think I served with him on the Honors Committee and I think I was chairman of the Honors Committee. So he put me in, and this was a very difficult time, this was in the middle of the Vietnam War, the middle of the student unrest, the unrest among the faculty, quite a turnover of the faculty, the generation was retiring and there were younger instructors. It was an attitude towards how education was different from the more generalist attitude of the previous generation. The previous generation sort of felt what we do on top of it is good, for those younger people it was a sense of the country was changing. You had to prove yourself to the outside world at that time, from higher education you proved yourself not by, putting a label here, publishing and research. The graduate schools were already encouraging this kind of attitude. So there was a little bit of turmoil on the campus. And I think Tarr was looking for a way of accommodating this change and accommodating the aspirations that came from it to these new bodies on the campus. It was a very good committee, there were some very outstanding people who made a great, thoughtful contribution.

I think we produced a good document with one mistake. And that mistake was to replace Freshman Studies with individual seminars. You know the Freshman Studies was already well established from Pusey's days which means for some twenty years we knew that even in that generation some faculty members sort of turned their nose on it, "how can I teach something about the solar system when I'm teaching literature," or "how can I teach a book on Machiavelli when I am doing experiments in the physics laboratory?" But in general I think it was accepted. Everybody felt there should be some kind of an introduction to the college. You should not get a kid from Scranton, Introduction to Physics. Out of that kind of uncertainty came the idea giving the students something they themselves could choose, but it was so the faculty could choose and would be happy to do, that was the Freshman seminar. If you're a political scientist, you could teach the presidency of Woodrow Wilson. If you are a physicist, not the theory of relativity, but something related. If you were an English professor, and you were a specialist of the 19th century or whatever. This passed. It is very hard to say if it was successful or not successful; it simply did not do what it should do. President Warch was a dean, and he never told me, we became relatively good friends. In 1976, President Smith asked me to be an acting dean, to be the dean. So I telephoned everyone in the department, big shots in the department, and asked if I should take it, and they said yes. Then came Warch and Warch got my job; President Smith wasn't there. I had a sense that Dean Warch was not sure about this business. Then he became president, he asked me to be a dean. So after two years, I became a dean because he did not want to wait until he found a dean. And he began to work slowly in working the Freshman Studies back. We changed the distribution requirements in the planning commission, because by that time the student body, the students graduating from Lawrence began also to aspire beyond the college.

Boys and girls married, went to work. But now they began to increasingly aspire law school, medical school, not that there were not law students or medical students before, but more, a great larger number. Opportunities opened to them. And the faculty enjoyed it, because the political scientists could start preparing students for graduate school in political science or law school. The physicists said, you go to my school, graduate school in physics, medical school. And Warch began to feel this kind of pressure, too. He sort of started moving in the direction for two years, putting Freshman Studies back. There would only be two terms of it instead of three. Some people did not have to do it. I told him before and I told him after, every freshman takes Freshman Studies until this program and Freshman Seminar, and I enjoyed that very much.

A year ago President Warch, at a retired faculty seminar at Bjorklunden, took one morning to talk about Freshman Studies. He started with how it was almost killed. He read a letter and looked at me and said, "Do you know who wrote it?" I said, "Don't play that game with me." I'm really glad it is back. I may have more concern about it today because the original Freshman Studies was sort of within the frame or within the boundaries of what you would call Western Civilization. Every distinguished school had a course in something of that sort again. Columbia, two semesters, this one, that one. The important thing was we kept after the Warch reform the three or four books that sort of have become the college list. Never have we allowed Plato to be taken off, so everybody knew about the cave at least. Never Kuhn and his paradigm argument. You could go to an assembly of 100,000 undergraduates and you say "paradigm," it would be the Lawrence students who would get it; the others would not know what you're talking about. And then it was one of the great novels. But it was a great experience.

Now were there any professors that you worked with that really made a big impact on you?

