

**PER ASPERA AD MUNDUM:  
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS FACES THE WORLD**

FRANCIS H. HELLER  
for the  
Office of International Programs  
of the  
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

**2003**



## CONTENTS

<a href="#"><u>PREFACE</u></a> .....	2
I. <a href="#"><u>Of Universities, Especially American Ones</u></a> .....	5
II. <a href="#"><u>The Years Before World War I</u></a> .....	7
III. <a href="#"><u>The Years of Chancellor Deane W. Malott</u></a> .....	11
IV. <a href="#"><u>The Years of Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy</u></a> .....	17
V. <a href="#"><u>The Years of Chancellor W. Clarke Wescoe</u></a> .....	27
VI. <a href="#"><u>The Seventies and Thereafter</u></a> .....	36
VII. <a href="#"><u>The New Century: The Institutionalization of International Education</u></a> .....	41
<a href="#"><u>Post Script</u></a> .....	44

## PREFACE

The initial impetus for this account of the international activities of the University of Kansas came in 1993 from George Woodyard, then the dean of international programs and studies of the university. He suggested that, because I had been personally involved in many of KU's early ventures in international education and had continued these interests of mine beyond the years (1957-1972) when I served in a succession of administrative roles in the university, I should prepare a narrative of the university's involvement in international programs. He knew that I had been compiling some recollections of my years at the university and that, included in these fragments, were some pages dealing with some of KU's ventures in the international field. Thus I was in a poor position to contradict his assertion that I might, quite possibly, be able to write the story without having to research it "from scratch."

My acceptance was, however, qualified. I did not want this to be a tale of my involvement. On the contrary, I wanted to relate what the university had done, how KU came to do what it had done, and who all had contributed. I would, in other words, attempt to produce a record of University of Kansas achievement, without, however, glossing over failures and shortcomings. My method would be to examine as many documents as I could find and talk to as many participants as were still available.

But I still faced the issue of what I ought to do with those parts of the story in which I myself had played a part. Even as I look over these opening paragraphs I am struck by the fact that the word "I" appears ten times in two paragraphs. The prospect of a publication purporting to be the story of an institution's activities, yet punctured throughout by the word "I", holds no appeal for me. But I am certainly no Julius Caesar and writing in the third person strikes me often as contrived, even arrogant. Thus I will try to keep the "I"'s to a minimum but will use the first person where that is the appropriate way to tell the story.

One other constraint I faced was whether this account should include activities originating at or related to the Medical Center and the schools located there or, by analogy, at the Regents Center in Johnson County or the Medical School's Wichita branch or the Capital Center in Topeka. (Some of these parts of the University of Kansas did not even exist fifty or twenty years ago; all of them now enjoy degrees of autonomy—which has not always been the same.) Medical schools are, for good reasons, grounded in the nature of the profession, different from liberal arts colleges or engineering schools. Academic work offered to persons holding full-time jobs has to take account of the fact that most of these students can pursue their educational objectives at only one site, that nearest to their habitat. This account will therefore be confined to events and activities on the original core part of the university, the Lawrence campus.

Several years elapsed after George Woodyard's suggestion as other commitments delayed my compliance with the assignment he had entrusted to me. During the subsequent tenure of Andrew Debicki as dean of international programs it appeared that a graduate student at the University of Missouri at Kansas City might take on the task as his doctoral thesis. I took this man to lunch, gave him a fairly extensive oral introduction to the topic and provided him with copies of materials in my personal files. Unfortunately the student's plans had to be changed before he could even start on a thesis. Thus when Diana Carlin, newly named to the deanship of international programs, inquired about the program's past, she learned that the information was

widely scattered. She also learned that George Woodyard had hoped that I would eventually prepare an account of KU's international programs and that Andrew Debicki would have done likewise, if it had not been for the appearance of the UMKC doctoral student. Dean Carlin then urged me to undertake the task, and Provost David Shulenburg provided initial support. To all and each of them, my thanks for the opportunity.

Specific thanks are also due to William Crowe, librarian extraordinaire, who made it possible for me to devote much of the year 2002 enmeshed in the University Archives in the Spencer Research Library (over which he presides), and to Ned Kehde and Barry Bunch, whose knowledge of what is to be found in the archives goes far beyond the portion of the archives' contents that the two of them, the entire full-time staff of the unit, have been able to inventory and index.

Because the University Archives continue to be a project in the making, I have not routinely included references to specific record groups and/or files in the archives; they appear only where they seemed to be needed. Other footnote references are used only to document the use of language used by other authors or to enlarge upon the text where this appeared to be necessary or desirable. Any textual statements not accompanied by a footnote should be assumed to be drawn from the University Archives or, if the text indicated my own involvement, my personal recollection. I learned in the course of my visits to the University Archives that most things I had in my personal files were also to be found in some of the many boxes on the top floor of the Spencer Research Library.

In a few instances words or phrases appear in a language other than English. Where this is the case, the foreign expression is italicized and the English translation follows in parentheses. In the case of proper names that appear in Spanish showing both parents' family names, I have rendered them in that manner at the first mention of a person but have omitted the maternal name at subsequent mentions.

A great many people talked to me as I was writing this story, including many who were (and many who are) part of the continuing story. I shall not attempt to list them all by name, mainly because I fear that any such list would be incomplete. To those who feel that I should have sought their personal account, I offer my assurance that no slight was intended; my perusal of the documentary information made me feel comfortable enough for the limited purposes of this account.

Inevitably, the documentation I have consulted is uneven and many of the players are no longer available. In a few instances the international facets of a project appeared to be secondary in nature; in a few other instances the available information was too meager to indicate whether the project had even gotten off the ground. Thus this account does not purport to be an all-inclusive inventory.

Lastly I wish to single out three persons—now all deceased—because there would be no story without them and, perhaps less importantly, because without them I would never have been a part of the story. In alphabetical order they are: J.A. (Toni) Burzle, indefatigable advocate of educational exchange, generous to the university both in service and substance; Franklin D. Murphy, a man of exceptional vision and capacity, towering among past chancellors; and George

R. Waggoner, broad-gauged scholar, inspired and inspirational educational leader, and one of the best friends I ever had. To their memory this story of the international programs of the University of Kansas is fondly and respectfully dedicated.

[Return to Contents](#)

## Chapter I

### OF UNIVERSITIES, ESPECIALLY AMERICAN ONES

The dictionary tells us that the word “university” is derived from the Latin *universitas*, meaning entirety, more specifically the entirety of knowledge; the primary definition, according to the Oxford English Dictionary,<sup>1</sup> is that it denotes “the whole body of teachers and scholars” engaged “in giving and receiving instruction in the higher branches of learning.” Used in that sense, the term emerged in Italy in the eleventh century. It is an open question where it was first used, but Amalfi, Bologna and Padua each assert primacy.

Among the factors that gave rise to the emergence of these new institutions of learning, two probably predominated. One was the recovery, through Arab and Persian sources, of the legacy of Greek learning—Plato, Aristotle, and others. The other was the growing need of the societies developing in and around cities for specialized knowledge. The church needed people trained in the sacred traditions and in the methods for their implementation; the holders of secular power required individuals capable of formulating and applying their edicts; society at large clamored for aid in the struggle with sickness and death. Thus law, medicine and theology (in the order of the alphabet, not chronology or importance) became the three key components of the medieval university; a fourth faculty, sometimes denominated *studium generale* but more often “philosophy” (literally, love of knowledge), is often described as the precursor of “liberal arts and sciences.”

Although these new institutions of higher learning were generally created (and partially supported) by the local ruler (whether clerical or secular)<sup>2</sup>, they shared an important supranational feature: Latin as the language of instruction. Students could—and frequently did—move from one university to another, seeking out the teachers under whom they wanted to study. Just as the Inns of Court in London owed their existence to the lawyers’ needs for housing in the vicinity of the tribunals where they argued their cases, so the fraternities at the universities on the continent of Europe (and similar organizations) originated as housing for students from other countries or principalities.

England deviated from the pattern. Medicine, with the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons in charge, early on went its own way. The education of barristers (i.e., litigators) became the prerogative of the Inns of Court, leaving theology and philosophy as the main fields of study at the two early universities, Oxford and Cambridge.<sup>3</sup> While on the continent the faculty of philosophy was lagging behind its sisters, in England it became the mainstay of the universities, which eventually became—and until the middle of the 19th century remained—little more than finishing schools for the sons of the aristocracy and of the landed gentry.

---

<sup>1</sup> Second edition (1989), vol. 29, p. 87

<sup>2</sup> Note that older German universities carry the founder’s name, e.g. Bonn’s formal name is Friedrich Wilhelm University while Göttingen is Georg Augustus University, the Georg in question, prince of Hanover, being better known to us as George II, king of England.

<sup>3</sup> Both of these venerable institutions came into being in the first half of the thirteenth century, with considerable disagreement about any one year or years as the initial date.

That was not the primary concern of the early English settlers in North America. Their principal need was to have ministers for their respective religious establishments. The earliest institutions of higher learning in the colonies (Harvard, 1636; William and Mary, 1693; Yale, 1701) were established to educate ministers for the churches dominant in the respective colonies. Beginning with the College of Philadelphia [founded in 1749; later the University of Pennsylvania], the model became the English college. Thomas Jefferson's design for the University of Virginia (founded in 1819) followed the French and German patterns as he had come to know them during his extended stay in Paris; in practice it soon became an English- style college.

As the country expanded toward the west, new states considered it a mark of progress to provide for a state university. Minnesota, for example, established a state university in 1851 but did not become a state until 1858. Few of these new universities deserved that name: when the University of Kansas opened its doors in 1866 not a single one of the first students was prepared to do college-level work as it was then defined (and only 22 of them eventually completed the first academic year).<sup>4</sup>

By the end of the nineteenth century one could begin to identify three strands among colleges and universities in the United States. One was the church-sponsored and/or church-related college, in the tradition of the earliest colonial colleges. The major universities, with Harvard in the lead, were embarked on emulating the model of the German universities which in the course of the nineteenth century had placed research in central focus. The third, and the only pattern of genuinely American origin, was the land-grant college, the creation of the 1862 Morrill Act<sup>5</sup> that provided for substantial donations of land held by the federal government to allow the states to establish colleges specifically for the training of agriculturalists, engineers and army officers.

By the middle of the twentieth century, not without considerable contest along the road, the three tracks were in convergence. Virtually every land-grant college now bears the title "university," many of them offering Ph.D. programs across the spectrum of disciplines. Most formerly church-affiliated colleges now have governing boards with a majority of lay members; many of them have discontinued mandatory denominational courses; few turn away students of other religious identification. Institutions that a hundred years ago proudly proclaimed themselves "doctoral" because they offered instruction not only in medicine but also in a broad range of subjects leading to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy now invite persons seeking doctorates with specialized titles ranging from "Arts" to "Social Welfare." Others engage in "outreach" activities designed to attract, usually for a fee, student bodies of virtually any description. The common denominator was and is, understandably, the paramount need to generate income.

[Return to Contents](#)

---

<sup>4</sup> Clifford S. Griffin, *The University of Kansas: A History* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1974; hereafter Griffin, *History*), pp 37-38.

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Statutes at Large, 12:505-504.

## Chapter II

### THE YEARS BEFORE WORLD WAR II

Partly because of this diversity of antecedents, but partly also because the openness of the American society demanded it, the growth of higher education in the United States was almost totally unplanned. One could argue that the Morrill Act was an exercise of educational planning but, while the law stipulated that the money realized from the land grants was to be used for colleges that would offer instruction in the three areas specified, there was no provision of what precisely was to be taught and on what level or scale. Time and again policy makers would seek to encourage the education of young people for trades and occupations where they were needed, only to be disappointed in the lack of response. Health care specialists may deplore the tendency of prospective physicians to move into specialties that are more interesting (and more lucrative) than family medicine in rural areas. Community colleges have been provided with extensive facilities to help future farmers utilize modern technology to advantage, but most of these colleges discovered that the majority of their students preferred learning tracks that would allow them to transfer to a four-year college and pursue the likely benefits of a broader range of vocational choices.

