

KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

INTERVIEW WITH PRESIDENT DANIEL S. PAPP

CONDUCTED BY THOMAS A. SCOTT AND DEDE YOW

EDITED BY SUSAN F. BATUNGBACAL

INDEXED BY THOMAS A. SCOTT

for the

KSU ORAL HISTORY SERIES, NO. 50

3 AUGUST, 5 SEPTEMBER, AND 28 SEPTEMBER 2006

Kennesaw State University holds legal title and all literary property rights, including copyright, to this oral history. It is not to be reproduced without permission from the director of the Kennesaw State University Oral History Project.

Kennesaw State University Oral History Project
KSU Oral History Series, No. 50
Interview with President Daniel S. Papp
Conducted by Thomas A. Scott and Dede Yow
Edited by Susan F. Batungbacal
Location: President's Office, Kennesaw Hall

Part I, Thursday, 3 August 2006

TS: President Papp, why don't we start with a little about your background, your time in Cobb County and maybe a little before you got here as well?

DP: Sure. Before I got to Cobb County I was born and raised in Cleveland, Ohio. I did my undergraduate work at Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, got my bachelor's degree in international affairs, Phi Beta Kappa at Dartmouth. I played some football and basketball and learned how to play rugby and ski while I was up there and did all sorts of neat things.

TS: Do they have football scholarships at Dartmouth? Is that how you got up there?

DP: No, Dartmouth is a Division 1, non-scholarship institution. So you still played serious football and all that. But I only played freshman year because I screwed up my knee when I was there.

TS: Why did you go to Dartmouth?

DP: I went to Dartmouth because it was an excellent undergraduate institution, and I knew that I wanted to go to school out of state and out of Ohio. I was recruited to play football and visited Dartmouth, Yale, and Harvard. People were just friendlier at Dartmouth than anywhere else, and I wound up deciding that was the place to go.

TS: Three colonial colleges.

DP: Yes, exactly. But the football at Dartmouth was basically one of these situations that the football coach would get mad at you if you came to practice and you had a chemistry test the following day. "What are you doing at practice with a test the following day? Get out of here."

TS: Really?

DY: That's refreshing.

TS: It is.

DP: The reason I picked on chemistry is because I started as a chemistry major and went from chemistry to math to economics to international affairs.

- TS: Well, we can see what you were moving away from. I guess the question is what attracted you to international affairs?
- DP: International affairs, Tom, is really interdisciplinary. I had a little bit of history, a little bit of economics, a little bit of political science, a little bit of sociology, a little bit of religion, a little bit of everything.
- TS: A real liberal arts education.
- DP: A true liberal arts education. It was also right at the center in the world of 1965 through 1969. During those years, you're talking about the Vietnam War; you're talking about the height of the arms race; you're talking about the Prague spring and Soviet troops rolling into Czechoslovakia. So it was just one thing after another. Yes, a true interdisciplinary education, a true liberal arts education. But it was plugged into what was happening everyday on the world scene.
- TS: Were you marching out in the streets protesting the war in Vietnam or were you a supporter or where were you at that time?
- DP: No, I did not support the war in Vietnam, but I was not one of those who opposed it strongly enough to go out into the streets. As a matter of fact, when the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) took over Parkhurst Hall and a couple of other administration buildings, a couple of my fraternity brothers and I set up a lemonade stand and made enough money to fund a weekend in Boston. It was great [laughter]. We had the state troopers buying lemonade from us and we had SDSers coming out of Parkhurst Hall buying lemonade from us, and we had people just hanging around
- TS: You should have majored in business.
- DP: We did it as a lark just to be funny, but we made a couple of hundred bucks.
- DY: A weekend in Boston, hey!
- TS: Did you have long hair and a beard back then or were you a conservative student?
- DP: I had hair just about like this now, although at some point in time you will see one picture of me from 1975 when I had just come back from leading a group of Georgia Tech students to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and hadn't shaved in three months and hadn't gotten a hair cut in three months. Well, actually I did shave, I had—what did they call it—a VanDyke? I also had a Cossack's shirt on.
- TS: So you looked perfectly normal for '75 [laughter]!
- DP: Yes. I did my undergraduate work, and then I went back and I taught high school at the same high school from which I graduated for a year, which was a fascinating experience.

DY: What did you teach?

TS: Was it a public high school?

DP: It was a public high school. I taught American government and U.S. History. I coached football, basketball, and baseball, and did that for a year and came to really appreciate not only how difficult high school teaching is in a teaching sense, but also in an intellectual sense. To go over the same thing

TS: Five times a day?

DP: Well, I had three preps. It was three times a day. But then to do it year after year without really being able to much change the content of the courses because the content was dictated by state rules.

TS; It's easy to understand how teachers burn out.

DP: Exactly, Tom, exactly. I burned out as a high school teacher after one year.

TS: Was that '69-'70?

DP: Yes, '69-'70 was the year I taught high school.

TS: How on earth did you get through a doctoral program so quickly?

DP: In three years? I had a wonderful undergraduate education at Dartmouth, and I had a superb set of faculty members at the University of Miami who were very much plugged into three or four things: number one, providing an excellent graduate education; number two, guiding students through so they didn't spin their wheels; number three, getting what they considered good folks out into the work force as soon as possible. So I started my graduate career in June of 1970, about six or seven days after I got done teaching my last high school class.

DY: I bet you were ready [laughter].

DP: And then got my doctorate in August of 1973.

TS: So you just skipped the master's and went straight to the Ph.D. program.

DP: Yes, straight Ph.D. program, which I opted for. I figured I was going to go on for the doctorate anyway, so why stop with just a master's.

TS: I guess you've explained why you went to the University of Miami, but I'm wondering why there?

DP: Actually I didn't. It was a superb program, and I'm very glad that I went down there. Florida was one of only a couple of places where I could get a high school teaching certificate and go to a good school at night. So I originally moved to Miami with the intention of teaching at [Henry H.] Filer Junior High School during the day and taking graduate courses at night. But in the spring of 1970 the lottery came around, and I got a pretty high lottery number. I believe it was 256.

TS: So you're not worried about the draft, so you didn't have to teach?

DP: Exactly.

DY: Everyone remembers their number.

DP: Yes, exactly. On the night of the lottery the high school teachers played Marcus Haynes and the Harlem Magicians, which was a low rent version of the Harlem Globetrotters. So, of course, everybody, instead of wearing their basketball number wore their draft number. So it was a hoot [laughter]! But that's why I wound up going down to Miami, to teach. I was also looking at graduate school at Yale, but I couldn't get a teaching certificate in Connecticut. I could have obtained a teaching certificate in Colorado to go to the University of Denver, but decided on Miami.

TS: Well, Miami is a little warmer than those other places.

DP: Yes. So we went down there and had three years and three months or so

TS: You say, we went—were you married at that time?

DP: No, I went down there. I played a lot of rugby, met a lot of good people down there, traveled all over the Caribbean while I was in graduate school playing rugby.

TS: Well, one thing we've been asking everybody is about mentors along the way that had a particularly strong influence. Are there any that come to mind in your case?

DP: Let me start with influences and then go to mentors. My dad was a big influence because he served in World War II.

TS: What's his name?

DP: Stephen Papp. Dad died in May of 2001. He would often have his cronies over or we'd go over to his buds or down at the local bar. This was in the '50s, and they'd tell war stories. Dad was blown off of—he originally served on a munitions ship when we were invading Guadalcanal. It was in Iron Bottom Sound, and his ship got sunk, so he spent some time in the water. I heard some of those stories. Then he wound up being on a destroyer, so I was interested in things military, et cetera. When I went to Dartmouth, with my evolution from one major to the other—which by the way is great, because when a student comes into the office and says, "Dr. Papp, I don't know what I want to major

in.” I can say, “I can relate. Don’t worry about it. It’s no big thing. Part of the process of being an undergraduate is to discover who you are.”

TS: I started out in zoology.

DP: There you go. What did you, Dede, start out in?

DY: Well, I had my bachelor’s in history, and then I got a master’s and Ph.D. in literature.

DP: Good examples as well. Mentors up at Dartmouth and influences—Charles McClain. He was professor of Political Science. In addition to getting a scholarship to go to Dartmouth—Dad was an assembly line worker. We couldn’t afford sending me to Dartmouth, so Dartmouth gave me a nice scholarship. But that wasn’t quite enough to make ends meet, so I did work-study and got put with Professor McClain who was a Sovietologist. So that got me really interested. Another one of my mentors was a geographer by the name of Robert [E.] Huke. He was big even then in climate change and physical geography and that sort of stuff. So that, of course, blended chemistry and geology with the physical world and policy. So that was absolutely fascinating. I guess those were probably my two biggest mentors.

TS: What was it about them that made them mentors for you?

DP: Interesting people. Professor McClain was a superb skier, and he also, maybe once a quarter or so, disappeared for a couple of weeks, and he’d be off in the Soviet Union. I thought that was pretty cool. Then Professor Huke was really big into Southeast Asian affairs—not the war or anything; he was involved with something called the Mekong River Project in an effort to make the Mekong River more productive—try to put some dams on it and generate hydroelectric power.

TS: Wasn’t it Lyndon Johnson’s proposal that they just accept that and just stop resisting and we’d build all these dams for them?

DP: That was part of it. So here were folks who were good people and good athletes and involved with things of the mind and involved with real world situations. And, wow, that was pretty neat.

DY: Renaissance men.

DP: Renaissance men, really.

TS: Well, I guess in the ’60s you thought there would always be a need for Sovietologists, I guess.