Bill Riker was the one political scientist in the department. He was only a few years younger than I but because of the two different paths our lives followed, he had ten years of teaching when I came and he was really a great political scientist, very imaginative, very broadly educated. He pioneered the application of mathematics in political science. I think his theory of games and political science still is the most powerful explanation of building of coalitions. So he was both a very good friend, we were practically of the same age, and lovely, lovely guy. I had great respect for the two old men in the Economics department, and Mr. Bober, the Marxist scholar. Although he was here for only two or three years during my tenure, and Mr. McConagha. Then Steve Darling, a chemist who devoted his life to Lawrence. He was a very productive scholar, but also a fun-loving guy and life-loving fellow, and he and his family, his wife, whenever they were in our house, they would come to the kitchen after dinner and tell me, "I never go to sleep after a party, after I sweep the kitchen."

There were many, you know. Mr. Hulbert, the man of all seasons, great, great, voice teacher. He was always on the side of the president, either as his advisor or passing dean. That was a very great guy. In the Music department, Professor Ming the composer, we became very good friends. Both his family and ours, we spent a couple of sabbatical

leaves at the same time in Paris. That's the whole gallery. Among the women, Anne Jones, the French professor, Elizabeth Forter, another one was Ben Schneider, the English professor. And one who I'm friends with and we're still as tight as ever is Bill Chaney. He is our best friend, I don't tell him he's our best friend because I don't want to encourage him too much! But he is our best friend, we spent a lot of time together. We spent several vacations together in Cyprus, in Portugal, in Rome, and he to this day is our great friend. He is an embodiment of Lawrence at his best. And I'm sure there are younger men growing up, I have a lot of good friends among the younger faculty.

Were there any places that you travelled to for sabbaticals or for vacations while you were teaching at Lawrence?

No, we were, it sort of sounds crazy, but I was only here for three or four years, and I wanted to do something new in political science. The kind of field that was being worked out was integration, sort of national integration. It was already on its way in the early 1960s. At the same time the promising field was the emergence of the African independent nations from the rule and what was going to happen with them. Would they go the nationalistic so-called way, or will there be some kind of an interest corporation? So I asked the president if I could go in 1961, three years after we came here. He let me go for a year to Europe, we went to Paris. So I began to work on it, and I went to Africa for almost three months. We had two babies, and my wife was in Paris, and her mother came, so she could spend almost six weeks with me. I learned a great lesson, that simply states "do not surrender their sovereignty, even part of it, until they are well established and self-confident." And the Africans were so new you know. There was a governor from Paris who ruled over them. Here they were sitting by themselves in the palaces. But it was a tremendous experience to see Africa. The next time I went after Lawrence introduced the sabbatical leaves, and I got a grant from the Associative Colleges and we went to Paris and I got to work on Eastern/Western relations. A few years later, by the time the two of us went to London. We had a great time. Paris has always been a second home to me because I was a village boy, I never grew up in a big city, I was in Prague for half a year, then I was in New York for a while, in Chicago. I had a great year in Paris, and my wife loves Paris. So we had a great time. Lawrence was very helpful in that aspect.

I was going to ask, you retired in 1987?

I retired in 1987, I was 65 the year before. At that time you could stay on for another year or two. I was very much involved in the Czechoslovakian exile movement, and this was very hard to do during the full teaching and responsibilities. So I thought I'll retire. At that time the air was full of change, the Cold War. So I thought, I'll retire, and retired that December. I got a nice citation and picture.

I read the citation, yes. And I was going to ask, you came back in 1992 to serve as acting president while President Warch was on sabbatical.