Just as the American college student will find ways to satisfy academic requirements in the manner he or she prefers, so the American college and university teacher also expects to be able to discharge his or her responsibilities on the basis of individual choice. The more prestigious, the more prosperous the institution, the more autonomy the members of the faculty aspire to. The “holy trinity of academe”—teaching, research and service—takes on very different manifestations in a research-oriented university than it does in a struggling small, two-year college. In a university with a faculty of twelve to eighteen hundred members—not an unusual number for a typical state university—there will be persons who disdain “service” with a vengeance: nobody is going to make them attend committee meetings or keep fixed office hours; there will be teachers who attract students because they are superb performers in the classrooms but who will barely exert themselves to do any research for publication. The higher up you get in the academic pecking order, the more research is the touchstone, the golden calf—and the reward system duly accounts for it.

It is part of the American saga that the colonists and the early generations under the Republic rejected the mother country’s use of education as social barriers. The Morrill Act stands as a symbol of the new nation’s commitment to education as both the goal and the means of an open society. Selective admission was the hallmark of conservatism—and commanded only limited support among the broad range of institutions (and practitioners) of higher education in the United States. Mostly, the doors were wide open—in both directions: foreign students were welcomed on the American campus, and American students encouraged if they sought to further their horizons by study abroad. But well into the middle of the twentieth century it was a matter of individual initiatives, not institutional commitment.

Some Americans spent a year studying abroad because it was a family tradition or because it was perceived as an indication of social status. Thus young Franklin D. Murphy, KU class of 1936, son of a prominent Kansas City, Missouri, physician, went to Germany to study—as his father had done more than thirty years earlier. The initiative was young Franklin’s—though it may have



been planted by his father. Franklin went to Germany under the auspices of the Institute of International Education (IIE) which required the sponsorship of a university.

Chancellor Ernest H. Lindley's correspondence with IIE makes it clear that, however much he may have been in favor of the student exchanges arranged by IIE, KU did not have any money to spare for that purpose, not even the \$200 that IIE expected the home institution to provide for the support of the program. Franklin Murphy's expenses were totally covered by his family.<sup>6</sup> He would savor the experience for the rest of his life.

Across the country, the strongest appeal for a young person to go abroad came from recruiters for the missionary societies. Thus Katherine Hansen, KU Class of 1905, daughter of a Danish immigrant who settled and became prosperous on the open spaces of northwest Kansas, went to Japan—and spent a lifetime there as a musical educator. The university was only marginally involved in the choice that Kate (and her lifelong friend Lydia Lindsay) made to go abroad. Both young women were attracted into mission work by the activities on the Lawrence campus of the Student Volunteer Movement for Foreign Missions. This organization, with campus chapters and societies throughout the country, called upon young people to “win the world for Christianity.” Local Protestant churches and campus officers of the Young Men's (YMCA) and Young Women's (YWCA) Christian Associations supported its efforts. Kate Hansen kept a diary that allows the reader to trace her gradual commitment to the life of a missionary teacher abroad—there is no mention in these pages of any involvement of the university (or any of her teachers). Nor, for that matter, is there any mention of money: missionaries were expected to find support where they could, starting with their home church and its denomination.<sup>7</sup>

But in Kansas, as in some other states in the Midwest and the Rocky Mountain region, the beginnings of higher education were feeble. Often years would pass before the undergraduate college had more students than the “preparatory department,” a division needed because most students admitted lacked the educational background for college-level work. But, once started, these institutions of higher learning soon aimed to develop the characteristics of a true university—or at least a good resemblance of one.<sup>8</sup>

To a considerable degree, this was due to the faculty who had joined these new institutions. Quite appropriately, we find their names inscribed to this day on campus buildings, for it was indeed they who laid the foundations. Whether as presidents, chancellors, deans, department heads or full-time teachers and scholars, they contributed the initiative and the drive to provide

---

<sup>6</sup> IIE required that each exchange student sponsored by it write two reports during the year, with copies to the president of their college or university. Extracts from Murphy's reports from Göttingen may appear in *Kansas Alumni* in the near future.

<sup>7</sup> Extensive extracts from Kate Hansen's diaries and letters (held in the University Archives, hereafter UA), along with narratives relating to her long stay in Japan (1907-41 and 1947-51) are in *Kate Hansen: The Grandest Mission on Earth: From Kansas to Japan, 1907-1951* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Division of Continuing Education, 2000), compiled and edited by her nephew Dane G. Bales and his wife Polly Roth Bales, with the assistance of Calvin E. Harbin.

<sup>8</sup> The early years of the University of Kansas are fully related in Griffin, *History*, especially chapters 4 and 5.

knowledge (“universal” knowledge) to the students who, in ever-larger numbers, came to find it on Mount Oread.

At the University of Kansas, as at other comparable institutions, the early faculty came from the east coast, mainly from the established colleges in New England. Several of them had implemented their college or graduate schools years with a year or two at a university in Europe. Their image of a university was thus not confined to their home state or their home institution; it encompassed a wider world of knowledge and an understanding that knowledge was not bounded by state lines or national borders. The best of them became role models who in turn encouraged their best and brightest students to go on, not just to graduate schools but also to exploit the opportunity of study abroad. A professor in Kansas might urge a student he considered capable of it to study in Berlin, Heidelberg, London or Paris. The initiative of one teacher might produce a small parade of students heading toward Germany, England or France—just as one outstanding scholar might cause several generations of students to follow his example in scholarly pursuits.

In the University of Kansas’s first century its involvement in international programs is a tale of individual initiatives—as is equally true of other American universities. Indeed, one of the challenges facing such institutions—as this narrative will show—is that of stabilizing what had been wrought by individuals into a continuing factor of institutional life.

For private colleges the first step was often sanction (but no financial commitment) for arrangements engineered by an individual faculty member, often with a personal friend or acquaintance at an institution in Europe. Since some of the colleges exacted substantial payment and residence charges, the cost to the individual student of such a period of study abroad was sometimes even less than the charges for a corresponding period of study on the home campus.

The faculty member serving as director of such a program was often quite autonomous. In some instances he established residence at the foreign study location and made only occasional home visits. The home institution was often quite content with this arrangement—it reaped the benefits without investing much of its own resources, be they human or fiscal. As a consultant to several colleges and universities with programs abroad, I learned early on that nothing was more difficult than to get an answer from a college president to this question, “What happens to this program when Professor X retires or dies or leaves for another college?” Public colleges and universities, catering as they were to a less affluent student clientele, could not adopt this pattern. The University of Kansas did not develop a program of this kind.

But, in spite of the state’s landlocked position in the center of the country, the University of Kansas maintained an interest in the international dimensions of higher education. The records show that a foreign student (neither name nor country of origin appears on the record) was admitted in 1881. In the late 1880’s, the faculty authorized the enrollment of a young Japanese (his name does not appear) who was in Lawrence as guest of a faculty member’s family. There is no indication, however, that either person actually enrolled at KU.

But it is amply recorded that in 1896— when KU awarded its first Ph.D.—the recipient was a student from a foreign country, a mathematician from Switzerland.<sup>9</sup>

It is worth noting that, whether the student involved was one from Kansas going abroad or a citizen or resident of another country coming to Lawrence, it is always the chancellor who was involved—just as he was in all faculty personnel matters. It would be some time before there was a need for specific offices dealing with the various aspects of international study. World War II became the turning point.

[Return to Contents](#)

---

<sup>9</sup> The last name of this student does not appear on the list of students from abroad which the legislature required to be submitted each year: He had spent two or three semesters at Kansas State College in Manhattan and had filed “first papers” to indicate his intent to apply for citizenship. More on Arnold Emch is in G. Baley Price’s “History of the Department of Mathematics at the University of Kansas,” on file in the University Archives. The reporting requirement was for the names and place of birth of all students not born in the 48 states and who had not filed first papers. Fifty years later this list included a daughter of Chancellor Malott, born while the Malotts lived in Hawaii, then not yet a state.

## Chapter III

### THE YEARS OF CHANCELLOR DEANE W. MALOTT

Deane Waldo Malott, who succeeded Ernest Lindley as chancellor in 1939, was not only the first alumnus of the University of Kansas to become its chief executive officer, he was also the first to bring to this task experience in business and exposure to international aspects of American life, reinforced by several years on the faculty of the Harvard Business School. His tenure at KU's helm encompassed the war years and the half-decade after the war—a period when there was an increasing recognition across the nation of the significance of the emergence of the United States as a world power. Chancellor Malott approached these challenges with a perception and energy that earned him national recognition—and eventually a call to the presidency of an Ivy League university.

He first gained attention when, following the relocation of Nisei (second generation Japanese-Americans) from the west coast, university presidents there appealed to their colleagues at other universities to provide opportunities for students of Japanese ancestry affected by the deportation orders to continue their education. Malott was among the presidents who responded affirmatively. The Kansas Board of Regents, under pressure from the legislature, took the opposite view and barred such transfers. Malott lost this battle, but his posture brought him widespread approbation from presidents of major universities and in the national media.

Thus when the Institute of Pacific Relations<sup>10</sup> resumed its practice of inviting the Association of American Universities (AAU) to send three presidents as its representatives to the IPR's annual meeting, Malott was a member of the delegation. The 1949 meeting was at Lucknow, India. There the three presidents were approached with a proposition that would result in the first major internationally oriented consortium in which the University of Kansas participated, the American Universities Field Staff (AUFS), later renamed Universities Field Staff International (UFSI). The University of Kansas not only became one of its founding members but was still actively participating when the organization discontinued its work forty years later.

The history of the AUFS goes back to the end of the First World War. The peace conferences to mark the Allied victory were held in several Paris suburbs, with each of the victorious powers represented at each of the four sites by a substantial delegation. Most of the American delegates were at a decided disadvantage, knowing little of European geography, even less history, and rarely any of the languages spoken in the area whose fate they were called upon to decide. There were only few exceptions, among them Charles R. Crane, a philanthropist friend of President Wilson and the head of Crane Plumbing Company, a major manufacturer of bathroom fixtures, and Walter Rogers, a former newspaperman whom Wilson had brought to Washington to work in the War Information Office. Crane and Rogers, long-time friends, shared hotel accommodations in Paris, which allowed them to talk candidly about the frequently displayed ignorance of the American negotiators. What was needed, Rogers proposed, was a program that would train specialists in areas that might become the focus of American interests in years to come. Crane agreed to support the venture, provided Rogers would be its director. Beginning in 1926, the Institute of World Affairs (IWA) each year selected four fellows who would be supported for three years, the first devoted to intensive language instruction (mostly at the

---

<sup>10</sup> IPR. Malott had become a member while he was in business in Honolulu.

London School of Oriental Languages), followed by two years of residence in the area of specialization, typically away from locations frequented by Americans and western Europeans. During this period each fellow wrote monthly letters (“IWA Reports”), which Rogers edited for distribution to contributors to donors and friends of the Institute. Rogers saw to it that the fellows were well placed after their fellowships, many of them with the Chicago Daily News, the newspaper that had employed him for a number of years.

When war engulfed the globe, the expertise the IWA fellows had acquired frequently proved useful. Thus Phillips Talbot, after two years in Kashmir, served on the staff of Lord Mountbatten, the Allied commander for South Asia.<sup>11</sup> Albert Ravenholt had spent his fellowship years in a village deep in the interior of China and later became a close associate of Ramon Magsaysay, who led the Filipino government’s action against the Communist-supported rebels in northern Luzon and then became his country’s president.<sup>12</sup> After the war these two spearheaded the fellows’ discussion of their future service.<sup>13</sup>

Chancellor Malott and his two fellow presidents listened to the plan that Talbot and Ravenholt presented to them. Then, perhaps following the lead of Herman B Wells, the highly regarded president of Indiana University who was the senior member of the AAU delegation, Malott invited Talbot to come to Lawrence and give a lecture on recent developments on the Indian subcontinent. Following his presentation he would meet for lunch with a group of faculty members and tell them what he thought the proposed consortium could do for the University of Kansas. After listening to him, this group recommended that KU join, provided at least five other universities did the same. The condition was soon met and the first AUFS associate visited the Lawrence campus in the spring semester of 1951. Thereafter four came each year, until 1988 when the organization dissolved, mainly because most of their member institutions had developed foreign area expertise of their own.