DP: Yes. In the ’60s and in the ’70s and a lot of folks thought in the ’80s, that there would always be a need as well. I was not one of those, by the way. I did not see the break up of the Soviet Union, jumping forward. But probably the best article I ever wrote was

published in 1982—maybe best isn't the right word; maybe the most foresighted article I ever wrote was published in 1982 in the *U.S. Naval War College Review* [XXXV (July-August 1982): 50-68] after it had been rejected for publication four or five times. The article was entitled "From the Crest All Directions Are Down." The original title was "From the Crest All Directions Are Down: The Growth of Major Problems in the Soviet Union." The editors up there thought it sounded neater if you said, "From the Crest All Directions Are Down." And that became the title of the article. I started writing this in the world of '80 and '81. Of course, it was the Reagan election in 1980 and it wasn't cool to say that the Soviet Union has problems in '81 or '82 or even '83—I got some considerable flack for some things I said.

TS: Sounds like you were agreeing with Reagan?

DP: No, no, no, no. The article didn't say that.

TS: Wasn't that what you were implying, though, that you wouldn't want to be associated with Reagan?

DP: I was implying that even in the world of academia, the alleged objective world of academia, in the early '80s or in the early 21st century, publication is in fact subject to political pressures. So what the article basically said, Tom, is, "Let's all agree that the Soviet Union's military is really impressive. Maybe it's as good as ours, maybe it's better than ours, maybe it's not quite as good as ours." I couldn't find any admirals or generals in the U.S. that wanted to trade militaries, so my guess was theirs was a little bit worse than ours. That having been said let's just accept the Soviets had a doggone good military and then put that aside. We're done with that. Let's look at what's left. You've got a country where the average age at death is going down. You've got a country where the rate of growth of the agricultural output is negative—they were growing less and less each year. You've got a country where the industrial output in non-military sectors—the growth rate—was negative. You've got a country where at least on an anecdotal basis there was the growth of nationality problems. I have two specific examples from leading my kids over in '75—my first trip to the Soviet Union was in '75 with a whole bunch of students. We were in Samarkand, Soviet Central Asia. When you travel in the Soviet Union you have a country guide that goes with you the whole time and a city guide that goes with you just in the city. Our country guide was a lady by the name of Natasha, ethnicity Great Russian, very nice lady, Communist party member. So we're in Samarkand, and I'm walking down the street with her one day, and I noticed that many of the locals when they get relatively close, maybe from here to the wall, would step out in the street, some of them would cross to the other side of the street, and some of them when they got past you a little bit would expectorate in the street. So I asked Natasha, "What's going on here?" She says, "Don't worry about it—old local custom." A day or two later I'm with the country guide, not the city guide, and I don't remember her name. I asked the same question when the same phenomenon occurs, and her response is, "Don't worry about it; they think you're a Russian!" Okay, so . . .

TS: Anti-Russian sentiment.

DP: Anti-Russian sentiment, exactly. Then a couple of weeks later we're in Soviet Georgia in Tbilisi, and this was when the joint Soyuz-Apollo shot went up. I've still got [in my office] my Soyuz-Apollo poster that I brought back from the Soviet Union in 1975. So we're at a quote, unquote, "party"—[watching] a TV where the Russians broadcast the American Apollo launch live and delay the broadcast of the launch of Soyuz. "Why do you broadcast Apollo live?" "In case something goes bad—show American humiliation if something goes bad." "Why do you do a tape delayed broadcast of Soyuz?" "In case something goes bad—you'll never see it." That's the kind of stuff that really went on. We're at this party, and my college students and a couple of my friends went over as well. Most of our kids were eighteen to twenty-two or twenty-three, and the Soviet Georgian students are in their early thirties and propagandists, et cetera, et cetera for the party. My kids did pretty good defending themselves and defending the American way of life and the western way of life while at the same time pointing out all of our shortcomings. But the word came in that the Soyuz and Apollo hooked up. The leader of the Soviet Georgian group jumped up on the table with his glass of vodka or vinjak or whatever he was drinking, and says, "To the United States and Apollo." And everybody in the room, Americans and Georgians toast: "To the United States and Apollo." So I'm thinking, okay, I'm leading the U.S. group. I've got to respond. So I jump up on the table, and I say, "To the Soviet Union and Soyuz!" Every one of the Americans in the room says, "To the Soviet Union and Soyuz." And all the Soviet Georgians go [silence]. So the Soviet Georgian puts his arm around me and says, "Dr. Papp, you don't understand, 'To the United States and Apollo.'" Every one of the Soviet Georgians goes, "To the United States and Apollo." So here we have in about two weeks two incredibly telling incidents where there are nationality problems, immense nationality problems, just below the surface. I built that into the article. So I used seven or eight or nine or ten different parameters. You take the Soviet Union, take the military there, and in issue after issue outside the military it's a country coming apart at the seams. Conclusion: the next Soviet leader—[Leonid] Brezhnev was still alive when I wrote and published it—the next Soviet leader is going to have to cope with these problems or there will be hell to pay in the Soviet Union. I concluded that the next Soviet leader would have to cope with these problems in one of two or three different ways: if he does not cope with the problems, the country will continue its downward spiral. If he attempts to cope with the problem in way number one—way number one is to find an external enemy and try and bring the country together—a classic way to do it to bring your country together, find an external enemy and rally around [the flag]—so that's one possibility. Another possibility is you might have a reformer come in who will implement some serious economic reforms, political reforms, and social reforms. If there's any way the U.S. can get that kind of person in, that would be wonderful. We got lucky. We got, well, [Yuri] Andropov got in—Andropov, had he lived longer would have been very, very dangerous. Fortunately he died quickly. [Konstantin] Chernenko came in and he was irrelevant because he was old and infirm when he came in. Then we got a reformer [Mikhail Gorbachev] who came in. From the crest all directions were down.

TS: So you think it was blind luck on our part?

DP: Yes [laughter].

TS: Okay.

DP: Yes. The Reaganites try to claim too much credit. I do give them some credit. I'm not one of the analysts who said that it was Ronald Reagan who brought down the Soviet Union. Bull. The Soviet Union was in the process of coming apart at the seams anyway. What Reagan's defense policies did, and what his standing up to the Russians did, was to convince Gorbachev that internal reforms were necessary. So I think Reagan has to be given some credit for Gorbachev's going in the direction he did, but not as much credit as the Reaganites [claim]. There wasn't nearly as much credit as the Reaganites [claim].

TS: The right place at the right time—but the wrong person in the White House could have really messed up everything.

DP: Yes, the wrong person in the White House or the wrong person in the Kremlin. So the world was very fortunate that we had Reagan and Gorbachev together. You don't hear that perspective very much from either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party or the academic world.

TS: Right. Any particular mentors at Miami that stand out?

DP: Yes, one in particular, Dr. Leon Goure. Leon was my thesis advisor, and Dr. Goure was the guy who took me under his wing from the day I met him. He said, "Dan, what you need to do during your first semester is identify a thesis topic. Work with me on identifying a thesis topic." This is first semester. "What you need to do"—you asked me before, Tom, how I got done quickly. Here's why I got done quickly—"What you need to do then is in all of your graduate courses that you take, have them oriented in some way, shape or form towards doing research on what your dissertation is going to be."

DY: Yes, in an ideal world!

TS: So Miami strikes me as a private school that maybe was highly selective in who they let in, but who they let in they expected to get the doctorate, so from day one they're preparing you to get through.

DP: Right. Now, the Center for Advanced International Studies (CAIS)—the faculty there was primarily retired state department types, retired think tank types, and only a couple of people who had come up through the traditional academic ranks. Some of my professors, like Gerald Govorchin and a couple of others who were in history or in political science were folks who had come up through the ranks, but a significant percentage of the folks that I studied under and worked with were people who had their doctorates, but who had non-academic and so-called "real life" experiences.

TS: Right. So does that kind of steer you toward maybe applied research, an interest in applied research?

- DP: Absolutely. Applied research has to be based in many or most cases on original research. That having been said, my orientation is clearly towards applied research, which fits in really nicely here at Kennesaw. At the doctoral level what did the Board of Regents say we could go ahead and do? Not a Ph.D., but applied doctorates. It's a nice fit from that perspective. But Leon was my biggest influence at Miami, and he was very good.
- TS: By the time you get through in '73, the job market's not the greatest in the world, I guess. You went to Georgia Tech and you pretty well stayed there, and, of course, we think of Georgia Tech as an engineering school, but I know they've got the history of technology doctorate and things like that.
- DP: We didn't create that until twenty years later.
- TS: Right. So why Georgia Tech at that time?
- DP: Three or four reasons, Tom. I came up to Georgia Tech first because I was dating a girl in Atlanta who was a stewardess. She'd come and visit me in Miami once in awhile. So at spring break she'd come down to Miami and I came up here, and I thought it's not a bad city. Even in '73, Atlanta was a pretty nice city, so when I visited her, I said, "Well, I wonder if there are any job opportunities in Atlanta?" At that point in time I knew I was going to get a doctorate in either August of '73 or December of '73; it was that close. Reports were positive. So it was just a question of how hard I worked during the summer of '73. So I thought, "Hm, I'll go visit the universities." I went to Georgia State and met the chairman of the department of political science, Chuck [Charles B.] Pyles.
- TS: Oh, yes. I remember him.
- DP: Chuck was a great man, became a good friend of mine after I moved to Atlanta. He didn't give me a job offer though [laughter]! I went over to Emory, met Dennis [S.] Ippolito, who ran political science. Then [I] went to Georgia Tech and met Pat Kelly—no job offers or anything. So I went back to Miami and I was still looking at going to work for the Central Intelligence Agency. I was looking at the possibility of Auburn, they had an opening; University of Redlands in California had an opening. Then on Memorial Day 1973, I had just come in from the pool in Miami and my roommate, Mark Miller, said, "Hey, Dan, there's some guy on the phone from Georgia Tech who wants to talk to you." So I went over and it was Pat Kelly who was the chair of the department of social sciences at the time, and he said, "Hey, I've got a job for you starting in September if you want it." I said, "Well, how much time do I have to think about it?" He said, "Three or four days." I asked how much it would pay, and he told me how much it would pay. I went and talked to Leon Goure who was—we talked about this before—a big influence on me. Now, the gentleman that I'm about to discuss was not really a big influence on me, but he had a big role in my taking the position at Georgia Tech—his name was Mose L. Harvey. Dr. Harvey was the director of the Center for Advanced International Studies where I was getting my degree. He was the former head of policy planning at the Department of State. He was also a graduate of Emory, so he said,

“You’ve got a chance to go to Georgia Tech, take it” [laughter]! “Okay! Dr. Goure says it’s a good place to go. Dr. Harvey says take it. Dr. Kelly told me when I needed to be there.” So that’s how I wound up moving here. I broke up with the girl, by the way. So that was okay. She wanted to be a movie star, so she flew for about six months after I moved here and then she moved to California to try to become a movie star, but never quite made it. So that’s how I wound up getting to Georgia Tech. Why did I stay at Georgia Tech? Tech was very good to me. Tech gave me the opportunity to teach what I was interested in teaching, to do research in what I was interested in doing research on—and this was just the beginning of the era. Joe [Joseph M.] Pettit had just come in as president in ’71, or something like that with the specific job of making Tech a research university—most people don’t remember this, but this was one of my biggest challenges at the Board of Regents, when I was there, to get people to remember things.