Yes, Warch is a tricky man. When he came and became the dean, he always says, I was dean in that year, 1976 or 1977, and when they interviewed him, he came to see me in my room and we talked about it and he said "what do you think about it?" Because he was not a dean before. He was some kind of assistant to the president. I told him it was the best job besides teaching in the college university, because first as the president, everyone is under you and you don't have to raise money for it. And he always repeats, "You told me it was the best job." And then he became president. When he was a candidate, we talked about the presidency, he and I. I said how everyone expects you will express interest in this, everyone is sure that you will be the president. And so when he became president, he came to our house and asked if I would serve as a dean for him for a year because it takes a year to find a president. So I became his dean. And then 1992, I was happily retired. I think I had just come from Vienna from those European security conferences. I had a call from him asking whether he could come for a visit. It was Sunday afternoon, why would a president want to visit? He said, "well, have you heard about what happened to me?" I said no. He said, "the trustees gave me a term off, and I would like you to come to Sampson House. You don't have to do anything, you just have to be there." We didn't talk money or anything. At that time I didn't have to go and raise money. I had to think for every donation practically and had to go to budget meetings and a couple of trustee meetings at the time. I don't know how the current trustees are, but there were tough guys. And then the budget, that was the most difficult part because the faculty and employees were not satisfied with this, with what you pay them. These are my friends, and I knew more about them than the president himself. So that I could be more discerning. We had a funny incident in the budget, we made the budget with the business manager and put it to the Finance Committee which met in the afternoon and the Finance Committee said, "fine, that's okay." At ten o'clock in the evening the business manager calls me and tells me, "I have just heard from one of the offices that they forgot to include about \$150,000 in their budget which has to be done. It is not my fault, it not my fault." I said, "It's not my fault either." So I called Mr. Herbert, he was a chairman of the board of the paper mill in Kaukauna. I said, "Mr. Herbert, I'm sorry to bother you." He said, "What happened?" I said, "Something's missing." He said, "Oh, we'll fix it." The next morning he came to the Board and said, "There was a mistake in the budget." That was the kind of gentleman you dealt with. He said, "We will take care of it." So I was vice-president. It was a good time, a great time. It was good to know all the faculty, I had been out for quite a few years and there were new people, not like now, now it's completely different. I got to know them.

When you received the award in 1996, the Masaryk, I was going to ask you about receiving that.

Since I left Czechoslovakia for political reasons, I had been sort of in exile politics from the day I crossed the border. A small group of students, former student and young graduates, sort of published a magazine and published memoranda that appealed to different organizations from the United Nations down to whatever to sort of help with the Communist operation in Czechoslovakia. I was very soon elected to the general assembly of the organizations which was representing the Czechoslovakian movement, an international plan. Former ministers and generals and prominent party leaders who put

together the Free Council of Czechoslovakia in 1949, or course they could not get recognition in a certain government of exile or regional government because all the countries had their diplomatic relations in Prague with the Communists. By the late 1950s I was already elected to the Executive Committee and was writing some of the drafts. Then the old generation began to sort of vanish, old, died. So for us the younger ones, there was about ten of us in my generation to decide whether to continue or not to continue. This was almost 35 years after the fall of democracy. It was still alive, but we decided to continue. That meant we took leadership and I happened to be elected the president of it. A very close friend of mine who was at the college at that time in New York was the secretary general, a Slavic friend from Toronto was the chairman of the assembly of the [?] of course could never be because they were scattered throughout the world. But the committee would meet once or twice a year, twice a year at the beginning. I spent weekends in New York. Then came the conference on [secrecy?] That sort of gave a very good push to both the movement in those countries under Communist rule, including Czechoslovakia, especially Czechoslovakia. Whether the regime would fall, that was still in the stars.

So the conference was organized so it had four meetings every three years. The first one was in Belgrade in 1977. I could not go to Belgrade because it was Communist and you didn't know what was on your paper. The next one was in Madrid in 1982, and the last one was in Vienna was in 1987, 1989. So I went to the Madrid and the Vienna meetings. We sort of knew from the contacts the citizens fairly well, they knew us, and the regime collapsed. It's not necessary to go into the details of the collapse, but it happened simply in November 1989, the Communist regime collapsed in Czechoslovakia. Gorbachev was still with the Soviet Union. So two weeks later, three weeks later we went for the first time back as a delegation to Prague and met all the leaders of the country, the president down to the ministers. The revolution was their business, you know. They would not let you, not that you aspired to any kind of positions, the welcomes overwhelmed me. In the course of the years, the Parliament had to decide to recommend certain people for this highest Czechoslovakian civil order. I was the first president of the Republic from 1980-1985, so I have a medal and pins.

It's quite an honor.