It is worth noting here that the faculty members on whose recommendation Chancellor Malott committed KU to the AUFS consortium were, with one exception, all people who had joined the University of Kansas after 1945 (the present writer being one of them). There were twice as many students on the campus in 1948 than there had ever been before, so many that some were housed under the stadium, some in church basements downtown, and others in wartime housing near a former ammunition plant in De Soto, 16 miles east of Lawrence. In the depression years of the early 30’s the legislature had linked the number of authorized faculty positions to the number of students expected, thus forcing reduction of the number of teaching positions; now, with massive (and sudden) enrollment increases, the formula produced corresponding additions to the faculty. Like many of the students, many of the new teachers could only be housed in

---

<sup>11</sup> In the Kennedy and Johnson administrations Talbot was assistant secretary of state, then ambassador to NATO. In later years he served as president of the Asia Society.

<sup>12</sup> His years in China and in the Philippines had given Ravenholt a continuing interest in agriculture and land questions. In his retirement he became the operating owner of a successful winery in Washington state.

<sup>13</sup> His years in China and in the Philippines resulted in Ravenholt having an intensive interest in agriculture and farming practices. In his retirement he became the operating owner of a successful vineyard in Washington state.

emergency facilities; a row of army surplus barracks located on the south side of the campus and labeled “Sunnyside.” The barracks have long gone, but the street still bears that name.

Not only did the newcomers outnumber the pre-war faculty, they were unburdened by the stresses and tribulations that had exhausted Chancellor Lindley and brought many of the faculty of the twenties and thirties to a state of resigned toleration. Malott (and Murphy after him) came to rely on the new arrivals to provide impetus and support for change in the university.

This was, of course, not unique. Every institution of higher learning in the country had the same or similar experiences, and in every college and university the presence of these younger elements in the faculty and of a substantial proportion of students with wartime military service experience abroad affected life in and out of the classroom.

In church-related colleges charitable or missionary work had always been encouraged. As the extent of destruction in the war zones and the subsequent distress of the populations became known, the main question for these colleges was how the students who desired to help in Europe could be transported to the Old World. A consortium, the Council on Student Travel (CST), was able to rent some wartime transport ships and began to carry students to Europe, mainly from colleges where luxury was largely absent and sometimes disdained. In the fifties, when air travel became feasible, CST shifted its emphasis to air charters. To aid student travelers abroad the organization established a field office in Paris, to be followed later by an office in Copenhagen and one in Tokyo. As student travel began to expand beyond Western Europe, CST enlarged its scope to the creation of learning opportunities in locations where it would be difficult or even impossible for the individual to find them (initially mainly in the Soviet Union). To reflect this change, CST adopted a new name, the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE). By that time the University of Kansas had long been a member; I served as a member of the board of CST/CIEE while this transformation took place. KU was among the first universities to send students to Leningrad (now St. Petersburg) with a CST program; KU provided the director and often also an additional faculty member for a program set up by CST/CIEE in Zagreb (then, Yugoslavia, now independent Slovenia).

The major impetus for the exchange of both students and faculty members between the United States and foreign countries was, without a doubt, the adoption by Congress of the proposal by Senator William Fulbright of Arkansas, himself a onetime Rhodes Scholar and a former president of the University of Arkansas. The concept was relatively simple: After the war the United States, rather than to incur the expense to bring home all its widely scattered supplies and equipment, had turned these properties over to the respective government, to be paid for at a later time. The Fulbright Act<sup>14</sup> authorized the President to negotiate agreements with any of the countries qualifying under the act to repay their resultant obligations by placing funds in their own currency in “counterpart” accounts to be used for grants for the exchange of persons (more specifically, students and scholars). The Concise Dictionary of American History<sup>15</sup> states that the Fulbright Act “originated the largest program in history consisting of international exchange grants made to individuals and thus helped demonstrate the value of such activities and broadening the community of interests among people.”

---

<sup>14</sup> Public Law 584 (1946).

<sup>15</sup> New York: Scribner’s, 1961 (Wayne Andrews ed.), p. 388.

Although the Fulbright Act was signed in 1946 its implementation took time. The first students awarded scholarships went abroad in 1949: Among them was KU's first Fulbright student, Virginia Joseph, of Whitewater, Kansas, who went to Paris to study political science.<sup>16</sup>

Probably realizing the same concern with the larger world scene, Rotary in the United States revived and intensified a program of fellowships that it had first established in the aftermath of World War I. If Virginia Joseph's hometown was small and remote, John Conard's exceeded hers on both counts; Coolidge, Kansas, sits alongside US highway 56 (then 50) literally hugging the Colorado state line; in 1949 it had fewer than 200 inhabitants and was about to lose its post office. Rotary had, oddly enough, made no condition of foreign language competence, believing that Rotarians abroad would be of sufficient aid. Conard recruited the one and only student on campus from France to tutor him and his wife. Five years later he returned with a doctorate from the Sorbonne, earned while he worked for the European headquarters of the Marshall plan.<sup>17</sup>

That KU soon became a national leader in its participation in the Fulbright exchange program was largely due to the commitment and energy of one person. John Anthony Burzle, always known as "Tony," was among the faculty who joined KU after the war. A native of Munich, he was brought to KU to chair the German department, and to rebuild the department that was down to just one member, a young instructor.

But the teaching of German was not Burzle's only qualification. While a student at the University of Munich he had worked part-time in the Auslandsamt (Office of foreign students) where he had met Dr. Ralph Major, a professor of medicine at the University of Kansas, who befriended him. He also met a young woman from Canada. He emigrated to Canada to marry Muriel and eventually came to the University of Kansas at Professor Major's urging. (He had taught German at the University of Manitoba until 1945.) Toni Burzle remained a member of the KU Faculty until his retirement, in 1996.<sup>18</sup>

There is only one word to describe Burzle: He was indefatigable. With the strong support of Dean John Nelson of the Graduate School, and working with fraternities, sororities and scholarship halls on campus, he soon built up a method that both supported students from abroad and integrated them into the campus culture. So successful was this scheme that it was widely emulated and became known nationally as "The Kansas Plan."

---

<sup>16</sup> While there, she met and married a young man from the principality of Liechtenstein. Although she frequently returns to the United States, she is a permanent resident of the small country between Switzerland and Austria, of which her husband was, for several years, the prime minister.

<sup>17</sup> Conrad later was a member of the legislature, speaker of the House, KU's director of university relations, the governor's legislative liaison, executive director of the Board of Regents, and executive with a major firm handling student loan programs. He and his wife still return to France every second or third year.

<sup>18</sup> The Burzles had no children and left their substantial estate, including their home two block west of the campus and their art collection, to the University.

To provide partners for educational exchanges, Burzle negotiated one- on-one student exchange programs with nearly twenty universities, mostly in West Germany, but also in England, France, Scotland and Switzerland. Some of these exchange arrangements operate to this date, and others have been added.

Burzle also originated an annual summer orientation program for foreign students newly arrived that the U.S. Department of State consistently supported from 1951 till 1977, and held up to others as a model. Only a few of these students were headed for continued study at the University of Kansas, but their first exposure to an American campus and its environment served to develop a group feeling that survived — nurtured, to be sure, by Tony’s annual Christmas letter, with which he enclosed news from members of the group. He likewise maintained contact with former Fulbright visitors—to and from KU, and took justifiable pride in the number of KU students he persuaded to make application for study opportunities abroad.

There were other, smaller initiatives from within the faculty. The dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences,<sup>19</sup> Paul Lawson, returned from the annual meeting of Midwestern liberal arts deans, reported to the faculty that there was a movement at major universities to offer interdisciplinary majors focused on geographic areas; he thought that KU had sufficient offerings for an undergraduate major in Latin American Area Studies. It could be done without any additions to the faculty. A committee was duly appointed to study the matter, rendered a positive report and the new major was, equally duly, approved. The dean had, however, failed to determine with what frequency the courses he had culled from the catalog were being offered—and neither had the committee. Nor had anyone looked into the availability of books to go with the proposed program. Without books in the library, without the necessary courses, the first undergraduate area program did not have much of a future.

The library situation was no different for other non-European areas. Thomas R. Smith, who had joined the geography department the year before I had come to KU, wanted to teach a course in Far Eastern geography. I, having spent eighteen months on occupation duty in Japan, had proposed to teach a course on Far Eastern governments and politics. Our joint effort to assess what library holdings might be available revealed that there was not a single volume that was less than twenty years old. Knowing of Chancellor Malott’s affiliation with the Institute of Pacific Relations and inferring from this fact that he might be sympathetic to the introduction of some course work covering the Far East, we brought the matter to his attention and he made an allocation to the library of \$2,500 for the purchase of social science books on the Far East. The director of the library begged off: he had a huge backlog of books in need of processing and, without added professional staff, he could do nothing to bring these books (let alone the additional ones that the Chancellor wanted him to buy) into circulation. The librarian outlasted

---

<sup>19</sup> This, the formal title, appears on the dean’s stationary and on his office door. All other comparable units on the Lawrence campus bear the title “school.” Hence on that campus, “College” always means “Liberal Arts and Sciences.” More recently the acronym “CLAS” has been introduced. It would be unfamiliar to older readers and will therefore not be used in this narrative.



the chancellor—the money for the Far Eastern books was not spent until KU had both a new chancellor and a new head librarian.

In 1950, a specialist in Russian history, Oswald P. Backus III, joined the history department, and in 1954 a specialist in modern Japanese history, George M. Beckmann, followed. Both quickly discovered what Tom Smith and I had already learned: If KU was to introduce its students to the non- Western world, the library would need a great deal of help. Fortunately, the new man in the Chancellor's chair would be supportive of improved international perspectives as well as marked improvements in the university library system. The story of Franklin D. Murphy, KU class of 1936, and himself once an exchange student abroad, as chancellor deserves a chapter by itself.

[Return to Contents](#)

## Chapter IV

### THE YEARS OF CHANCELLOR FRANKLIN D. MURPHY

As late as 1997 when Franklin Murphy returned to the Lawrence campus to address the founding meeting of KU's chapter of the international studies fraternity Phi Beta Delta, he proclaimed with evident feeling that his education would not have been complete without the year he spent in Germany's famed University of Göttingen. Whenever there was an opportunity he would let it be known how highly he valued the experience he had gained during that year in Germany.

As chancellor of the university from 1951 to 1960, he led the way for the university's growing involvement in international programs. He took a strong personal interest in projects and programs. He accepted and retained throughout his years as chancellor the chairmanship of the American Universities Field Staff.<sup>20</sup> In 1958 he called for a study of the teaching of foreign languages, a report that attracted a good deal of attention as it justified the strengthening of the foreign language requirement for liberal arts and sciences students at KU. But he also sought to direct the university toward a broader and therefore possibly more lasting vision. To this end he appointed in 1959 a special committee to study the university's role in world affairs. Both then and now that committee's report stands out as a fitting capstone to this chancellor's leadership in international education, both at the University of Kansas and nationwide.

When Murphy was named dean of the KU medical school in 1947 he was, at the age of 31, the youngest dean ever of a medical school in the country. He was 35 when he moved to Lawrence and the chancellor's chair, again the youngest person in such a position. He had won national acclaim for his original program of support to medically underserved areas in the state; he was soon nationally known (and he knew how to project himself and his achievements).

When the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, for the first time ever, invited the Association of American Universities to send a delegation of university presidents to Moscow for an exchange of views, Murphy was one of the six United States delegates chosen for this groundbreaking visit. The travel costs for this journey were assumed by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and Carnegie's president John Gardner<sup>21</sup> accompanied the group. Gardner was impressed with Murphy and, after the trip to the USSR, invited him to be the United States co-chair of the Council on Higher Education in the American Republics (CHEAR), another Carnegie-supported venture. Its aim was to bring together ten rectors of Latin American universities and a like number of their counterparts from the United States, to exchange views and help to strengthen higher education throughout the hemisphere.