TS: Institutional History.

DP: The University System of Georgia—and we in the USG get pilloried all the time for our relative lack of research—except for UGA’s agricultural research, there was zero research being conducted in the state of Georgia before Joe Pettit came to Georgia Tech. So the history of true academic research, outside of the very good agricultural research that UGA was doing, dates to roughly 1971. So here we are in the world of 2006, thirty-five years after Joe Pettit came to Georgia Tech, and the University System of Georgia is about the tenth or eleventh largest generator of academic research, collectively, in the United States. USG research is only thirty-one years old. You look up at the Cal. Berkeleys, you look at the Ohio States, you look at the

TS: They were getting all that grant money in the ’50s and ’60s.

DP: Exactly. So this state is doing doggone good, we just don’t appreciate our starting point. Our starting point for research is doggone recent. So why did I stay at Georgia Tech? I got to teach what I wanted to. I got to research what I wanted to. I was “present at the creation,” to use Dean Acheson’s phrase from his book [*Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1969)] of the movement into scholarship and research at Tech. We did it—I’ll give Pat Kelly a credit for this—in social sciences, we did it all the time, saying, “number one on the block” for just about everybody is teaching—with one or two exceptions—number one on the block, you’re a good teacher. If you’re not a good teacher, I don’t care what you bring in or what you publish. With the exception of one or two faculty, if you’re not a good teacher, no matter what you bring in, you’re gone. It can be done. I’ve experienced it.

TS: Did your department have a major when you started at Georgia Tech?

DP: No. And we started a phrase there that you’re going to hear me use with modifications here, but for different purposes at Kennesaw. We didn’t have any majors, but we wanted to influence every student that we had. Our line was, “every student is *our* student,” and it was true. I used to bug my friends at Emory all the time that Georgia Tech engineers got a much more liberal education in the classic definition of what a liberal education

was, than the students at Emory did. Why? You could go through Emory without taking a math course. You could go through Emory without taking a natural science course. You couldn't ever be an engineer coming out of Georgia Tech without taking at least eighteen hours worth of humanities and at least eighteen hours worth of social sciences. You could not do it. So the classic definition of the liberal education is what? A little bit from here, as we talked about before, Tom, a little bit from natural sciences, a little bit from the social sciences, a little bit from the mathematical sciences.

TS: I've heard Bob [Robert B.] Ormsby say exactly the same thing—the retired president of Lockheed-Georgia.

DP: I taught his daughters by the way.

TS: Did you really? He was making that point that he knew a whole lot more about Shakespeare than English majors knew about quantum physics.

DP: Yes. Here's a trivia question, and please don't think I'm pro-engineering. Engineers do a wonderful job; there are some real issues with engineering education. Other than philosophy majors—this was true twelve years ago, so I don't know if it's still true—in the world of 1994, as far as we knew, other than philosophy majors there was only one other major in the world that we could track that required at least six hours of philosophy to graduate. What was that major? Good trivia question.

DY: Yes. Not history?

TS: No, I don't think so.

DP: Electrical engineering.

TS: Is that right?

DP: You needed a course in general philosophy, and you needed a course in ethics.

TS: So your department played a major service role then at Georgia Tech.

DP: That's all we were during the 1970s, exclusively service. Every student is our student, and we had a huge impact on a huge number of kids. Every one of our faculty members, with one or two exceptions were good researchers, but teaching was number one. Make sure that those engineers and make sure that those managers and those natural scientists really were interested. to get them interested you had to be interesting. So that kept me there and plus, I got to travel.

TS: You got a whole year to go to the War College [U.S. Army].

DP: I taught at the War College.

- TS: You were at Georgia Tech for four years when you went there, three or four years?
- DP: Even before I went to the War College I arranged a visiting professorship, actually an exchange professorship in Australia. So I lived in Australia for seven or eight months and then came back and immediately went to the Strategic Studies Institute in Carlisle. I had just a wonderful, wonderful time there, learned a lot, and worked in the Pentagon for a couple of months during that period, and did a project on the neutron bomb, the military utility of the neutron bomb, which was fascinating. I did another project on the army strategic environment from 1990 to 2000, which I'm scared to go back and look at because I'd be afraid how badly we missed. I did a number of other projects. That's when I started to do my work on Soviet policies in the Third World. In fact—I was there in '77-'78 which was when it became public knowledge, the extent to which the Soviets had been mucking around in Angola, I think '77-'78 was when they went into Ethiopia.
- TS: What did you do your dissertation on?
- DP: My dissertation was on "Soviet Perceptions of the Goals of and Constraints on U.S. Policy toward Vietnam, June 1964 - December 1965." It was basically diving deep into Soviet literature and seeing what they were saying.
- TS: Yes. It's really Third World though, the emphasis on Vietnam.
- DP: Exactly. So that was a good dissertation. My first book was entitled, *Vietnam: The View from Moscow, Beijing and Washington* [Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1981].
- TS: Were you able to get into Soviet records? You couldn't get the Soviet records.
- DP: No, just public Soviet commentary. One of the tools of the Kremlinologist during that era, a tool that some mainline political scientists and mainline historians disagreed with tremendously, was reading Soviet sources to see if you could cipher and decipher slight differences in emphasis. I remain convinced that was a very, very useful methodology.
- TS: So you must have picked up Russian pretty early on.
- DP: Yes, I picked up Russian; my Russian today is miserable. I have not used it really in fifteen or sixteen years, since just after the break up of the Soviet Union because I began re-orienting my research at that point in time.
- TS: You are doing a ton of research and you've got what, ten books nowadays?
- DP: All of them stacked right behind the plunger [on the book shelf in his office].
- TS: All right. You've got a couple of textbooks maybe. I was interested in your resume on the Dean Rusk book. You said you edited 100 percent and wrote 30 percent of his autobiography [laughter].

DP: I had about 3,000 pages of transcripts of interviews with Mr. Rusk. Some of it, to make it really a book you wanted to read, had to be rewritten. You ran it back by him to make sure it was exactly what he meant. I have a couple of good anecdotes, one of which I maybe ought not use in mixed company, but I will anyway unless you tell me not to.

DY: I don't consider myself mixed!

DP: The first one, I was up there one day interviewing Mr. Rusk just after the former Soviet foreign minister, Andrei Gromyko, wrote his memoirs, and Mr. Rusk said, "Dan, have you read my good friend Andrei's autobiography yet?" I said, "Yes, sir, I have." Mr. Rusk said, "Well, tell me what he said about me so I know what to say about him" [laughter]! He meant it as a joke! So that was the first one. The second one came back from Mr. Rusk talking about—this is a true story, although the first one was a true story as well—in 1963 Gromyko was still the Soviet Foreign Minister and Mr. Rusk was Secretary of State, and they were at a cocktail party together. Of course, Mr. Rusk's classic comment about the Cuban Missile Crisis was, "There we were; we and the Russians were standing eyeball to eyeball; and the other fellow just blinked." Gromyko came up to Rusk at this cocktail party and said to him, "Dean, I do not understand. You said we were standing there balls to balls and . . ." [laughter].

DY: Lost in translation!

DP: Lost in translation! Long before Bill Murray ever got lost in translation ["Lost in Translation," by Sofia Coppola (Los Angeles, CA: Focus Features, 2003)].

TS: I met Richard Rusk when he came—we invited Steve Oney in to speak at the 1st annual Jewish Life in the South symposium in 2004, and he was talking about the Leo Frank case, and Richard Rusk came to try to get people interested in a memorial for Leo Frank.

DP: The way I got involved in the Rusk project—this is worth telling. The way I got involved in the Rusk autobiography was that Mr. Rusk and Richard were totally alienated over the Vietnam War. Richard had been a student at Cornell. [He] had [some emotional difficulties] over his dad's role in the War, refused to talk to his father, moved to Alaska to get away from everything. Mr. Rusk had a stroke, and the book project began as a father/son near-death reconciliation project. But Richard couldn't do it. Richard just couldn't do it. So the people at the Southern Center for International Studies, Peter [C.] and Julia [A.] White, whom I worked closely with, knew that I had known Mr. Rusk from during graduate school days. They asked me if I would be interested in getting involved in the project to save this father/son reconciliation project. That's how I got involved.

TS: Thank you.

DY: Thank you so much.