The military order of the white lion is given to heads of foreign states and military leaders who deserve, who fought for freedom on the battlefield, and this is a civilian order. So there was a big celebration, my wife went with me. The order is given in the castle in the hall which goes back to the fourteenth century. It still has steps on which the knights came on horses. It was a very pleasant occasion, very formal occasion.

We've already talked about this some, but I was going to ask what activities and travels you've done since you retired.

I really devoted my time largely to the liberated Czechoslovakia and then after the division of the republic, the end of 1992, to the Czech Republic and Slovakia. So with the friends and there were only three of us from the original youth movement who spoke about after 1945. And four of them in Czechoslovakia who survived the Communist

regime. One was sentenced to death and got a commutation to life that lasted about 20 years. The other two had about fifteen years in the mines and then somehow finished there. So we got together which was a very moving kind of reunion after forty years and thought well, why don't young people who are here now do the same what we did when we were young in 1945? Engage in public life, prepare themselves for public life, service, do academic work if they are capable. So we went to talk to the director of the university, an anti-Communist descendent, and he said, "Oh, it's a great idea." We said, "well, we need to have access to those students, and we would need a room." He said, "well, you all are graduates of the local school except for one who was a sociologist, go to the Dean and tell him I'm sending you, and you just tell him what you want." So we went to the Dean, it was still a Communist dean. And he said, "oh, great idea." It was time to wash off the red. He said, "I'll call the faculty who are here, and we a meeting with them, and I'll introduce you to a couple of the kids who are very promising students of law." So we met with them, we met with the faculty, they had all been through the party before, except one woman who came from Paris who told me I was. They gave us a big room and we met with two students and with one faculty member who taught constitutional law and political science at the same time. He was so eager to help. Within two weeks we had a small group of students who asked what they could do. So we talked about what we were famous of in 1945, we published a survey of Czechoslovakian politics. We said, you know, the newspapers here, this was the post-Communist era. "Why don't you work out a system by which you will be able to publish it?" Those friends of ours who stayed, we went back to America, to Holland, they would be led to commentary.

And from that grew a group of youngsters, we got them some money from here, from our pockets actually, and they got the room, and from the university the support to have it printed. I sent them my professional library, the friend from Holland sent them his library, and all of a sudden there was an institute. They looked for a name and called it International Institute of the Study of Politics. That became sort of a magnet which attracted other young people even from other towns. The Communists had already established universities elsewhere, so the kids and faculty were interested. We did the same in Slovakia. They immediately began to organize seminars and lectures so I lectured there three times a year whatever they wanted on American politics, about the role of the Supreme Court, things of that sort. It became sort of an established institution. Then the next director who had some experience in America called us about 3 or 4 years later and said "listen, I'm not going to let this institute be in the law school because I can't get rid of those guards who are working. You don't know it, but in this country there are associations still, it's better not to be. I'll make it an independent research institute." I said, "but director, who is going to pay for it?" He said, "well, you are generous enough, I'll put it on the budget of the university." And he put it on the budget of the university, it got affiliated with the new department of political science, today it has four assistant professors associated with it, it published, organized conferences, it has an international reputation. So that's our gift, to build that university.

Two of the boys already were here on Fulbright. They are internationally recognized, especially in Europe. Great stuff.

That's a wonderful project.

So I started it, doing a little service of domestic politics and writing essays. Then here in this country I have very ambitious in a dying newspaper in New York. It was dying because it was in the old tradition, on you know, of the nineteenth century. In the old tradition, you know, how to cook good dumplings, this kind of stuff. He made it into a political journal, and he had a few correspondents in Prague, and he appropriated me to write a postcard from the United States. So every two weeks I have to think up to write about something.

That's fun to do.

Yes. Tomorrow his wife is flying to Prague because their son there had a baby, so she has to help the mother, and we are having a summer vacation for two weeks. But I have to write something. Do you have any idea what I should write?

I'd have to think about it.

I have to write mostly about Czech politics, what I can get from the internet and news, and try to jazz it up. The kind of political science that I still carry in my head.

Was there anything else that you wanted to talk about?

No, I don't think so, no.

I was just going to ask as a last question, how has Lawrence changed since you first came here and what ways has it stayed the same?