It was on the first tour of the CHEAR presidents and rectors that Murphy met Rodrigo Facio Brenes, the rector of the University of Costa Rica; the man, the university he headed and the small country it served intrigued Murphy almost instantly.

---

<sup>20</sup> His successor, Clarke Wescoe, likewise chaired the AUFS board throughout his years as KU chancellor.

<sup>21</sup> Later founder and long-time president of the reformist organization "Common Cause," and secretary of health, education and welfare in the Lyndon Johnson administration.

Differing from other Latin American countries, Costa Rica had enjoyed a history markedly free from recurring violence. But in the early twentieth century its economy was still almost entirely based on agriculture, with the United States-owned United Fruit Company playing a major (and not merely economic) role. A university (the University of Santo Tomas) had been started in 1843 but had closed its doors in 1888 for lack not only of funds but also teachers and students.

The Spaniards had controlled the area between Mexico and present-day Panama as a Captaincy-general, with its seat in Guatemala City. There they had also founded a university (San Carlos, in 1676) and it survived through the centuries, revolutions, civil wars and all. Costa Rica was more peaceful, but it was also clearly a backwater.

In the 1940's improvements of the harbor facilities at Limon (on the Caribbean coast) and the beginnings of electrification brought some increase in Costa Rica's interaction with the outside world. Among those from the United States who became visitors were biologists interested in the flora and fauna of the tropical forest. Two of these visitors were E. Raymond Hall, the director of KU's museum of natural history, and his colleague Edward Taylor, a world-renowned herpetologist commonly known as "Snakes" Taylor. Hall called on the rector of the university and suggested an agreement for the exchange of scientists between Kansas and Costa Rica.<sup>22</sup>

The rector followed up and raised the matter in a letter to Chancellor Malott. While this letter has not been located, Malott's reply<sup>23</sup> indicates that Rector Fernando Baudrit credited Hall with the suggestion and also indicated that it had been Hall who had specifically named two prospects: Maude Elliott, and assistant professor of Spanish, and Taylor, the herpetologist.

It is worthy of note that Malott's reply was entirely in keeping with the traditional approach to international education: it is all up to the individual. Both Taylor and Elliott were already planning to visit Costa Rica again this summer; all Baudrit had to do was talk to each of them and ascertain their interest in spending some time in San Jose. If it came to an agreement between one or both of the KU teachers and the University of Costa Rica, it would behoove the KU person to find out if KU could spare him or her. That decision would be his, Malott's, based on the dean's recommendation. If it was possible to spare one or both, Malott would request that the Board of Regents grant leave without pay—it would be up to UCR to pay them. For the rector's convenience, Malott supplied the current salaries of the two KU professors. But an agreement to exchange professors could not be considered at this time: KU lacked the funds to finance such an agreement, and given the large number of students, could not commit itself to grant any leaves.

---

<sup>22</sup> Charles Stansifer and Maria Eugenia Bozzoli documented (in "The University of Kansas and the Universidad de Costa Rica: Origins of an Exchange Relationship," UA RG 12/0 - International Programs - Artificial Files - Box 2 - Costa Rica) still earlier contacts between Costa Rica and Kansas, especially among biologists. A Spanish language version of this paper was published in Costa Rica in 2000. As Hall's initiative and Malott's reaction indicate, none of these contacts took on institutional dimensions.

<sup>23</sup> UA RG 12/0 - International Relations - Artificial Files - Box 2 - Malott to Baudrit, June 9, 1947.

There is no indication that either Facio or Murphy was aware of this (or any other earlier) contact. Facio sought Murphy's advice and assistance in his efforts to make the University of Costa Rica (established in 1940) into the kind of institution he had known as a student in the United States. Differing from the traditional universities, such as Peru's San Marcos and Guatemala's San Carlos, Costa Rica had a School of General Studies, comparable to the first two years of a liberal arts college in the United States, and plans were well advanced for a campus, with a central library and administrative offices. But the faculty consisted largely of professional people who regarded university teaching as a part-time occupation. A number of them looked at involvement with the university as a stepping-stone for political ambitions.

Costa Rica appealed to Murphy because the university was more modern than any other he had seen in Latin America. The country's new constitution did away with its army and committed Costa Rica to the support of education. The nation's basic document mandated that at least ten percent of the money annually allocated to the ministry of education had to go, without any conditions attached, to the university. To Murphy who was getting increasingly frustrated by the never-ending battle to increase what his state's legislature was willing to spend on higher education, Costa Rica had a decided advantage. But it is also undeniable that Facio and Murphy had developed a genuine sense of community of interest and personal friendship.

In a four-page letter to Facio, Murphy projected his vision of the future cooperation of the two universities and the role he thought the two chief executives ought to play:<sup>24</sup>

Dear Rodrigo: — I have not communicated with you for some weeks, but this does not mean that I have not been busy on our joint project to bring the life of the University of Costa Rica and that of the University of Kansas closer together.

Briefly let me outline the way my thinking has developed in this matter, and tell you what success we have achieved so far. I should add that my thinking continues to be modified by the restrictions as to mission that exist in the various agencies of the United States Government, the foundations, etc. (Let me add that these restrictions are completely unpredictable. For example, under the terms of the gift by Mr. Carnegie to the Carnegie Foundation, this Foundation must spend its money on projects which have to be in the specific self-interest of the United States. On the other hand, the ICA [International Cooperation Agency, the fore-runner of AID, the Agency for International Foundation] has, until recently, had a very rigid feeling that their responsibility is exclusively technological, not intellectual development. Etc., etc.) In any event, here is the basic plan which has always been related to the conversations which you and I have had.

The central point of this program is to stimulate the intellectual and scholarly development of the University of Costa Rica and the University of Kansas, and at the same time develop personal as well as professional relationship of lasting value

---

<sup>24</sup> UA, RG 12/0 - International Programs - Costa Rica - 1959-60: Letter, Murphy to Facio, May 29, 1959.

between the staff, faculty and students of these two institutions. This program has been arbitrarily divided into four parts. Of course, all four are inter-related.

Part One consists of the development of a “Junior Year Abroad” program between the University of Costa Rica and the University of Kansas. This program will be financed by the International Educational Exchange Service of the United States Department of State as authorized by the Congress of the United States. It will be the only such program in Central America.

The second part of the over-all program involves a project designed to bring to Costa Rica over a period of four years ten of the most able younger full-time members of the faculty of the University of Kansas and their wives, as well as at least two chief administrative officers (deans).<sup>25</sup> The Carnegie Foundation has made a grant that will permit this project to go forward starting this fall (September 1959).

The third phase of the program is a project designed to bring selected (by you) members of the full-time faculty of the University of Costa Rica to the University of Kansas for whatever length of time may be required for such persons to get either the Master’s or the Ph.D. degree. . . . [I]n the beginning at least, such persons would be selected from the various sciences (Biology, Geology, Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics, etc.) I have a letter from ICA indicating their real interest in such a program and requesting a proposal. I have [also] talked to Mr. Wolf, of the Ford Foundation, and have sensed a sympathetic interest in him concerning this phase of the program.

The fourth project has to do with the opportunity for leaders in Costa Rica and in the United States, outside the universities, to visit the two countries and to work, or at least spend time, with their counterparts in the other country. I have talked with the heads of . . . various operations [in this region] and they are enthusiastic about the idea and I am sure would be willing to put up money.

The net result of such a program, spread over a four-year or five-year period, would be to develop, in depth, an understanding between the Central United States and Costa Rica of an unprecedented type. It could set a pattern for international relationships not only in Latin America but also in all parts of the world, and of course both the University of Kansas and the University of Costa Rica would be substantially strengthened in many aspects. You and I have a lot of talking and planning to do when I come to San Jose in July.

As this letter indicates, the junior year was already set to go, largely due to the efforts of Seymour Menton, a young (but already tenured) member of the Spanish department who would take the first grupo de Kansas to San Jose the following February.

---

<sup>25</sup> The “Costa Rica faculty project” is more fully described below.

Murphy shared his enthusiasm for Costa Rica and the potential he perceived in a continuing relationship between KU and UCR with his friend John Gardner at the Carnegie Corporation. Gardner told him that, if KU could send him a truly novel approach, he could almost guarantee support from his foundation. But the Carnegie board met only quarterly and would next do so the following week. To obtain board approval, he, Gardner, would need to have the proposal in hand within three days.

Murphy had related his exchanges with Facio to George Waggoner (who had succeeded Paul Lawson as dean of the College in 1954). By coincidence the Waggoners and the Hellers came to live across the street from each other; equally unplanned, I had been elected to the College Administrative Committee, a body that had rarely met under Dean Lawson but that became a virtual steering committee of the College faculty under the new dean. In 1957, Waggoner had brought me into his office as associate dean (the title was new and for several more years I was the only person in the College holding it).<sup>26</sup> George came to share much of his concerns and aspirations with me—and that included what Murphy had told him about his contacts with CHEAR and with Facio. But both of us were still taken by surprise when, late one Saturday evening, Murphy appeared at a party at which both the Waggoners and my wife and I were present, pulled George and me aside and told us that we had to get to work—at once—and produce something that he could send to Gardner as soon as possible.

I had a typewriter at home; our five-year old son was staying overnight at a friend's house. George and I spent the rest of the night in my study where I took notes as he developed a series of alternatives. The result was the Costa Rica faculty project, which the Carnegie Corporation supported for the next six years.

What was novel—or at least different—about the project was that it was designed not for the academic specialist or the prospective employee of what later came to be labeled “multi-national” enterprises but for academics who were not Latin Americanists but were willing to learn about Latin America (and whose spouses were prepared to take part in the project). The participants selected (husbands and wives) would spend June and July in an eight-week intensive course of beginning Spanish, and would then spend the month of August in Costa Rica with, for all practical purposes, a working relationship with counterparts identified by the University of Costa Rica. One purpose of this interaction was the development of a plan of activities which the visitor from Kansas could carry out on his or her next visit, three months during the following summer. In the intervening time months the Kansas participants were expected to continue with their study of Spanish.

Among the volunteers for the first group were two deans, Jim Surface of the School of Business and George Waggoner. Everybody in this group returned from the first stay in San Jose full of praise for the little country, the friendliness of the ticos (the nickname Costa Ricans use for themselves), and the opportunities that they could see for themselves and for the two universities.

---

<sup>26</sup> There was only one other associate dean on the campus, my good friend William Argersinger who had been given that title in the Graduate School at the same time that I was so designated in the College. He and I worked closely together for the next fifteen years.

The first eleven students to spend their junior year in Costa Rica arrived in San Jose on Lincoln's birthday in 1960 and, except for a two-week vacation trip to Panama in July, remained there until the end of Costa Rica's academic year in November. Meanwhile four junior faculty members from UCR, all in the sciences, had taken up residence in Lawrence to pursue doctoral work at the University of Kansas. Suddenly there was so much traffic between Kansas and Costa Rica that it was fortunate that some years earlier a member of our Spanish department who had taught in Costa Rica and married a Costa Rican had been designated as an honorary vice consul and could issue visas from his home in Lawrence. Seymour Menton, the Junior year program's first director, acclaimed the Kansas–Costa Rica relationship in the *Modern Language Journal* (October 1961) as “truly cultural penetration in depth.”

But Latin America was not the only direction in which KU's international activities developed. The passage of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in September 1958 introduced a new dimension in curricular planning by inviting applications for federal support of area centers.

Fortunately NDEA's concept for area centers included building up appropriate strengthening of library holdings and the addition of catalogers capable of processing publications in “unusual” languages. With Murphy's interest in libraries and the imaginative, also critical, leadership of Robert Vosper, probably the best director of libraries KU has ever had, KU had already made some progress, especially in Russian materials.

Earlier Oswald Backus had scored a master stroke when, on a visit to Moscow, he discovered in a second-hand book store (one of the few trade areas that had not been nationalized) a complete run of Russian statute books from Ivan the Terrible to the end of the Tsarist regime. The store's owner told him that a professor from the University of California wanted to purchase the set for his university and had written to the librarian there for authorization to do so. Backus asked if the man would sell to him (for KU) if he could produce the money before his west coast competitor could get a reply from his colleague back home. The Russian agreed that he would sell to the first person who could pay him.