Kennesaw State University Oral History Project
KSU Oral History Series, No. 50
Interview with President Daniel S. Papp
Conducted by Thomas A. Scott and Dede Yow
Edited by Susan F. Batungbacal
Location: President's Office, Kennesaw Hall

Part II, Tuesday, 5 September 2006

TS: Dr. Papp, we talked a lot last time about your background. We got up to Georgia Tech and some of the things you were doing there, your scholarship and so on. I'd like for us to get started today talking a little bit more about your career at Georgia Tech. I thought a good way to get into the interview today is with some of the honors that you won there. You were Outstanding Faculty Member in 1976. I believe that was selected by the Student Government Association.

DP: Yes.

TS: And then you won a Distinguished Professor Award in '93, which I guess would be the equivalent of our Distinguished Professor Award here, maybe the same type of award.

DP: I think so.

TS: Overall teaching, scholarship, service.

DP: Teaching, research and scholarship, service, the whole nine yards.

TS: Obviously your reputation in the classroom and the things that faculty members are expected to do was sterling at Georgia Tech. I wonder if you'd talk a little bit about those awards and maybe a little bit about your perceptions of the role of teaching and scholarship and service.

DP: Sure. Let me start with the awards and then do my perception of teaching, scholarship and service. I have a unique perspective on teaching, which we'll come back to in a minute—I think it's unique anyway. I was very surprised to get the Student Government Association Award because I'd only been at Georgia Tech for three years at that point in time, but obviously pleased to get it. At that point in time, I was teaching three classes per quarter.

TS: Five-hour courses?

DP: Actually ours were three-hour courses.

TS: Well, yes, you wouldn't be teaching fifteen hours at Georgia Tech.

- DP: We were doing nine hours. One of my classes every quarter was the large section of American Government. I had 225 students in that class every quarter, and then I would teach two other classes in my field or specialty, American Foreign Policy or Soviet Foreign Policy or U.S. Defense Policy or International Relations Theory, that kind of stuff. On a quarter to quarter basis, I always had 300 students, and we had no graduate teaching assistants either.
- TS: You didn't have the doctoral program at that time.
- DP: No doctoral program, no master's program, nothing like that. All of us in international affairs and in political science and history and sociology and philosophy, the units that made up the old School of Social Sciences, were all teaching between 200 and 350 students per quarter. So I figured by that point in time, Georgia Tech was probably only about 9,000 or 10,000 students. After I had been there three years, I had probably taught already about one-third of the student body! That having been said, I was still surprised to get that award simply because I was such a "newbie" at that point in time. Then the 1993 award, I was also surprised to get that because up until that point, nobody other than an engineer or a natural scientist had ever received that award at Georgia Tech. This was a combination of alumni, faculty, students, and administrators all got together and did this. I was pleased and proud to get both those awards. My view on teaching, you've got to figure out a way to get students interested. I don't care where you are, I don't care if you're at Georgia Tech or Kennesaw or Southern Poly or Georgia Perimeter College or Waycross College, you've got to figure a way to get students interested. I always try to find a hook in one of my classes or preferably multiple hooks. My whole philosophy of teaching is to confuse students about what they really believe in such a way that they want to learn for themselves. I don't want them to take my beliefs. I want them to think; I want them to think for themselves. So that is what my objective is: confuse them about the beliefs that they previously held, so that they want to rethink their beliefs and their outlooks on their own. If they reach the same conclusions, that's fine. If they reach different conclusions, that's fine. At least have the students be critical thinkers on their own and not listen to somebody else, most of all, the professor. Just get them thinking.
- DY: Complicate their world.
- DP: Yes, complicate their world, Dede.
- TS: Did you find it easy or difficult to encourage critical thinking when you were doing those large classes of 250?
- DP: Difficult. But there were ways to do it. You did a little humor—one of my favorites was the electoral college example, where you explain why the electoral college came into being, and then you talk about the way the electoral college really operates so that you could have somebody win with a minority vote.
- TS: Which we did in 2000.

DP: Which we did in 2000, exactly correct, and still wind up being elected president. So that got people thinking, well, gee, is there a better way to do it then? Go back to the context of the times when the electoral college was put in, where you had few people reading, few people deeply involved, it seemed to work. But the class of 225 was always a challenge. That was always taught in D.M. Smith 105—that was the room number; that was the name of the building. Research? I was blessed; I was doing research in a field that was critically important to the United States and to the world, the inter-relationship of the U.S. and the Soviet Union, whether it be in strategic nuclear policy or whether it be in U.S. and Soviet policies in the Third World. That was something that students were interested in, and it was something where I had no problem putting what was cutting edge research into the classroom in ways that students were interested in it. Service? Service was easy. I loved to be on a college campus working with students. You can do all sorts of things working with student organizations. I was the faculty advisor to a fraternity for a number of years. I was the founder of the Georgia Tech Rugby Club. I'd go out and lecture in high schools all over the state, primarily in Atlanta and primarily in Cobb County. I worked very closely with the Southern Center for International Studies on a host of different projects.

DY: So your service was very student focused.

DP: Very student focused and also service focused to the profession. I was chair of the American-Soviet Section of the International Studies Association. I was twice chair of the Southern Section of the International Studies Association. I served on the executive board of the Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Association, [and] served on the executive board of the section on military studies. So I was very much involved in service to the profession as well.

DY: But not so much with administrators. You were not on committees necessarily with administrators; is that what you're saying?

DP: Yes. Not until later on.

DY: That's very interesting that your focus was students.

DP: I started in '73, and then in '79 or '80 I wound up becoming director of the School of Social Science at Tech. Then, I started beginning getting a bit more involved with the administrative side of the service.

TS: Was that a tough decision for you to move into administration as director, or was that something that you wanted to do?

DP: No, it was just something that I wandered into, to tell you the truth, Tom. Our school director resigned, and we had a school that consisted of a few political scientists and historians and sociologists and anthropologists and religion folks. We were a mini school of humanities and social sciences. We had about 23 or 24 faculty members, and it was internecine combat very frequently—"are we going to get that position"—and I just had a

knack to bring people together. So a couple of other faculty members said, “Gee, we’re spending all of our time politicking; why don’t you let us nominate you to be chair because you can probably bring everybody together. Then we’ll all have more time to do our teaching and our research and our writing because we won’t have to worry about politics.” So that’s what happened. I went into administration because if I went into administration running the School of Social Sciences, everybody would have time to do their teaching and their research and writing because they wouldn’t have to worry about politics. We’d just sit down, and instead of conniving behind each other’s backs, we’d sit down and have meetings and, “At the end of this hour, we’re going to reach consensus. If at the end of this hour we don’t reach consensus, we’re still going to have a decision, but everybody will have heard everybody else’s arguments and we’ll be done. Then we can go teach and research and write.” So that’s why I got into administration.

DY: So you saw yourself as a mediator, in a mediating role.

DP: As a goal directed mediator. I was not and am not one of these folks who will sit around and say, “Well, we don’t have unanimity, therefore we can’t reach a decision.” I’m not one of these folks who says, “We do not have a hundred percent of the information that we need, therefore, we will not reach a decision.” Those two examples are honestly one of the reasons why the academic world is held in less than stellar regard by many people on the outside, because until unanimity is there, no decision is made. Until you have perfect knowledge, no decision is made. That’s not the way to move forward and get things done. Will you make some mistakes on occasion? Sure. But not making a decision is an even bigger mistake.

TS: I was thinking that nobody would ever get a book or article finished if they waited until they had all the knowledge before they wrote something.

DP: Exactly.

DY: Yes, a good analogy.

DP: We, in the academy, write books all the time without perfect knowledge, but yet when it comes to making a decision we either want unanimity or perfect knowledge.

TS: Right, we become Quakers at that point, I guess [laughter]. Well, you moved into administration. I guess one of the things that interests me is that you moved into administration without sacrificing your scholarship or your professional service to your discipline.

DP: Or my teaching.

TS: I didn’t know how much teaching you were doing at this time, but I see lots of administrators around here who practically give up their scholarship once they become administrators.

- DP: What I was doing was too fascinating to give up my scholarship. I just couldn't do it. And I've tried to keep at least the toe in scholarship up until basically about a year or two ago, and I still tried to keep up my toe in scholarship, even as senior vice-chancellor. That came out about a year and half ago [pointing to *American Foreign Policy: History, Politics and Policy*, by Daniel S. Papp, Loch K. Johnson, and John Endicott (New York: Pearson Longman, 2004)].
- TS: Yes, I saw that on Amazon.com.
- DP: That's what I call integrative research. It is a textbook, yes, but what it does is take a whole bunch of different perspectives from different experts in the field of American foreign policy. Starting with the *history* of American foreign policy, going through the *process* of American foreign policy, going through *issues* of American foreign policy and in each of those areas, integrates the perspective of other folks in those three separate areas, and comes out with what I think is something new.
- DY: Do you see the intellectual energy that propels you and gets you moving to do this kind of work—how does it engage you in your administrative work? Do you switch off one and flip on another?
- DP: Yes. Thank you for phrasing it that way. The simple answer to that, phrasing it that way, [is] yes, absolutely. [Scholarship] is almost relaxation. And it really has always been relaxation, even when I was less involved in administration.
- TS: But I guess if you're studying American foreign policy it's all about diplomacy, and when you're talking about being a mediator as an administrator, it's kind of the same thing, isn't it?
- DP: In many respects, it is. You're exactly right.
- DY: Well, and having been a student of military history I can see how you would come out of that with a view of a mediator.
- DP: Particularly when there are nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction around. We don't want to use those things! But you don't want anybody else to use them either. When my second oldest boy was growing up, he said, "Dad, what do you do for a living?" I said, "Basically, my chief objective is to keep faculty members from killing each other and to keep Americans and Russians from killing each other" [laughter].
- DY: Guess which is easier [laughter]!
- TS: That's great! I notice that you also have an Outstanding Civilian Service Medal from the Department of the Army.
- DP: I got that twice.