There's a lot of surviving heritage here at Lawrence, at least, I like to think so. And I get disturbed if there is some harm done to it. It certainly has grown with the growth of American higher education. Maybe I am not entirely correct, but when I came to Lawrence, you may say the liberal arts college in America of the late 1950s, it was a finishing school. It's true that from many places, including Lawrence to a small degree, men went into some professional school or professional education after graduating, law school, medical school, business school. For a Masters degree in order to enter the public service, a great number of Lawrence graduates went to teaching from Lawrence, high school teaching and even elementary teaching, and we had a great reputation. When I was the Dean once, the Department of Public Instruction sent me somebody to evaluate our program. And they came back by mail or telephone that we were very short in discharging our responsibility because we only had two courses in education and practice teaching, and where were the courses on method? We used to say, "why don't you teach a course on how to plug a record player or something?" Then a year later, the department issued a report and the guy called by the time I was not a dean, but I called Mr. Warch and said, "you know what, among the teachers in Appleton, elementary and high school teachers, the best teachers are your graduates." That was the situation, and that began to change in the 1960s. When I came we had a ROTC, a very prominent ROTC, and a lot of

fun with the officers and the kids. Lawrence has always been about developing minds behind the start of a movement. They became radical, we were radicalized here about a year later. I think it has grown in the scholarly orientation that is largely due to the younger generation of the faculty for whom scholarship is a very important part of the profession. I still think that the teaching which was the kind of responsibility in the earlier days has not suffered from this scholarly orientation of the faculty to whom I was still a contemporary. I spent for those last seven years, I would know if the movement was in some kind of negative or unwelcome way. I think it is also good that in response to the changing world in which the contemporary generation that they do go for further education. I think the American college is a very splendid contribution to education globally. Because I think the European student who is thrown from the gymnasium into the university does not have the kind of the Europeans would claim the gymnasium is like your college. We teach Plato and we teach stem cells in the department, but I think the adjustment and accommodation of the young person to the kind of larger scholarship and the demands of the scholarship and the responsibility of the scholarship is very well performed by the liberal arts college. I was going to say, I may be very unfair to the colleges attached to the universities, but that's where you hear the complaints. This relationship between the scholar and the student which a liberal arts college provides is simply something that should not be missed and cannot be replaced by something. And I think that has remained the attribute of Lawrence to this day.

I think it has become more bureaucratic, but some of the bureaucratization, you take one of the crucial aspects in the life of the faculty, the tenure decision. The president called the dean about a couple of faculty, "here is x, y, and they have been here for five or six years, do you want to keep them, yes or no." The darker aspect of it is such as misuse and abused term about family and say that this used to be a family. There was an intimacy of knowledge and relationship between the people, and I don't mean only the faculty, the faculty and the two guys who were raking the leaves every fall before we bought those \$3,000 machines. They knew you, you knew them. And I had experience it in the spring. They asked me to serve on a little group in the Development office connected to the campaign to speak to the faculty and the staff with the process of the campaign, what they can do. When I said "I'm going to talk," they gave me a list of people, and I said, "I'm going to talk to everybody to invite them," and they said, "well, we can send them an e-mail." I think they appreciated it. I'm not complaining about it being that way because I know enough about organization theory. You cannot run an institution without having bureaucracy. You have to inject into it a spirit and so much depends on the leadership. I think Lawrence in the last 25 years was terribly lucky to have a president who somehow managed those two sides of his responsibility with great skill.

The students, are they different? – yes, they are different. I came in 1958, they would wear long pants, skirts, blouses. Now they wear t-shirts, bikinis, shorts up to here. But they are still the beautiful faces of American boys and girls as they were then. I don't think it has changed much with the fact that they have co-ed dorms. When Mr. Tarr came, he inherited the last decision of President Knight. There could be a visit on Wednesday for two hours, and I was in Chicago, we could not visit the women's side of International House except once a year for a party in the afternoon. But I don't think that

changed too much. There was no beer, no Viking Room, but the police were on the campus from time to time, around the fraternities in 1958 as they are probably today because of different things. So yes, things changed. I'm very happy to have been here.