Backus proceeded to the American embassy where one of his Yale classmates was stationed and was allowed to use a phone there for a call to the University of Kansas. Fortunately the chancellor was at his desk. Murphy listened to Backus, asked how much money was involved. After Backus had told him, Murphy said he would have an answer the following day, in care of Backus's friend at the embassy. Two days later a letter of credit in the amount involved had arrived at the embassy in the diplomatic pouch. The next day Backus went back to the bookstore. After the storekeeper had converted the letter of credit, he packed the huge shipment in a number of crates and shipped them to the United States, at his expense. Years later Backus learned that the letter of credit, issued by the Riggs National Bank in Washington, had been purchased by Judith Harris Murphy, Franklin's wife. It was not the only time that the Murphys assisted the university out of their own pockets—and without publicity.

The introduction of the area centers through the NDEA did not come as a surprise to George Waggoner. His Ph.D. was in English but his approach to literature anticipated the “area” concept: his dissertation dealt with Shakespeare but with the Bard's perception and rendition of every-day life. In World War II Waggoner had been in the navy language program, studying

Malay; he recalled that instruction in Malay history, geography and culture was an integral part of what he was taught. (He never had an opportunity to apply what the navy taught him.)

Thus he was predisposed to interdisciplinary perspectives. Even before he assumed his decanal duties he let it be known that he was very interested in KU's Western Civilization Program, a program that does not "belong" to any department, yet is required of all students in the College. One of his earlier proposals as the new dean for change in the College was the revitalization of "Western Civ." Hard on its heels came an increase in the foreign language requirement from ten to sixteen hours. But even before he had assumed the deanship he had recognized that humanities and social science departments would not add area-oriented faculty members unless there was a tangible inducement. George had given me the responsibility for the assembling of the College budget; after clearing the matter with Murphy, he instructed me to include three lines for area programs, each to be funded at \$20,000: East Asia, Latin American, and Soviet and Slavic. In those days changes of this kind were rarely taken up separately by the Board of Regents; Chancellor Murphy made sure that the approval of the three area program would be noted—it signified, he advised the Regents, that KU had made a strategic decision: it would not undertake to expand all over the globe, only into the three identified areas. The board was not asked to rule on this self-denial but Murphy, his successors and their associates referred to it whenever there was pressure to expand into other areas.<sup>27</sup>

Two of the area programs already had committed leaders, both historians: Backus for the Soviet and Slavic area, and George Beckmann for the East Asian area. Both had, almost from the moment of their arrival, clamored for instruction in the principal languages of their respective areas. The third area, Latin America, weighed in with a request for at least one full-time faculty member in Portuguese. Russian and Japanese had been taught occasionally, with the department of Germanic (!) languages sheltering the instructors, usually persons who were hired without expectation of continuity. Backus and Beckmann pleaded for departments that would teach Slavic and Oriental languages respectively. No self-respecting language teacher, so they argued, would come into a situation in which his language was a mere appendix to another department's curriculum.

But it was not easy to find qualified teachers of the "unusual" languages and more difficult to retain them. The College set up departments of Slavic Languages and Literatures and Oriental Languages (later renamed East Asian Languages and Cultures) but in their early days both suffered from high rates of faculty turnover and sharp internal divisions about methods of foreign language teaching.

Beckmann wanted three languages to be available, Chinese, Japanese and Korean but only a modest beginning in Chinese could be realized. It may have been difficult to allocate positions for the unusual languages at the time that the increase in the College's foreign language requirement caused an increased need for instructional staff in the traditional foreign languages.

Some relief in the traditional foreign languages came with the introduction in 1960 of the summer language institutes, a concept originated by "Toni" Burzle. He proposed that we arrange

---

<sup>27</sup> The only area program subsequently added was African and African-American Studies but its genesis was reflected in the second part of its title.



for some of the students who had shown themselves capable in the first two semesters of German to do the work of the remaining two semesters during the summer—in the country where the language was spoken.

Tony had established the necessary contacts in Holzkirchen, a small town south of his native city of Munich, and was ready to put the plan into operation when George Waggoner persuaded him that the idea was so good that it should be applied, at the very least, to French and Spanish as well. Waggoner also arranged for some scholarship support for the three programs and placed the entire undertaking under the supervision of the College office. Beginning in 1960 KU sent upwards of 120 students each summer to locations in Germany, France and Spain. This is still done today and Eutin, near Kiel in northern Germany, which had replaced Holzkirchen as the principal site for the German program, is now officially a sister city of Lawrence, Kansas—a relationship that enjoys considerable public support in both communities.

These summer programs would, of course, have been impossible without the availability of air travel. Prior to the introduction of jet planes trans-Atlantic flights required re-fueling stops in Newfoundland and Iceland, frequently making it a ten- to twelve-hour trip. Jet travel made it possible to cross the ocean in about half that time. Technological advances produced larger planes; in 1960, we had to impose a limit of 120 students (the capacity of the plane we had could charter) for the three summer language institutes in Europe; five years later a larger summer group filled only a part of a scheduled airliner.

The decade of the fifties thus saw a noticeable change in student traffic, both into and out of the United States. It is interesting to contrast the patterns of study abroad that had prevailed at the beginning with the broader and more varied ranges of activity that could be found at the end of the same period.

A good overview of the more traditional approach can be found in a survey of such programs prepared for Michigan State University by two of its faculty members and published in 1955.<sup>28</sup> The first thing that is striking is that there is no public institution included in the survey.<sup>29</sup> All programs described were operated by private colleges, mostly in the northeast, and mostly undergraduate in nature. Most of them housed their students together: Smith College actually owned a house in Paris; Stanford rented hotels that were no longer functioning as such and—importantly—were some distance from any major city. The authors considered it necessary to identify those programs that attempted to expose the students to the language of the host country: most arranged for all instruction to be offered in English, frequently by members of the college's own faculty. In general, the impression is that the purpose was to provide a modern version of

---

<sup>28</sup> John A. Garraty and Walter Adams, *From Main Street to Left Bank: Students and Scholars Abroad* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1959). Garraty, a historian, later served for a number of years at Columbia University; Adams, an economist, spent the remainder of his career at Michigan State.

<sup>29</sup> The only exception was the University of Maryland which, under a contract with the army, offered college-level courses at several sites where American troops were stationed in Europe. The instructors were mostly Europeans, frequently persons with prior teaching experience who had been displaced from their homes by or after the war. Credit was given by the University of Maryland but the students had no other ties to that university.

the “grand tour,” that common practice of English public school graduates in the 18th and 19th century, but under supervision designed to discharge the in loco parentis function that characterized American higher education before the 1960’s.

The Fulbright program targeted the individual student or scholar. In the State department the cultural and educational affairs office saw merit in junior year programs—without, however, having a specific type of program in mind. The Association of American Universities, speaking for the country’s research universities, argued for increased support of area specialists; NAFSA, the organization of foreign student advisers, sought more support for students from other countries. The major funding organizations interested in furthering international aspects of higher education (mainly Ford and Carnegie but also more recent approvals on the scene, such as EWA [Education and World Affairs], of which Franklin Murphy was a member) perceived the need for a clearer definition of the goals. Out of their discussions there arose a national committee on “The University and World Affairs,” to be headed by President Morrill of the University of Minnesota. Murphy had participated in the discussions that resulted in the creation of the Morrill committee and decided that, whatever the advantages of a national perspective on the questions, it was appropriate, perhaps even necessary, that individual universities address the questions in their own contexts. As he was about to do he discussed his idea with George Waggoner and asked him to assume the chair of the committee he expected to form. George turned him down, arguing that he could contribute more as dean of the College than as the chair of a committee appointed by the chancellor—and suggested that Murphy should ask me to chair the committee. In retrospect this may have been what Murphy had intended—at least he said so in later years.

The committee consisted of some people who were identified with international programs but a majority of persons whose professional and personal concerns were not primarily oriented toward the emerging global education scene. In alphabetical order they were:

Lester R.C. Agnew — an English scholar of broad interests who, while teaching history of medicine at the KU Medical Center, chose to live on the Lawrence campus in one of the large residence halls.

J.A. “Toni” Burzle — chair, Germanic languages and literatures; his leading role in the establishment and maintenance of scholarly student exchanges has been discussed earlier.

Francis H. Heller — professor of political science, associate dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (chair of the committee).

Charles D. Michener, professor of entomology, research professor with the Institute of Tropical Studies (Costa Rica).

Raymond G. O’Connor, professor of American diplomatic and military history (secretary of the committee).

Alvin Schild, professor of education (social studies) and political science.

William P. Smith, professor and chair of the department of electrical engineering.

James R. Surface, professor and dean of the school of business.

Charles K. Warriner, professor of sociology, recent Fulbright scholar in the Philippines.

W. Clarke Wescoe, professor of pharmacology and dean of the School of Medicine

Murphy made it clear that he wanted a long-range view, not an assessment of programs in place. The committee responded with a brief but eloquent report. But by the time the report was submitted, Murphy was in the process of cleaning out his desk, headed for the University of California at Los Angeles. Luckily for the future of international programs at the University of Kansas, his successor as chancellor was one of the signatories of the report, the dean of the School of Medicine, W. Clarke Wescoe.

[Return to Contents](#)

## Chapter V

### THE YEARS OF CHANCELLOR W. CLARKE WESCOE

At first blush, Murphy's successor as chancellor of the university appeared to be very much like him. Like Murphy, Clarke Wescoe came to the chancellorship from the deanship of the medical school where, when he succeeded Murphy as dean. He was only one year older than Murphy had been at the time he became dean. Both men were of rather short stature but agile and energetic. Both were highly articulate and could be strongly persuasive.

The Regents had wasted no time: Murphy had announced his coming departure for UCLA on a Monday; by Saturday of the same week Wescoe had agreed to be his successor. "Agreed" is used deliberately: Neither Wescoe nor his wife was eager to make the change but were prevailed upon by the Regents in the face of a public announcement by Governor George Docking that he saw no reason why Kansas should have to look outside the state for a chancellor for its university and then identified four individuals, all in Kansas, as prospects that would be agreeable to him.<sup>30</sup>

To be sure, during nine years as dean of the medical school Wescoe had become well known in the state; since the medical school's budget was (and is) separate from that of the main campus in Lawrence, the dean of the School of Medicine (and later the provost and then the executive vice chancellor of the Medical Center) is also always well known to the members of the legislature. Just as Franklin Murphy had been the logical choice in 1951, so Clarke Wescoe was in 1960.

Murphy had been a product of the University of Kansas as an undergraduate; how deeply his year in Göttingen had affected him has already been noted. He had enjoyed the benefit of growing up in material comfort amid high culture. Clarke Wescoe was the son of a Lutheran minister in Pennsylvania; his undergraduate years had been spent at Muhlenberg College, a small Lutheran college in Allentown that waived tuition for the sons of Lutheran clergy. Until he became dean of the KU Medical School Wescoe had done little traveling outside the United States.<sup>31</sup>

One of Wescoe's first acts as chancellor was to direct that the report of the Committee on "The University and World Affairs" be printed and widely distributed.

The greatest challenge facing the American people today [so the committee wrote] is learning to live in the world of tomorrow. The challenge is addressed primarily to the American educational system, and especially to the institutions of higher learning.

---

<sup>30</sup> Under Kansas law the governor has no part in the selection or appointment of the heads of the institutions under the Board of Regents. For a variety of reasons, not all of them pertaining to the university, Governor George Docking and Chancellor Murphy had become increasingly hostile to one another.

<sup>31</sup> Wescoe's wife Barbara was a Kansan, daughter of a state judge who was also an influential leader of the state Republican party; she had attended the University of Kansas for two years.

The world of tomorrow will be no larger than the nation of today — or the county of yesterday. Improvements in transportation and communication continue to shrink the globe. Already communication between nations and peoples has become practically instantaneous.

The revolutions of our time promise to create a community of people whose interests and aspirations do not stop at geographic boundaries. More and more, domestic and foreign issues are having worldwide ramifications. Today the problems of one nation are the problems of all nations. To accept responsibility for the welfare of others is therefore not only a moral obligation; it is a simple matter of practical necessity dictated by self-interest.