- TS: Twice? I noticed the one in '79. I guess I missed the other one.
- DP: The '79 one was for work that I did when I was up at the Strategic Studies Institute of the Army War College. I was living in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and the Army War College was at the home of the old Carlisle Indian [Industrial] School, which was where Jim Thorpe went to school. But what I got that first Outstanding Civilian Service Medal for was for a series of projects that I worked on for the army that included things—some of the projects, for example, were the study of policy implications of the neutron bomb, the technical name for which was the Enhanced Radiation Reduced Blast Weaponry [laughter]. See, that's what it does. It's a baby nuclear weapon, so it's got a small blast, but the radiation—they build it in such a way that they enhanced the radiation so the killing mechanism at a distance is the radiation, whereas the blast and the heat killing radius is very short.
- TS: It's a much more horrible way to go.
- DP: You're dead either way.
- TS: I guess so.
- DY: "Fire and Ice," as Robert Frost says [originally in *Harper's Magazine*, December 1920)].
- DP: Exactly. Another project we did was Army Strategic Environment 2000, which we wrote in the world of 1978-79. For this, we did prognostications of what the world would look like in 2000, and then tried to figure out what the army should look like. We did not predict the demise of the Soviet Union; we did predict the growth of state sponsored terrorism, which of course occurred before the breakup of the Soviet Union. The terrorism of today is just another version of state sponsored terrorism. So we were decent on that projection. Then the second time I got the Outstanding Civilian Service Medal was three years ago, something like that, for some work that I did at the University System office to help make the University System of Georgia more friendly to folks serving in the U.S. military and their families. We worked with the regents and wrote policies so that folks serving in the U.S. military based in Georgia could pay in-state tuition, even though they didn't have in-state residency. We thought that was the right thing to do. We got the board to do that. And we extended it to their families as well.
- TS: Let me ask you, you've done a lot of professional service, but you've also done some community service as well, and I'm just wondering about your philosophy on that. I know you were in the East Cobb Kiwanis Club at one time. You coached a lot of youth sports when your kids were growing up.
- DP: When my two oldest kids were growing up—I've got two step sons now, and now I'm just a fan. I just go to their games. I just don't have the time to go coach them anymore.

TS: You did everything under the sun at the Lutheran Church of the Resurrection [on Paper Mill Road, Marietta] for a number of years as well.

DP: I did that as well. Until I changed memberships of churches.

TS: Is that why it ends about '99?

DP: Yes, exactly. I went through a divorce, which is one reason I changed, and then I also had some issues with the previous minister there, who I didn't think was very pastoral.

TS: But you were like a lay minister there?

DP: Right, an assisting minister, which basically was that you got to go to the altar and say the prayers and distribute communion and all that kind of good stuff. So I enjoyed that.

TS: So you were heavily involved in the community then.

DP: Yes. Very much so.

TS: How does that fit in with, I guess, the overall picture of service? Is that as important, do you think, as professional service?

DP: Yes. I've got to divide my yes into two parts: is it as important as professional service? Yes. Should it be counted—because we're all parts of the communities in which we lived—in promotion, tenure, reappointment and raise consideration, should it be included? No, because we ought to be doing that regardless of whether we're employees of Kennesaw State University or Georgia Tech or assembly line workers or postmen or whatever we're doing. We all ought to be contributing to the community. As an administrator, don't ask me to count the stuff you ought to be doing. The line there can be sometimes vague and hazy. Let me give you a specific example. When I was at Georgia Tech, I used to coach the Georgia Tech Rugby Club. Well, that was with Georgia Tech students; so you were a role model, hopefully, for students, which is important [laughter]. Did I ever put that in? No, I never really claimed it, but I sort of hoped that the people who looked at me—I have no idea if the people who looked at me and who were assessing me ever counted it, but they knew that I was coaching Tech students. Also I was coaching basketball and football for my kids. Did I put that in? Absolutely not; so there's a gray area in certain endeavors.

TS: Sure. I think it's important for us to be out in the community so they can see faculty members at Kennesaw as relatively normal people, hopefully.

DP: Absolutely. I agree completely.

DY: Well, in that sense we're stewards for the college as well. Good citizens.

DP: Yes.

- TS: I was interested in your resume. You had Southern Center for International Studies more in the community service rather than in the professional service category.
- DP: It could have gone either way. To tell you the truth, I have no idea why I put it more in the community side than I did on the professional side. That's one of those that from my perspective could have gone either way. I lectured very frequently for the Southern Center to folks in the community.
- TS: So it's not peer reviewed.
- DP: Yes.
- TS: Let's talk a little bit about your different positions as administrator. You've talked about being director of the School of Social Sciences, and then in 1990 you became the founding director for the School of International Affairs. Why don't you talk about your role in creating the School of International Affairs at Georgia Tech?
- DP: When Pat Crecine [John Patrick Crecine] came in as president at Georgia Tech, he was given the directions by the Board to expand the number and types of majors that kids could major in at Georgia Tech. He looked at the School of Social Sciences. We had, by that point in time, in the late '80s developed something called a Master of Science degree in Technology and Science Policy that took kids who had technical competencies and gave them policy understanding with some policy capabilities as well. We had three separate tracks. We could have gone farther with three different degrees, but we decided to create one degree and track it three ways. One of the tracks was in the history of technology, which made sense for Georgia Tech since we had a lot of historians, a lot of sociologists, and a couple of philosophers involved in that. We had another track in Technology Policy Analysis; we had a lot of political scientists involved there. The third track was in International Security and Development where we had political science and historians and folks coming out of philosophy and religion and some economists. The Master's of Science in Technology and Science Policy with three tracks bound together all the disparate disciplines. So Pat came in and said, "Hm. You have these three different tracks. They're good enough so that each one of them deserves its own school, and that also will help expand the purview of the social sciences at Georgia Tech." But by that point in time, our faculty liked what the School of Social Sciences was doing so much that many of the faculty opposed Pat's expansion. And since I was the director, I was at the center of it, and Pat thought that I opposed him. He kept an enemies list. I made his enemies list because I disagreed with him on the way he was going about doing things and some of the narrowly based specifics of change. I told him on more than one occasion, "Pat, your problem is you don't have enough confidence in the value of your own ideas. Instead of trying to do things via force, just go out and explain it and people are going to sign on like crazy." Eventually he and I got back together on viewpoints and he understood that I was not his enemy and that I really supported the reorganization. This led to as many as thirty new faculty slots, ten in history, focused on the history of science and the history of technology, probably another ten in technology policy analysis,

and probably another ten in international affairs. So I was right at the heart of the reorganization that took place at Georgia Tech. As it moved down line Pat asked me to become the director of what became the Sam Nunn School of International Affairs, which now has about 300 undergraduate majors and about 75 or 80 master's degree students.

TS: So the School of Social Sciences goes out of business at that time and divides three ways.

DP: Right. Each one of the three tracks in the old Technology and Science Policy program became the heart and soul of a new school.

TS: I know Bob McMath [Robert C. McMath, Jr.] has been there forever.

DP: He's gone now.

TS: He is?

DP: Yes, Bob is running the Honors College at the University of Arkansas.

TS: I didn't know that.

DP: Bob is wonderful.

TS: I agree. And I guess maybe Ron Bayor [Ronald H. Bayor] was coming in at this time?

DP: Let's see. That whole group of us, we came to Tech in the world of '72-'73. Bob came in '72—Joe Pettit [Joseph M. Pettit] came in as president in '71, I believe. Joe was basically given marching orders from the Regents to “make Georgia Tech a research university.” Before Joe, Tech was not a research university; it was a bench engineering institution. It was one of the most incredible things that happened at Tech, now the eighth best public university in the country. As a research university, it's only 35 years old. Bob McMath and Bob Whelan came the year before Ron Bayor and

TS: Ron's been there that long?

DP: Yes, Ron and I were in the same class of the faculty at Tech. Barbara Karcher, as a matter of fact, was—I think Barbara came to Tech with Bob McMath and Bob Whelan.

TS: That's right, she was there awhile.

DP: She was there, I think, for two or three years. Gus [August] Giebelhaus, you probably remember him.

TS: Yes, I know Gus.

DP: Gus came in, I think, in the faculty class of '75. Gerry Reed [Germaine M. Reed], I don't know if you know Gerry. She was there for a long time. She has since retired. But the

real star historians who came in then were Bob McMath and Ron Bayor and Gus Giebelhaus. Did you know Dorothy [C.] Yancy?

TS: No, I don't believe so.

DP: She's an African-American lady; she's now the president at Johnson C. Smith [University]. We just had a stellar group of folks there.

TS: So you ran the—I guess it wasn't Sam Nunn when you were running it?

DP: At first it wasn't the Sam Nunn School. It was the School of International Affairs. When I went up to the president's office as Executive Assistant, that's when Senator Nunn retired. I had known Senator Nunn because we were both students of international affairs and defense policy. Since I knew the senator, I called him up, and asked, "Hey, with you retiring, would you be interested in having a school named after you?" He said, "Well, I don't know." I said, "That sounds to me like a definite maybe." He said, "Yeah." I said, "I'm going to have some meetings with President [G. Wayne] Clough." And then President Clough and Senator Nunn and I worked it through and talked with some other alums at Tech and by 1994 or '95, sometime in that time frame, we got Senator Nunn to add his name to it.

TS: Great. What did you do as executive assistant to the president?

DP: Whatever Wayne didn't want to do [laughter]. A little bit of everything. The same thing that my faculty executive assistant is going to do [laughter].

TS: I guess it's great to be president where you can let somebody else do it.

DP: The second job he gave me, and thank you, Dr. Clough, was to kick my old fraternity off campus. They deserved to be kicked off.

DY: I don't even want to know what they did, but I can probably guess.

DP: They had been warned multiple times about hazing. They grabbed a couple of freshmen, brought them over to somewhere in Alabama, threw them out of the car with a quarter and their underwear, and somehow one of these two kids got into a fight with a motorcycle gang and got stabbed. So, I mean, there was no doubt that they had to be kicked off of campus.