Higher education must share this responsibility. The problems created by the new world situation cannot be solved by political action alone, nor by economic or religious institutions. Education must supply the means that will develop an informed citizenry capable of recognizing its responsibilities and able to cope with them. Education at all levels must prepare the citizen of tomorrow to think effectively about the challenging world in which he will live.

...

No problem facing us today is more pressing or urgent than the challenge to understand the world about us, the direction in which it is heading, and the nature of our responsibilities. Then — and only then — by accepting these responsibilities can we exercise some control of the future.

...

[The same kind of ringing language appears in the final sentences of the report:]

Our age calls for an educational system that considers the world its classroom. A state university will not have fulfilled its obligations to its state in this, the 20th Century, if it fails to provide for its students the kind of educational experience which will fit them for life in the 21st Century.

The first part of the report recited some of the efforts in international activities by which the university had already moved toward the report's lofty goals, most based on or involving individual initiatives. In its later pages the report recommended steps which the university could and should undertake as an institution. Here appeared a goal of having one half of each undergraduate junior class spend a period of study abroad; this, so the report noted, would require a steady expansion of exchange arrangements with foreign universities. To accommodate such arrangements—which ideally should be reciprocal—the University should find ways to ease the rigidity of the credit system, largely unknown in universities abroad.

The report noted that greater attention than in the past would have to be paid to assure that faculty from abroad to study or do research at the University of Kansas would be adequately compensated and, both professionally and socially, integrated into the host institution and its city. Lastly, the report noted the need for an administrative focal point for international activities

and recommended that provision be made for such a position (without, however, being specific about the scope and placement of the official who would be given this task).

Franklin Murphy had already let it be known that he was in full accord with this report. In the years and decades to come, every chancellor, from Clarke Wescoe to the present incumbent, has allied himself with its aspirations and most have supported its goals by lending his voice and impact to the efforts to obtain the resources needed to sustain the university's thrust in international education.

In submitting its report to the chancellor the committee had formally called attention to the Ford Foundation's program to raise the level of international educational efforts at selected universities; the first round of awards had gone to private institutions (except for the University of Michigan). Wescoe resolved to make the case for Kansas to be the second public university to earn Ford Foundation support and appointed a committee to prepare the case for KU. He directed the committee to select a chairperson from among its members and the committee assigned the position to me. Eventually a subcommittee undertook the task of preparing the final application; in addition to myself this group consisted of John Augelli (Geography and Latin American Area Studies), Oswald Backus (History and Slavic and Soviet Area Studies), Floyd R. Preston (Petroleum Engineering) and Thomas R. Smith (Geography and East Asian Area Studies). Its work product ran to 35 pages, with appendices identified by the letters A through Z.<sup>32</sup>

After Wescoe had informed the Ford Foundation that the University of Kansas wished to submit an application and that I would be the person charged with its preparation, I was granted an interview—that seems the best way to describe it—with a staff member of the Ford Foundation. To set the stage, this gentleman advised me that I was being seen only because I had a Ph.D. from a respectable university (the University of Virginia). He never came straight out and told me that Kansas simply was not on their list, but he reminded me twice that we should expect our application—and our qualifications—to be subjected to rigorous review.

Wescoe had told me that my designation to the group writing the Ford Foundation proposal had been suggested to him by George Waggoner. Although we no longer lived across the street from each other, George and I still had adjacent offices and interacted continuously. I had his advice throughout the application process.

It was he who thought of two ways that might strengthen our case with the Ford Foundation. One was to provide them with statistics on the performance of our undergraduates in competition for prestigious awards: beginning in 1956, each year had seen one of our students selected as one of the 32 chosen each year to go to Oxford as Rhodes scholars. In the competition for Woodrow Wilson fellowships for graduate study (1,000 grants nationwide each year) KU had twice in the last three years been tied with Michigan for the highest number of grants among public universities. That information was easily assembled. Waggoner suggested that, whenever the foundation sent a representative to us for a site visit, I have the visitor meet a group of our honors undergraduates.

---

<sup>32</sup> UA, International Programs – artificial files – Box 2 – Ford Foundation – "International Education at the University of Kansas: A Prospectus for future Development" (September 1962).

The second suggestion was not nearly as easily put into effect. Waggoner had talked to his counterpart at Michigan and had learned that the Ford Foundation people had almost rejected Michigan's application for one of these major grants because the University's own private support organization had shown little interest in the proposed enhancements. At the University of Kansas, private support is handled through the Endowment Association<sup>33</sup> which has its own board of trustees and its own (at the time still small) staff. In its earlier years anybody could approach KUEA's staff with requests for small grants or loans, but by 1960 the KUEA board required that all requests for payments from unrestricted funds be brought to it by the chancellor or a person to whom the chancellor had formally delegated his privilege. Wescoe's first reaction was positive, but he wavered when George told him that he and I were thinking of a request for \$100,000. But the following weekend George and I were asked to come to the Chancellor's house for lunch where we were given the opportunity to make our case to the chair of the KUEA board. At the next meeting of the board the grant was approved.

In due course our application for a grant in the amount of \$750,000 went forward to the Ford Foundation. Eventually I was asked to come to the foundation's office in New York for a meeting with the same staff associate I had seen in my earlier visit. This time I managed to get him out of his office and took him to lunch at the Yale Club (where Virginia alumni enjoy membership privileges). My (and KU's) stock went up.

The foundation officer's first question was about the \$100,000 from KUEA. Surely this was just a loan. When we got back to his office I asked to use his office phone, called the executive secretary of KUEA (Irvin Youngberg) and handed the phone to my host. Youngberg confirmed that it was an outright grant, to be administered by me or whoever chaired the Council on International Educational Affairs. There were no further questions; I had the distinct impression that I had been summoned for the purpose of receiving the foundation's denial of our request. The KUEA grant obviously made the difference.

The same foundation official came to Lawrence for a site visit, in the course of which he did everything he could to collect evidence that our facts were, at best, in error or, at worst, deliberately false. My wife had suggested that the meeting I had scheduled with some of the honors students be held at our home. Fifteen students showed up—and overwhelmed our unfriendly guest.

Two more visits to New York followed. But we now had a friend in court; George Beckmann, our professor of Japanese history and, though currently on leave, chair of our East Asian Studies program, was temporarily working in the higher education section of the Ford Foundation and provided Wescoe and me with periodic reports which showed that, while we might not get the sum we had requested we would probably be given a half a million dollars. Chancellor Wescoe was eagerly looking forward to being able to publicize this unprecedented donation.

---

<sup>33</sup> Formally the Kansas University Endowment Association often referred to by the acronym KUEA. The University's legal name is, of course "The University of Kansas." Over the years chancellors have sought to persuade KUEA to change its name to conform with the university's legal name but always in vain. The fact that the local newspaper mandates in its stylebook that "University of Kansas" must always be changed to "Kansas University" is sometimes cited by KUEA as justification of its position.

At the last minute the foundation insisted that the university commit itself to create and fund an administrative office for international programs—a proposition that had, of course, already appeared in our own report on “The University and the World,” a copy of which was Appendix A of the application we had sent to the Ford Foundation. The same condition, we were told, had been exacted from all recipients of these “major” grants. Beckmann had alerted Wescoe to this last-minute condition and, in the course of their telephone conversation, Wescoe had asked Beckmann if he might be interested in this position, and George had responded in the affirmative. Wescoe knew that Waggoner was being rumored as a leading candidate for the presidency of Indiana University; if he left, Clarke wanted me available to take his place. He did not know but probably surmised that I too had been approached by other universities seeking to fill administrative vacancies. I thought it entirely reasonable that he should wish to strengthen his immediate staff—and agreed that I would turn over the chairmanship of the Council on International Educational Affairs to Beckmann.

By this time George Waggoner had clearly become the focal person for virtually all activities in our relations to Central America and the Caribbean. He had lost his wife to cancer in 1961 and remarried the following year. Helen he had met while both were undergraduates at KU where she had majored in home economics. A delightful person who enjoyed being wife and mother, she took little interest in her husband’s professional life. Barbara Ashton had lost her husband in the collision of two airliners over the Grand Canyon; at the time she met George Waggoner she was a very active Assistant Director of Continuing Education for the University of Missouri at Kansas City. She had a bachelor’s degree in anthropology from Ohio University and had a strong desire to be involved in the academic scene. Her command of Spanish was much better than George’s, and her involvement in Latin America was every bit as pronounced as his.<sup>34</sup> Their combined efforts resulted in, among other evidence, the joint publication Education in Central America.<sup>35</sup>

Waggoner had become increasingly well known among Latin Americanists in the United States and among rectors and deans of universities in Latin America. The latter group in particular produced a range of interactions that often started as purely personal ties but eventually grew into projects, programs and contracts. The rectors and deans valued the opportunities for dialog and learning that he provided in the annual seminar for Latin American rectors and deans which had grown out of the remnants of CHEAR, with the strong support of the Department of State. Eventually, for political reasons, the department insisted that the guests from below the Rio Grande should visit other universities in the United States besides KU, but Lawrence remained the key of their six-week tour, and many of them included Lawrence, Kansas, on later visits to the United States, whether personal or professional.

Thus Luis Penalver, the rector of the Universidad del Oriente [UDO] of Cumanà (Venezuela), took advantage of his participation in the seminar to talk about the needs of his institution, a new creation of the government of Venezuela in a remote area of the republic. He needed teachers

---

<sup>34</sup> She continued many of the activities she had shared with George after he became disabled and eventually died. The University directory continues to list her as an adjunct research associate in Latin American Studies.

<sup>35</sup> (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1971).



and the opportunities for potential teachers to get graduate training. With a strong assist from Waggoner, he found funding from the Ford Foundation with the result that four KU teachers, all in the sciences and mathematics, went to Cumanà to teach for six to twenty months at a time while four young instructors from UDO embarked on doctoral work at KU.<sup>36</sup>

While in Costa Rica on his first visit Waggoner had become acquainted with CSUCA (pronounced “Casoooca”), the Council for Higher Education in Central America, which maintained its offices in Guatemala City. CSUCA was particularly interested in establishing geography as a college subject of instruction. There was, at that time, not a single professionally trained geographer in all of Central America. This project was underwritten by AID, the government’s foreign aid agency. Pierre (“Pete”) Stouse and, after his death in a civil aircraft accident in Topeka, Robert Nunley, both of KU’s geography department, spent extended periods of time trying to stimulate interest in geography and identifying candidates for training in the field, all this in the face of senior colleagues who saw no merit to geography as a subject of advanced study. Similar undertakings covered sociology and anthropology, with similar ambivalent results.

This is only a partial listing of activities in Central America that had their beginning at or found critical support in the University of Kansas. George Waggoner played a major role in each instance; he became so widely known among Latin Americanists that, when the government of Argentina first seized and then closed some of its universities, Waggoner was a member of a three-person team dispatched to Argentina as a fact finding group.<sup>37</sup>

George had found a valuable helper in Thomas M. Gale, a young historian who in the decade that he was on the KU faculty spent more time in Central America than he did in Lawrence. Tom was completely bilingual and had a profound appreciation for the cultural setting in which he found himself. Differing from some others who ventured into Central America, Gale also knew how to get along with the Americans in the field, the embassy, AID and the Ford Foundation.

One of the propositions that the Council on International Education Affairs had developed and Chancellor Wescoe had approved was that KU should not enter into any commitments for work abroad that it could not perform with its existing resources. This position ran counter to the practices of some universities that promised to do things without knowing who would be doing them. KU may have had fewer foreign aid contracts than other universities, but every contract signed by KU was performed by faculty already on board (and preferable already tenured.)<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Andrew M. Torres, “Plan KUUDO: An Experiment in a New Dimension of University Responsibility,” AAUP Bulletin, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 83-89 (1968). Professor Torres, a botanist, spent eighteen months in Cumanà as a senior adviser to the biology department. A copy of his article is in UA, RG 12/0 - International Programs - artificial files - Box 2 - Cumanà.

<sup>37</sup> UA, RG 12/0 - International Programs - artificial files - CSUCA (eight files).

<sup>38</sup> Thus in 1954 I was invited by the University of Illinois to go to Japan where Illinois was obligated by a contract with the State Department to provide each year a faculty member to teach at the University of Kyoto a course on constitutionalism and one on the American Constitution. I was unable to accept and in the end Illinois, much to Kyoto’s dismay and the State Department’s dissatisfaction, sent a graduate student instructor to Kyoto.

The Peace Corps, however, purported to operate without regard to possible profits. But, in a concession to for-profit entities, Congress had not ruled out for profit operation of the training that prospective Peace Corps personnel had to undergo before being placed in the field. Tom Gale had talked to the Peace Corps representative in Central America, with a view of having KU placed in charge of both training and field operations for Peace Corps teachers in Costa Rica. KU, he noted in his report to Waggoner, could make some money on the training part. He was disappointed when I had to inform him that this ran counter to KU policy. Then he discovered that the Peace Corps, as a matter of policy, would not assign training and field operations to the same contractor. Eventually, with the aid of a United States Senator, the webs became untangled and KU, with Tom Gale as director, trained and operated a Peace Corps team for Costa Rica. That summer 1963, when I visited Costa Rica for three weeks, there were more than one hundred people in the small country who, in one way or another, were related to the University of Kansas.

An incident that fall may be illustrative. William Argersinger, the associate dean of faculties for research, was in San Jose at the request of the University of Costa Rica to talk to them about research. At the end of the second day of his discussions at the university he was offered transportation to his hotel but declined; he was confident that he knew where the bus stopped and would prefer to walk to that point and then take the bus. There was a small group of people at the bus stop and it did not seem to bother any of them that every bus drove on without stopping for these prospective passengers. Bill did not speak a word of Spanish. But he noticed one person who was black; blacks in Costa Rica, he knew, lived in the coastal town of Limon and, as descendents of migrants from Jamaica, spoke not Spanish but a resemblance of Jamaican English. But when he addressed the man, the response came in good Midwestern English: he was a KU graduate student in public administration doing research in San Jose under still another grant, from AID, and he was just as lost as the dean. (They caught a taxi and had dinner together).<sup>39</sup>

Waggoner, quite rightly, thought highly of Tom Gale and eventually brought him into the College office as an assistant dean. But his reputation as an administrator was already established and a year later he moved to Las Cruces as dean of Arts and Sciences at New Mexico State University. If he had spent the remainder of his professional years at KU it is highly likely that he would eventually have become a key administrator for international programs. His departure was a definite loss to KU and, more specifically to Waggoner who was clearly the most visible person at KU with a strong interest in Central America and in higher education throughout Latin America but was not inclined to become involved in the administration of projects intended to advance these interests. This was, of course, why the recruitment of John Augelli was of such importance to him.

In 1961 Waggoner persuaded Augelli to leave the University of Maryland and join KU as a professor of geography and director of the Center for Latin American Studies. Augelli was a man of tremendous energy, eager to build the center into a nationally and internationally renowned activity. But soon after he had assumed his duties in Lawrence, he began to express frustration about his apparent lack of authority and, more emphatically, about the lack of identifiable lines of authority. "You told me," he wrote to Chancellor Wescoe in November 1962, "that I would be in charge of all activities pertaining to Latin America, but I am unable to find out where I am to

---

<sup>39</sup> Related to the author by Dean Argersinger.

take my questions: Surface [who just been named the chief academic officer], Waggoner, Heller? Who handles problems with the Junior Year in Costa Rica? Any of the same three? Tom Gale [that year's director in San Jose]? The dean of students? Time and again I have been told to take my problems to Mr. Nichols even if they have nothing to do with money or budget, and he always gracefully sends me back on the circuit that seems to have no end."<sup>40</sup>

Augelli would leave KU for the University of Illinois in 1967 but returned in 1971 as dean of international programs, a position he found as frustrating as his earlier task and which he relinquished two years later. Augelli's complaints were not without substance. George Beckmann had prepared a job description for himself that placed all international activities (except the care of foreign students) under the umbrella of his office. George Waggoner thought that there were international activities that were entirely within the college, were in the college budget and should be handled in the college office. Beckmann persuaded the office of research administration, through which all university grants and contracts had to be funneled, to require clearance by him whenever there was an international aspect. He also insisted that his title should parallel that of the head of research administration, "Associate Dean of Faculties for —."

Among the matters that Beckmann had brought under his jurisdiction were the various activities that Toni Burzle had brought into being: the processing of Fulbright grants and the summer orientation program. Toni did not take kindly to the transfer of these matters and told Waggoner that he would look for another position. Waggoner assured him that the last word had not been heard and that he, Burzle, would always play a major role. Burzle was, after all, the chair of a department in the College but could Waggoner protect him if Beckmann was determined to carve out his area on his own terms—and had the chancellor's support? Or did he?

Shortly thereafter in 1964 the Institute of International Education cited KU with the IIE-Reader's Digest Award in International Education, one of five such awards it made this year and the only one to go to a public university. The annual award was accompanied by a monetary grant of \$1,000, which was to go to the person at the university who had contributed the most to the development of these activities. "Toni" Burzle and I were announced by Chancellor Wescoe as the two persons to share this award. Perhaps naively, we both took this to be recognition of merit—but later recognized that it had really been a consolation prize.

In 1965 Beckmann accepted an offer from the University of Washington to be its vice provost for international programs. A major reason for his decision to move was that he faced continuous difficulties in his efforts to gain, if not control, then oversight of international programs at KU. This was certainly the case.

Both Beckmann's and Gale's brief careers at KU may serve as examples of a major problem faced by KU. Time and again a well-qualified person would be persuaded to join KU's faculty or accept an administrative responsibility, only to be hired away after a few short years. Often this was due to substantially higher salary offers. But some departures, such as Beckmann's in 1965 and Augelli's in 1967, were caused by unfulfilled expectations. It is, of course, also true that area

---

<sup>40</sup> UA, RG 12/0 International Programs - artificial files - Latin America 1962-63. Raymond Nichols, eventually to be briefly chancellor of the university, was clearly a key (some would say, the) key person in the university administration, having served there since 1928.

specialists, regardless of discipline, need to return to their area of specialization, to reinforce their contacts, to refresh their linguistic competence, to be updated on changes in the order. Beckmann (and later Augelli) felt that there should be funds for such purposes, and they should be under the control of the person designated to administer the university's international programs. The fact was that the granting agencies, whether public or private, rarely responded to pleas for the support of faculty travel or library resources.

Backus, the Russian historian, who had a remarkable capability for foreign languages, asserted that, at the least, he needed to spend a semester every third year in a Russian-speaking environment—and had the impetus to find support for his trips to the Soviet Union. But he was exceptional—in many ways.

[Return to Contents](#)

## Chapter VI

### THE SEVENTIES AND THEREAFTER

It is a commonplace of administrative theory that, in any organization, each level will be viewed in one way by those above and in a totally different way by those below—and in still another way by those doing the work. The organization of American universities has undergone a great deal of change in the last century. When I came to the University of Virginia in 1938 that university had what was only its second president—there had been none before 1902! When I came to the University of Kansas ten years later I found that on almost any matter of importance—and many of little importance—one needed to talk to the chancellor (or the ever-present, ever-knowledgeable, ever-courteous Mr. Nichols). And KU was by no means alone in its haphazard, incremental approach to the challenges of management. George Beckmann is not to blame for his desire to see his responsibilities clearly defined; John Augelli battled for what in later years would be called “turf”—and could not get an answer.

Recall that until 1963 the University of Kansas did not have an office or an officer responsible for its main purpose—the academic venture. When such a job was created, it was decided that its scope should not extend to medical education—understandably, given the fact that for a dozen years the chancellor, as former dean of medicine, was the person best informed on matters of medical education. Using terms from corporate organization, the chief academic officer is the chief operating officer, but even in corporations that term may not always signify the same thing, and may not remain constant.

KU’s experience with the search for a proper scope and authority for the person administering its international programs bespeaks that proposition. Between 1964 and 1974 KU had six different persons serving in the job which, a decade or so later, came to be called “dean of international programs.”

Yet the amount and the range of programs continued to grow. Largely as a result of Toni Burzle’s contacts and efforts a junior year became available in Bonn (West Germany) in 1963. In the same year, as a result of an agreement I had reached with my counterpart at the University of Colorado, ten KU students went to Bordeaux for their junior year under CU auspices. A few years later we were sending undergraduates to Leningrad and Zagreb, and graduate students to Guadalajara, Mexico. Creating more foreign study opportunities was a high priority, perhaps at the expense of others.

The weakness of our administrative structure for international programs was compounded by the creation in 1961 of the Mid-America State Universities Association (MASUA), initially a grouping of the Big Eight Universities (Colorado, Iowa State, Kansas, Kansas State, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma and Oklahoma State, plus Colorado State. The purpose was to encourage joint ventures, especially in the light of expressed Congressional preference for cooperative undertakings, on the (untested) premise that this would reduce expenses. George Beckmann had reported that the Ford Foundation would operate in like manner. But the very first cooperative venture that Beckmann helped to bring about after his return to KU involved, in addition to Colorado and Kansas, Washington University in St. Louis—not a MASUA member but a logical partner for the project in question.

The MASUA arrangement had been fashioned by the presidents and chancellors of the Big Eight institutions, acting rather on their own. To compensate for their failure to include faculty input in the founding they let it be known that faculty initiative would be encouraged. John McNown, the energetic dean of our School of Engineering, had become interested in the need for engineering education in the new countries in Africa, especially the francophone states in West Africa (where he had been as a Fulbright scholar). Reading the MASUA by-laws, he solicited participation from the other engineering deans and took a proposal to the Ford Foundation. That was when Beckmann first learned about the venture.<sup>41</sup> It was another instance that contributed to Beckmann's decision to leave KU.

I must bear major responsibility for the university's failure to define clearly its international mission and to address the problem of the most effective way to organize for this mission. In retrospect, the several programs and international programs as a whole would have been better served if I had not encouraged the minutiae of their management to accumulate on my desk. I can advance reasons why this was the case, but I knew, even as this happened, that it was not the best way to serve the university's interests in the international arena.

One reason was that the second half of the decade saw a noticeable slowing down of the growth pattern in international education. It began with the failure of the International Education Act.<sup>42</sup> Early in 1966 Paul Miller, the president of West Virginia University, was appointed an assistant secretary of education (in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare) with the specific charge to draft and secure Congressional approval of an International Education Act, a law that would lay the foundation for long-range planning and funding for international education.

Waggoner and I were included in a group of about fifty educators from the Great Plains and Rocky Mountains areas who met with Miller and his staff at the University of New Mexico where he announced that the proposal for the International Education Act would be launched by President Johnson in an address at the Smithsonian Institution. Miller's staff then gave each of us a list of newspapers and other media in our hometown or region and briefed us, with the aid of a sheet of "talking points," on tactics to help create positive reactions to the President's speech. We came away full of enthusiasm for the President's plan.

There was only one contingency for which there no plan: on the day of the President's address the Washington media, of all kinds, were all closed down by a strike. Nobody not present at the Smithsonian heard one word of what President Johnson said; there was no broadcast and no press association carried any news of it. A bill to enact an International Education Act was introduced six months later but it was, as the media reported, "dead on arrival."

The war in Vietnam began to be foremost in the minds of the American people. Unrest disrupted campuses (including Mount Oread), as students demanded that instruction be "relevant." Some administrators left for less troubled environs, as Clarke Wescoe did in 1969; others yielded, as Chancellor Chalmers did in 1970. Then, in 1972, for the first time in nearly forty years, the Kansas legislature provided zero budgetary increase for the state's institutions of higher learning.

---

<sup>41</sup> In the end, only two engineering schools were prepared to take part and external support did not materialize.

<sup>42</sup> House Resolution 12452, 89th Congress, 2d Session.

At KU and elsewhere on the state's campuses, some people began to question the importance of international education.