TS: Was this the one that you had once advised?

DP: Not only the one that I advised! As an undergraduate I was an SAE at Dartmouth. I had been the advisor, yes, for SAE at Georgia Tech. By the way, the current president of the Kennesaw State University Foundation, Tommy [Thomas] Holder, is also a Georgia Tech SAE. Tommy Holder's one of my former students at Tech and a member of SAE. That was before we kicked them off. Tommy had graduated by that point in time.

DY: He's my father-in-law's [Lawson Yow's] next door neighbor.

DP: You're kidding!

DY: No, I'm not. I told Lawson last night that Tommy had told me that, and he said, "That's his claim to fame!" But I remember the SAEs—I went to Agnes Scott—and I remember the SAEs.

DP: They deserved to be kicked off.

DY: I'm not surprised.

DP: By the way, my son, when he went to Tech also joined SAE. He had graduated by that point in time as well.

TS: You offended everybody.

DY: So that was your second job.

DP: Yep, but even worse, the president of the Georgia Tech Alumni Association that year was SAE; the incoming president of the Alumni Association, from Maier & Berkeley Jewelers, the Maier of Maier and Berkeley, was SAE; and Tom [E.] DuPree, [Jr.], who had just given the college of management 25 million bucks of Applebee's stock to name the Tom DuPree College of Management, was also SAE. They were all SAE.

TS: So it was not a good career move [laughter].

DY: Hauled up your mediation skills on that. What was the first thing you did?

DP: The first thing I did, I had been in the office about two or three days, and I'm serious, I really did not know where the restroom was at this point in time. I got a phone call from Homer Rice—Homer was the athletic director at Georgia Tech, and I had known Homer for a while. He said, "Dan, congratulations on being named faculty executive assistant. Who is the president's office going to have at our news conference when we announce the naming of the McDonald's Center?" I said, "I don't know. Let me go ask President Clough." So I went and asked President Clough, and Wayne says, "The naming of what?" Homer, without telling anybody, had struck a deal with McDonald's to rename Alexander Memorial Coliseum the McDonald's Coliseum. So my first job that Wayne gave me was to tell Homer that a) nobody was coming to the press conference; and b) the press conference wasn't going to happen until the whole thing got reviewed and restructured. So that was my first job.

DY: Don't shoot the messenger on that one.

TS: Well, it's still Alexander Memorial I think, isn't it?

- DP: What we wound up doing was keeping it Alexander Memorial Coliseum, but it became Alexander Memorial Coliseum at McDonald's Center.
- DY: I love those prepositional phrases. You can do anything with them!
- DP: We worked with the people at the Board of Regents and struck out a geographical area. The geographical area became the McDonald's Center and we put in a time frame. The time frame would have been ten years, I think, after which both Georgia Tech and McDonald's would re-evaluate the naming. It is no longer McDonald's Center. That time frame expired two years ago, and Georgia Tech opted not to continue. I think McDonald's would have opted not to continue as well. So I did all sorts of interesting things like that. One of the other interesting things that I did was give back a million and half dollars.
- TS: Give back?
- DP: Well, actually tell the prospective donor we refused to take it.
- TS: Strings attached?
- DP: There were strings attached, yes sir. One of the strings was that the prospective donor, who is somebody that is well known in Cobb County, but I won't go any further than that, wanted to sit on the search committee [sigh]. So, Wayne said, "We're not taking that money." And we didn't take the money. I got involved in faculty governance reorganizations, chaired the diversity forum, worked closely with the alumni association, scheduled Wayne's visits to all the campus academic departments and the operational departments. It was a fascinating time. Until this job it's probably the best job I had.
- TS: Did you just carve out a few hours for your scholarship each day, or how did you do that?
- DP: Exactly. It was more like half a day a week. Sometimes I managed to sneak it up to two days a week, but yes, that's exactly what I did.
- DY: How did that change your perspective on teaching faculty when you had that job, that role?
- DP: It didn't. By that time, Dede, I had been a school director for fourteen years, so I still understood that faculty come in all flavors. Some folks are just absolutely exquisite and dedicated professionals, and some have retired on active duty, and some you've got to be careful that you don't take advantage of because they do absolutely anything because they love the kids and they love the work. There are others who will complain about anything if they have class sizes that are larger than two. You take the two extremes and you fill every hole in-between. Faculty folks are just like the rest of us.

DY: Well, it must have positioned you well, though, to do faculty governance work, I mean, as well as bringing in your own background.

DP: It did. I don't think it changed my perspective on anything faculty related. It changed my perspective on what it took to run the university. That really changed!

DY: That's an interesting point to talk about.

DP: I remember going in on occasion and, "Wayne, we never talk about things academic." We really didn't. I mean, we did talk about teaching strategy, we talked about retention, progression, and graduation, but we didn't talk about things like string theory in physics. We didn't talk about deconstructionism, the things that as a faculty member or as a department chair you talk about at the faculty lounge—which we've got to get here—and talk about all the time. We just rarely did that. But learning, that was really where I learned what it meant to run a university in the three years that I spent in Wayne's office as his executive assistant. I even got to close down the university one time when Freaknik was projected to come roaring over, and I was all set to close it down and I said, "Wait, you can't close it down because if you do we're going to wind up losing about a million dollars." "Why, to close down a university?" "Well, because all the contracts will not be billable on that day." "Oh, I never thought about that, that's right." "You close the university, that means the university's closed, and you don't bill contracts for that day." "Okay, what we're going to do is cancel classes and urge everyone who can do their research at home to do their research at home." Again, it's wording. I mean, you knew if you closed down the university and used that phraseology you were still going to have your computer science and lab folks. They were going to be in the labs.

DY: I'm curious about your chairing the diversity forum. What did you learn from that?

DP: Two or three things: number one, I think I always knew this, but it was really driven home—that different folks can use the same words to mean totally different things. So even though people are saying the same words, don't think they understand each other. Like I said, I think I always knew that, but, boy, chairing the diversity forum [brought it home]. It also drove home to me that, using the old Winston Churchill line, sometimes, "jaw-jaw is better than war-war." [From remarks at a White House luncheon, 26 June 1954, as quoted in the *New York Times* the following day] Sometimes there is no good resolution to an issue, but if you can just keep people talking with each other the issue will stay there; the tension might stay there, but the issue might never get larger and the tension might never escalate. That in itself is great progress on some issues.

DY: Yes, because there will be evolution in that individual's thinking, whether it gets out there on the table.

DP: Exactly right. You might not be able to resolve the issue, but you'll get people—"Well, so-and-so, I totally disagree with him, but he's not as bad as I thought he was." That's progress in some cases. So those are probably the two biggest things I learned.

TS: Well, in 1997, you became interim president at Southern Poly—I guess it was still Southern Tech?

DP: Southern Polytechnic State University.

TS: Oh, it was already by '97. [University status achieved in 1996]

DP: Yes, in the spring of 1997, just before I came on board.

TS: Right. They chose some other name first, didn't they?

DP: Yes.

TS: Okay, so you became interim president and I guess this is when Steve [Stephen R.] Cheshier left.

DP: That's when Steve retired.

TS: There were some controversies there at that time. [Laughter] From everybody I've heard, you must have done a great job there because everybody seemed to be very happy and wished that you'd stayed.

DP: Yes, we had a real good, thirteen or fourteen months there.

TS: Could you talk a little bit about that experience?

DP: Let me start with the controversies.

DY: Oh, do!

DP: During '95 and '96 and '97, I don't know how many times it happened, but two or three times the faculty and the department chairs and deans had voted no confidence in Steve, and there's a whole bunch of reasons why that is not relevant. Steve was too nice a guy to be president, quite honestly. Instead of moving people on when they needed to be moved on, he'd just find another position for them. Instead of when somebody was doing two-thirds of a job, if he didn't want to move them on, he would just take the responsibility that they weren't doing and put it somewhere else. So it was just a real discombobulated situation they had out there. About three or four days before I got out there, I've forgotten the specific number, something like five or six of the department chairs and one or two of the deans issued a statement of no confidence in the vice president for academic affairs, who was Harris Travis—just a nice, nice man who quite honestly had retired on active duty. So Harris said, "You guys have every right to say whatever you think about me as faculty members, but as department chairs and deans you have no right to do what you just did, so you're now former department chairs and deans." So I get out there and we've got a whole bunch of leaderless organizations.

DY: And hostile former leaders.

DP: And hostile former leaders. Everybody wanted to know what I was going to do, and I said, "The first thing I'm going to do is go visit everybody." So I talked to all the hostile former leaders and talked to Harris and talked to a bunch of people on campus. I did nothing the first two weeks out there except visit people in one-on-one's and reached the conclusion that this was one of those situations where nobody was right. I said, "Okay, here's what we're going to do." One of the deans was widely respected, a man by the name of Ed [Edward A.] Vizzini [Dean, College of Arts and Sciences], so I talked to Harris. The department chairs and deans petitioned me to put them back in, so I said, "Harris, I'm going to support your decision, but I need you to retire at the beginning of January." He said, "I'm ready to retire."

TS: He was already pastor of Zion Baptist Church, I think, while he was vice president.

DP: Exactly right, Tom. Exactly right. So I worked with Harris and I worked with Ed Vizzini, and I called a university meeting, and said, "I'm going to uphold Harris, but Harris is going to retire at the beginning of January. Dean Vizzini will become Interim Vice President for Academic Affairs. We're going to conduct a national search for every open position. Anybody in the nation, including the people who Harris fired, can apply for the positions, and we'll have the best person become the department head or dean." And that's what we did. So that was a very interesting way to start the year of the presidency. As it turns out, about two or three of the folks who had been fired got their positions back. Britt [K.] Pearce, head of the Department of Mechanical Engineering Technology, got his position back. Then Sandy [William Sanborn] Pfeiffer got his position back [as head of the Department of Humanities and Technical Communication and later as Vice President for Academic Affairs], and Sandy, by the way, is now the president at Warren Wilson College [Swannanoa, North Carolina near Asheville].

DY: Interesting. That must have been fun composing those search committees.

DP: It was interesting. I was very careful on that and relied very heavily on the advice of Becky [Rebecca] Rutherford [professor of Computer Science], who's still over there, and Joel [C.] Fowler [head, Mathematics Department], who's still over there. Joel was the head of the faculty senate that year.

TS: I know Mike Murphy [Michael G. Murphy] very well [current Dean of Computing & Software Engineering].

DP: Mike was one of the guys involved in that as well. Mike wound up coming back in.

DY: So you went to the faculty for advice on that? Is that what you're saying in part?

DP: To select the people. Becky Rutherford was my faculty executive assistant, and Joel Fowler was the chair of the faculty senate so, yes, very definitely went to them, and it worked out okay. We also kicked off strategic planning in a big way. They, also, had

been operating under an ancient strategic plan. We also had athletic association issues. Within about three weeks or a month after I got there, we were at a retreat in Brasstown Bald and got a phone call from our comptroller and the comptroller said, words to the effect that, "The secretary to the athletic director [who also happened to be the basketball coach] has just come in with \$12,000 in cash in a brown paper bag." I said, "What did you do with it?" He said, "Well, I took it from the secretary and I put it in the safe in my office." I said, "That's the right thing to do. We're going to suspend the basketball coach/athletic director until we get to the bottom of this." We did and found out that what he had been doing was taking all the Pell grant checks from his athletes, his basketball players, having them sign the checks over to him, and then he was cashing their checks and doling out money to them according to how much they said they needed and he thought they needed. This \$12,000 was what was left over from the preceding year. He had previously been making small contributions to the operating accounts in \$800 and \$900 increments, just below the \$1,000 mark. So we fired him.

TS: Breaks a few rules.

DP: Breaks every rule in the book.

TS: Well, we've gone beyond our time limit. I guess you have other appointments.

DP: I've got a four o'clocker and a 4:30.

TS: Maybe we can come back and do a third and final one?

DP: That sounds good.

TS: Thank you very much.

DP: Thank you for putting up with my babbling.

DY: It's very, very interesting.

Kennesaw State University Oral History Project
KSU Oral History Series, No. 50
Interview with President Daniel S. Papp
Conducted by Thomas A. Scott and Dede Yow
Edited by Susan F. Batungbacal
Location: President's Office, Kennesaw Hall

Part III, Thursday, 28 September 2006

TS: President Papp, last time when we stopped we had you up to your interim presidency at Southern Poly [Southern Polytechnic State University]. I think, actually, the last story you told was about having to fire the basketball coach, over there, over some financial irregularities. I think we pretty well covered coming in there and shaking things up, and of course, you spent fourteen months there. Is there anything that maybe we should say as a way of concluding that experience there? Anything you learned from it maybe, or anything that maybe ought to be said for the record about your year there?

DP: Probably three or four things, Tom. One of the things that I definitely learned there is that—I shouldn't say that I learned it, but I had reinforced during my time there—was that you might think that you're being very clear in saying something, but if there is any way that something you say can be misinterpreted, not out of maliciousness, but just out of accident or just out of alternative explanations, it will be. And, again, that's something I didn't learn at Southern Poly, per se, but it sure got driven home.

TS: You actually talked about that last time a little bit, when you were heading up that diversity thing at Georgia Tech, so it reinforces that language is important.

DP: Absolutely. It doesn't matter if you're executive assistant or president, it can happen. But the impact is greater if you are president. So it just re-emphasized again the need to be particularly clear, and to try to be as clear as possible. That's part one. Part two—again, I didn't learn it there, per se, but it got re-emphasized—is how there are always secondary and tertiary and whatever the fourth level is, as well. Any decision you make as president has secondary and tertiary and other impacts, and you need to the greatest extent possible to think through what your secondary and tertiary and fourth level impacts will be. Any decision, even if it's a relatively minor decision.

TS: Unintended consequences, is that what we're talking about?

DP: Yes, there will be consequences of any decision. First level consequences—that's what you want to happen. Then the second level, I won't say unintended because if you think them through, you can figure out a lot of them. There will also be unintended consequences, things that you don't think about. So that got driven home enormously. It was also driven home to me how delicate the sense of community at a university is. As I think I said in our previous session, Southern Poly really didn't have much of a sense of

the community when we got there. I like to think during my time there that we really did succeed in creating a good sense of community, but throughout that year, as we were creating that sense of community, there were folks there who, because of their previous experiences, were ready to go oops, ready to step back again. So that's what I mean by how delicate a sense of community is at a college campus. I think those are three of the big things that I learned there as president during '97-'98.

DY: Did they affect your, to use jargon, "leadership style" or "communication style?"

DP: I think they affected my communication style. I don't think it affected my leadership style, Dede, other than to influence me to be even more aware of things that I was already aware of. It might have led me to be more wordy than I used to be. "Here's what I thought I said, now, did you hear what I thought I said?"

DY: Right. I guess the few meetings that I've been in with you, what I've noticed, very happily, is that you are process-oriented and you're very interested in inclusivity, and you're very interested in knowing what's thought.

DP: Right. Absolutely. That did not really come from my time at Southern Poly. That came all the way back from my time back when I first entered academic administration, back in the days of the good old School of Social Sciences at Georgia Tech when there were all these warring factions. We really had the need to bring everybody together.

DY: That makes sense.

DP: Right then I needed to reach out to everybody to find out what folks thought, or try and bring viewpoints together to try to fashion something that moved us in the direction that Joe Pettit [Joseph M. Pettit] wanted us to move, but at the same time could be inclusive so that everybody could be part of the show. Almost everybody could be part of the show, so that you didn't have folks consciously trying to prevent progress. That is part of what I'm bringing here to Kennesaw State. As a specific example, [I] discovered last week that one part of the new governance structure is that the chair of the university council is to be on the president's cabinet. I'm not comfortable with that. The president's cabinet needs to be the the president's cabinet, so I've already talked with a number of folks about that, including Dick [Richard A. Gayler]. One reason we have the faculty executive assistant on the president's cabinet is to have that [connection].

TS: That's Dick Gayler? Dick Gayler is chair of the faculty senate or the council?

DP: He is chair of the faculty senate, and the chair of the faculty senate is also the chair of the university council.

TS: And the chair of the university council is supposed to be on the cabinet?

DP: Right. So that's what it says, that's the way it's going to be until we figure how to amend the university council, and then I'll explain my reasons for amending it. I would really

want the chair of the university council to be the chair of the president's planning and budget advisory council. But this is how it is now, going back to being process-oriented, so until we get it amended, hopefully we'll get it amended, that's the way it's going to be. Dick will be invited to the cabinet. But that just again goes back to me being process-oriented. You've got to have process; hopefully the process isn't too convoluted.

DY: Or slow!

DP: Or slow, yes. You've got to move forward with those things.

TS: I noticed by the time that you had gone to Southern Tech

DP: Southern Poly; the people over there don't want to be called Southern Tech.

TS: Excuse me, sorry. I remember when it was Southern Tech.

DY: We all do.

TS: I think Lisa [A.] Rossbacher created some kind of penalty, so many demerits if they called it Southern Tech, or something like that. Deducted their pay or something. But at any rate, by the time that you were at Southern Poly, it looked like your scholarship had moved into new directions. You edited a book that came out in '97, *Information Age Anthology [Information Age: An Anthology on Its Impacts and Consequences (Information Age Anthology, Volumes 1-2-3-4)*, David S. Alberts (Editor), Daniel S. Papp (Editor, Author), Joel Achenbach (Author), David A. Alberts, W. Thomas Kemp, Andrew Kupfer, Thomas A. Stewart, Alissa Tuyahov, Frank Webster (Washington, D.C.: National Defense University, 1997)], so it looks like you're moving into technology and its role with the military. Your publisher was the National Defense University Press, so I guess the anthology is defense directed. [President Papp holds up a copy]. That's the anthology, and it's a thick anthology. Let's see, it looks like

DP: Volumes 1, 2 and 3. Volume 1 had four parts.

TS: So that's coming out at this time, and you had mentioned, I think, at the first interview, that with the collapse of the Soviet Union, and so on, that your scholarship went in a different direction. Is this the different direction that it goes into?

DP: Exactly correct. My scholarship, I think you could probably say my cutting edge scholarship, had three different phases: the first was very much involved with the technologies—U.S. and Soviet strategic nuclear exchange doctrines. The second was U.S. and Soviet policies towards the Third World, and the third was the impact of information and communication technology on international affairs. Those were really the three major phases of my scholarly career.

TS: And in fact, you've got the first chapter in here with your co-editor David Alberts, "War in the Information Age: Military." Were you a computer geek, or did you get interested in computers real early?