When older Lawrencians, town or gown, speak of “the troubles,” they do not think of Belfast and Londonderry, or Jerusalem and the Gaza Strip but of Lawrence and KU in the period from 1969 to 1972: the arson fire of the Kansas Union; mass rallies in front of Strong Hall; a huge meeting in the stadium with the chancellor proclaiming that the university would remain open while in the same breath allowing students to do whatever they wanted; two students killed by law enforcement officers; the bombing of the computation center—the troubled chancellorship of E. Laurence Chalmers.

Whether under these circumstances another chancellor might have been more successful than “Larry” Chalmers will never be known. The fact is that, from the day of his installation in September 1969 to his final meeting with the Board of Regents in August 1972, the new chancellor was confronted by one crisis after another. In many respects the situation at the University of Kansas was not unique: the generational conflict exacerbated by the increasing unpopularity of the country's involvement in Vietnam, the older members of society outraged by the apparent lack of respect accorded them by the students of the day, by their involvement with narcotics and their demands for “relevance” in education. Lawrence was not the only community where merchants found it appropriate to keep fire arms (and ammunition) in their stores.

Nor was the state of Kansas alone in its reaction. Legislators and governing boards insisted on higher degrees of accountability by universities—alumni of the pre-World War II days were now trustees and regents, with often idealized memories of their student days overshadowing the realities of campus life and learning expectations. In the days from Malott through Wescoe members of the Kansas Board of Regents often served successive terms, sometimes for as much as twenty years; the board's staff was minimal in size and often depended on councils and committees made up from the institutions to provide the staff studies needed by the regents. It was not until the late sixties that the regents decided that the board's secretary—the title itself bespoke his limited authority—was given an assistant whose task it was to review, for the regents' use, changes in the academic activities on the campuses. The compensation provided for this official was so modest that none of the first three incumbents served more than a year. The size of the room where the board met was so small that only one of the institutional leaders could sit with the regents at any one time.

Even as the regents' office underwent rapid growth, other parts of the state government also changed. The state legislature had not been redistricted since 1911; the leadership was therefore almost always in the hands of members from small rural counties who faced little or no opposition at the polls. When the federal courts began to insist on equality of representation (“one person, one vote”) this pattern of state politics gave way and leadership came to change with increasing frequency. Individual members now exercised greater influence and became more deferent to local concerns. Being a regent had long been an honor; now it became a demanding chore, with single-term tenure the rule rather than the exception.<sup>43</sup> One by-product of

---

<sup>43</sup> See James W. Drury, *The Government of Kansas*, 5th edition (Topeka: University of Kansas Capitol Center, 1997), pp 31-33; Marvin Harder and Carolyn Rampey, *The Kansas Legislature: Procedures, Personalities, and Problems* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1972) , pp. 18-

this development was an ever greater dependence of the regents on the staff; it may be symbolic that the staff, once headed by a “secretary,” is now directed by a “president,” and turnover among the staff has sharply increased. In the process, familiarity with conditions on the campuses tended to decline.

George Waggoner has been quoted to the effect that there was no better administrative job in a university than the deanship of the College<sup>44</sup> but neither Robert Cobb nor any of those who succeeded him would likely echo that sentiment. Administrative stability was clearly at a premium.

That such stability had been wanting by the early 1970s as far as international programs were concerned has already been noted. It became even more of a problem in the latter parts of the decade. The area programs believed themselves being squeezed out by the traditional departments. Persons with split appointments (department + area program) complained that, in salary as well as promotions and tenure matters, they were being discriminated against. Area studies directors worried about ways to improve their office space. On a broader scale, questions were being raised about the validity of area (or regional) approaches in the light of a perceived trend toward “globalization.”<sup>45</sup> John Augelli, returned in the capacity of dean of international programs, resurrected Beckmann’s cry for a clearer (and more influential) role for the dean of international programs—only to have the area programs oppose the scope of control he considered necessary.

The situation became further confounded by the illness and subsequent disability of George Waggoner. Although he partially overcame aphasia, he found it necessary to relinquish his deanship. When Augelli resigned the international programs position, Ronald Calgaard, now vice chancellor for academic affairs, and Delbert Shankel, by this time executive vice chancellor,<sup>46</sup> considered that Waggoner’s popularity among the faculty—especially faculty relating to international education—would help to overcome the tensions that had surfaced in the course of the earlier debates over the place and status of international education. Chancellor Archie Dykes approved their recommendation that Waggoner should become associate vice chancellor for international programs, in the office of academic affairs. Carol Prentice, an efficient and notably tactful member of the staff in that office, was assigned to assist Waggoner. Eventually Waggoner’s health put an end to this arrangement and his duties were shifted to George Woodyard, added to his duties which placed him in supervision of graduate work.

---

28 and chap. 7; Francis H. Heller, *The Kansas State Con-situation: A Reference Guide* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1992). pp. 25-34. The two major decisions establishing the “one person, one vote” principle were *Baker v. Carr*, 369 U.S. 186 (1962) and *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964).

<sup>44</sup> Robert P. Cobb, Waggoner’s successor as dean, at the memorial service for Waggoner. UA - Waggoner, George R. - artificial files- box 12

<sup>45</sup> Though of somewhat later date, the arguments can be found in a recent issue of the Social Science Research Council’s quarterly publication: “Roundtable on Rethinking Inter-national Studies in a Changing Global Con-text,” *Items and Issues*, vol.3, no. 3-4 (summer/fall 2002).

<sup>46</sup> The position of provost, established by Wescoe in 1964, was eliminated by Chancellor Chalmers in 1970. It was reestablished, under the title of “executive vice chancellor” by Chancellor Dykes in 1973.



When David Shulenburger became vice chancellor for academic affairs in 1993, his prior experience in that office put him in a good position to direct a redesign of the infrastructure. It helped that the Board of Regents, historically suspicious of any increase in administrative staff on the campuses but now themselves possessed of a substantial bureaucratic structure, allowed expansions where in earlier days they would have been adamantly opposed.

The present structure of international education responds to many aspirations of the faculty while giving priority to the needs of students. The driving force comes from the provost's office and has found its most significant expression in the report on internationalization of the curriculum.

The final chapter describes this most recent evidence of KU's movement toward a clear institutional approach toward international education.

[Return to Contents](#)

## Chapter VII

### THE NEW CENTURY: THE INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION<sup>47</sup>

The charge to the task force on internationalization from Provost David Shulenburger echoed the closing words of the report of the committee on “The University and the World” in 1960: “To be a major university in the United States in the 21st century,” wrote the provost, “a university must be an international university. It must provide its domestic students with a window to the wider world through its teaching on campus and its programs overseas, it must encourage its faculty to do research on topics all across the globe and to collaborate with researchers in their disciplines in any nation, and it must welcome students and scholars from every part of the global community.” But it was significant that these words were not addressed to a committee but to a task force. By that choice of title the provost made it clear that he was not asking for a new vision—or the reassertion of an old time—but answers to specific questions.

What, precisely, defines a “significant international experience?” Meredyth-Wolf’s account takes this to specifics—each of them an issue that had beset those committed to or at least concerned about international education at KU in years past: How to make sure that each of KU’s approximately 19,000 undergraduate students would have such an experience? Where and how should the international experience fit into the system of academic book keeping? How and by whom would it be decided what experience qualifies as being not only “international” but also “significant”? And, perhaps most critical, how are these international experiences going to be paid for?

These are not idle questions. To take them in reserve order, KU’s inability, once the Ford Foundation money and the several Carnegie grants had come to an end, to build international education into the university budget caused the university to lose such energetic advocates as George Beckmann and John Augelli and to discourage many others who were perhaps less determined.

The university was not without experience with the allocation of courses to curricular categories. The College had mandated a distribution requirement at least seventy years ago, with each student having to take three courses in each of three areas of the curriculum. It started out neatly, with each department being placed in either the humanities or the sciences (including mathematics) or the social sciences. It did not take long before imaginative instructors found reasons to have this or that course listed in more than one area; the area programs were, almost by definition, either outside or all across the matrix.

Under Waggoner’s deanship “principles courses” had replaced the three- areas requirement—but before long departments or programs that had been denied a principal course designation claimed that they had been discriminated against—and soon practically every beginning course had been declared to be “principal.” Once again, reality had won out over a formal requirement. Could one overcome this problem in dealing with international experiences?

---

<sup>47</sup> Based on "Defining and Implementing an International Experience," by Anne Merydith-Wolf, in *Horizons* (quarterly publication of the Office of International Programs), vol. 16, no. 2 (spring 2002).

The task force, chaired by associate dean of international programs Paul D’Anieri (political science and Russian and East European Studies) and working through three sub-groups, addressed these issues and questions arising in relation to them. At the time the task force’s report was made public Dean D’Anieri was able to note that work on a number of the more pragmatic changes was already underway. But running through the report is the repeated warning that “where to draw the line between rigor and availability, is a difficult question.”

All members of the task force concurred in the finding that, to internationalize the students, the university must internationalize its faculty. This requires that internationalization must be “promoted either through selection (e.g. hiring and promotion) or through development (supporting efforts by faculty to increase their own international expertise.” Such efforts—and the emphasis is mine—will require commitment at the highest levels, both in terms of providing funds and eliminating existing discriminations. Chancellor Hemenway’s commitment—one of several he has made, in words and actions—properly appears on the first page of text of this narrative of KU’s journey *per asper ad mundum*—through difficulties to [awareness of] the world.

In the introductory chapter of this account the reader was given a gentle reminder that academics are to a large extent individualists. “Undoing” faculty members will not be an easy task. The task force alludes to “existing discriminations” —we noted earlier that some members of the area programs felt that they were being penalized by their traditional departments. In some instances this may have been due to personal frictions but it may also have been the result of systemic flaws (e.g. the fact the forms used for the processing for promotion in rank provide no place where international activities can be listed).

The task force did not mention that the selection of faculty members (or persons of comparable status, e.g. librarians or research associates) for programs involving groups of students or persons of differing cultural backgrounds requires more than the usual amount of scrutiny. One asked to serve as a faculty member or group director with a study abroad group is not only a teacher but also a counselor, a student welfare worker—a general troubleshooter. He or she needs to have a record of appreciation of cultural differences and diplomatic tact sufficient to cope with them. Not every person is suited for this kind of an assignment—nor is every spouse happy to be in constant proximity of a group of 20- or 21-year olds.

The structure for international education is now in place. The challenge to fill the framework with the kind of content that, from the 1960 report to the recent task force, has been the university’s aim—that challenge continues.

[Return to Contents](#)

## POST SCRIPT

Dean Diana Carlin appointed the Ad Hoc Committee for Certification of the Undergraduate International Experience to address the Provost's charge. The charge of this committee originated in the work of the Task Force on Internationalization, which completed its assignment in August 2001. The challenge was to devise a program that would enable students who remained on campus for their entire academic career to have an educational international experience. The committee recommended that the international experience be substantial, certifiable, and accessible.

With those goals in mind, the group developed the Global Proficiency Certification Program (GPCP). GPCP consists of three components: international experience, academic coursework, and co-curricular international activities. In order to be certified, a student must complete two out of three components. Completion of the program will be reflected on the student's transcript. The Global Proficiency Certification Program (GPCP) was unanimously approved by the Ad Hoc Committee on Global Proficiency Certification in May 2003 and presented to the Provost and Deans. As of August 2003, it is awaiting endorsement from faculty governance.

On May 16, 2001, KU student Shannon Martin was killed during a weeklong research trip to Golfito, Costa Rica. While she was not participating in a study abroad program, safety issues for KU students were raised. As part of the ongoing work of the International Programs task force, a committee was formed to explore ways to increase the focus on safety. In July 2002 KU announced that it would close its undergraduate Study Abroad instructional program with the Institute of Tropical Studies in Golfito in order to concentrate on other programs in Costa Rica.

In response to the Martin tragedy, Dean Diana Carlin appointed an implementation committee to help students and faculty better utilize the information in the Study Abroad Student Handbook. The committee recommended that student orientations address cultural differences between the United States and specific countries. Other committee recommendations included: orientation for GTAs regarding their roles and responsibilities as instructors in a Study Abroad program, and faculty members' duties to students in university programs regarding student activities, especially health and safety concerns. In addition to pre-departure student orientation, students would attend an on-site orientation.

[Return to Contents](#)