DP: No, not really. The way that I got in this is that all of the things that I was looking at academically, Tom, are what I would describe as big picture issues—strategic nuclear exchange doctrine—if somebody screws up, the world gets blown away. U.S. and Soviet policy toward the Third World, well, except for Europe, North America and parts of Oceania and Japan, the Third World is the rest of the world. If somebody screwed up badly there would be misunderstandings, and you could possibly blow the world up again. The Soviets disappear and I ask what's the next big picture issue. We're in the early 1990s when people are beginning to talk about globalization of communications. People are beginning to talk about the CNN affect on foreign policy. You do a little bit of reading and work with technology a little bit, and—I was still at Tech when I began to move in this direction—lo and behold, I began to discover that I was having more communications about things scholarly with folks in California and New York and Moscow and Beijing, than I was having with folks at the end of the hallway, and, whoa, something's happening here. You go down to visit Argentina, go down to visit Buenos Aires, and you discover that I've forgotten the name of the Buenos Aires newspaper—even in the world of 1994 or '95, [the newspaper was] 100 percent online. So you can have Argentineans living in Atlanta knowing what's going on in Buenos Aires the very morning that it goes on in Buenos Aires. Wow, that's got to have an impact on the way people look at the world and think about the world. And then you begin looking at the impact of information communication technologies on economics. You can have global corporations shifting production, based on the different costs of factors of production, changing virtually on a weekly basis. Overcapacity in a production plant is suddenly not a bad thing if it allows you to expand production and take advantage of decreased costs and factors of production in country "x" or "y." Then you look at the incredible impact even in the early 1990s that information communication technologies were having on the military. Think back to Desert Storm and Desert Shield. As an example, there you were, sitting in the living room and Forrest Sawyer, former newscaster from Atlanta, is in front of a dune in Kuwait and five or six Iraqis come out and surrender to him on television. The world is changing because of this kind of stuff. I figured at that point that the next big picture issue is to look at the impact of information communication technologies on international affairs. Since this was funded by the Department of Defense, the first set of four was on the global look of things, what the information communication revolution is all about, the impact of information communication technologies on business, commerce and services, on government and the military and then international affairs generically. The next volume looks at national security implications generically. Then we got down into real military operations. There's one scary—pardon me for my monologue here—there's one scary thing, if you realize this came out in March 2001. It was written in late 2000. Somewhere in here, it talks about the dangers of an anthrax attack on the United States. Another article talks about how the Internet allowed terrorist groups to get together and coordinate efforts to hurt the U.S. economy. So there were folks who were talking about things like biological attacks on this country and using the Internet to create economic issues, even before 9-11. The problem was nobody was listening.

TS: That's all right. I was wondering how you got involved in the Yamacraw project, but maybe that's a natural extension to what you're doing with your scholarship?

DP: A little bit, but it was also more than that, I think, Tom. I'd been president at Southern Poly, I had been executive assistant to the president at Georgia Tech, by this point I was relatively familiar with things technological, in part because of my research, in part because of having lived at Georgia Tech for so long and at Southern Polytechnic for so long. I had developed by that point in time a reputation for being able to bring people from disparate viewpoints and disparate outlooks together in pursuit of larger objectives. What the educational component of Yamacraw was all about was to get seven institutions ranging from three research universities through four state universities to work together on hiring faculty in a relatively narrowly defined area of expertise. How do you get [G.] Wayne Clough and Mike Adams [Michael F. Adams] and Carl [V.] Patton and Betty [L.] Siegel and Lisa Rossbacher and Bruce [F.] Grube and Tom Jones [Thomas Z. Jones] and Carlton [E.] Brown to work together? How do you get department chairs of computer science on seven campuses to work together, computer sciences or electrical engineering? So you needed somebody who knew the political side of the game, who knew enough of the technology to be dangerous, who could also work particularly with those fourteen people. So Stephen [R.] Portch looked around and Governor [Roy] Barnes looked around and found me. So that's how I got downtown working with Yamacraw.

TS: Were you happy with what you accomplished then?

DP: Yes. We got the strategic plan in place; that was part one. The hiring process was already in place. We had to figure out how to divvy up the money, so we figured out how to divvy up the money. To do that you need a strategic plan, so we did a system wide strategic plan—sound familiar? We divvied up the money, and then we worked with the seven presidents and the seven heads of computing and/or electrical engineering. I actually held veto power over who got hired. To get funding, folks who got hired had to fit within Yamacraw areas: digital signal processing, wireless telephony, wireless broadband, and two or three other related areas. If somebody didn't fit in that area they didn't get funding. So we turned down some, but not that many. We had to turn down three or four people before the folks on campuses realized that they had to fit within the Yamacraw area or they're not going to get hired. Why waste your time trying to hire somebody if they're not within our areas? I didn't have to turn down anybody at Kennesaw, as I recall. Kennesaw, I think, hired three people. Southern Poly, I think, hired four. Savannah State didn't hire anybody. Georgia Tech had the lion's share; they hired about thirty-five. They were the driver behind it. So I should have mentioned before that my connection to Tech was obvious, since Tech was going to hire half.

TS: Then you go from there to being Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs. That very title sounds almost like our provost here, I guess. It's more than academics. You're also dealing with budgets, and so on, but it looks like you're main job there was planning various types, strategic planning, dealing with admissions standards and retention, and that kind of thing. Would that be a correct assessment?

- DP: That was part of the job. I really had four main portfolios: academic, faculty, and student affairs. So we did
- TS: All promotion and tenure.
- DP: Exactly right. Then I had budget and finance, and then I also had information and instructional technology for the whole university system—both the academic side of the house and the administration side. The fourth part was strategic planning and analysis.
- TS: That was just a fourth of your time then.
- DP: Yes. We spent a lot of time—this maybe falls into strategic planning—I ran the statewide assessment. Kennesaw State was advantaged by the conclusions of the statewide assessments because—using the old terminology—we, the State of Georgia, needed to get some universities that were classified as Carnegie research intensives. Georgia didn't have any. [Research intensive] means limited non-research doctorals. Kennesaw was the logical one to get it: Kennesaw, West Georgia, Valdosta and Georgia Southern, so that was both strategic planning and economic planning. We also, with Frank [A.] Butler as the primary point man, looked at specific academic programs and turned some down, killed some, and approved others. The faculty affairs: we looked at faculty workload issues, looked at student issues. Fortunately, I was blessed with a very good associate vice chancellor of student affairs, didn't hear too many student complaints or parent complaints, because Tonya took care of most of those.
- TS: Who did?
- DP: Tonya [R.] Lam. So that was on the academic, faculty and student side of things. Then budget and finance—we spent a lot of time with Bill Bowes on what is now a five billion dollar budget. It was about a four billion dollar budget when I came in, but it was an interesting job. I was never bored.
- TS: I guess not. I would think that, that knowledge of budgeting for the whole system would be immensely valuable now that you're here at Kennesaw.
- DP: It is. I know some of the arguments to use and some of the arguments not to use. I also know that one big problem that Kennesaw had, quite honestly, and you've heard me say this publicly on more than one occasion, is that everybody thought Kennesaw was "Camelot" because that was the image that Kennesaw projected of itself. If everything is that cool, why do you need more money in a place where everything is cool?
- DY: Gosh, when I was on that university budget committee, I thought everybody went down there hat-in-hand for faculty positions and buildings, and all of that kind of thing. So it's very interesting that you come from the outside and say, "Gosh, y'all are just fine here."

DP: That's the image that kept getting projected that everything was fine. Yes, Kennesaw and West Georgia and Clayton State are near the bottom of the state university—state expenditures per full time equivalent student. But if everything is fine there, because you keep saying it—we tried to get money coming in this direction to balance it off, and to go to West Georgia and Clayton State. We put a policy in place that I'll come back to in a minute, to try to even things out. But I knew enough people out here that I knew that everything wasn't fine, but when you go to make the case, if everything is fine, where's the need for more money? Well, the need for more money is that everything is not fine. That's why one of the reasons you keep hearing me harp about graduation rates, our graduation rates are much too low for the quality of the students that we get here. It's not because of insufficient quality of faculty. It's not because of insufficient quality of student. It's not because of insufficient quality of infrastructure. It's because of insufficient number of faculty and classrooms and advisors and mentors. Give us more money! We need it! Everything isn't fine. So what Bill Bowes and I did put in place and what Chancellor [Thomas C.] Meredith accepted was something called the eighty-twenty policy, whereby 80 percent of new workload funds generated each year by increases in FTE were returned to the university. The other 20 percent was to be used for system-wide strategic purposes, which ran the gambit from providing expanded bandwidth for PeachNet—you haven't heard any problems about PeachNet for the last four years, have you—whereas, when we put this policy in place that was part of where it was going to redress serious inequities in state allocations per FTE. The first couple of years Kennesaw, West Georgia, Clayton State and at the time Georgia Perimeter College benefited from that policy. We only got about \$400,000.00 and that's chicken feed, but it was a start. If we could have kept that policy in place from 2000 up to today, Kennesaw would be about two million dollars annual budget better off than it is right now. It didn't happen. We did it one year and then a bunch of cutbacks started.

DY: I remember that well.

DP: And the decision was made over the objection of this senior vice chancellor and Frank Butler and Bill Bowes that the budget cuts would be handed out evenly, and that rather than do the eighty-twenty, that about 95 percent of any increases would be returned to the institutions. Kennesaw wasn't hurt as badly as West Georgia and Clayton State because Kennesaw continued to grow, but Kennesaw still didn't benefit as much as it would have.

DY: Still treading water.

DP: Still treading water. So what has happened now that Chancellor [Erroll B.] Davis [Jr.] is in; he's also ditched the eighty-twenty. He has gone to a policy, or at least last year he went to a policy where 80 percent of the new workload money that was generated at research universities was returned to the research universities. State universities, including Kennesaw, got 70. Two-year schools got 60. The rest would be used for strategic purposes. We got \$400,000.00 out of strategic purposes money. That would be RPG money that was returned. It was better than nothing, but it basically made up for the difference between the 70 and 80 percent. So we're still making the case, and Chancellor Davis said that he fully understands that there are apparent inequities—and “apparent” is

the right word—apparent inequities in the distribution of funds. The reason I say “apparent” is the right word is I fully buy the argument that we as the largest state university in the system have economies of scale that a place like Georgia Southwestern or Fort Valley do not have. You can amortize administrative costs across 20,000 students, whereas at Ft. Valley or Georgia Southwestern you amortize administrative costs across 3,000 students. But economies of scale don’t explain our full shortfall.

TS: You had an opportunity to be chancellor of the Florida system in 2002. On the surface that sounds like a good job. What happened? Why did you choose to withdraw?

DP: You used exactly the right term—“on the surface.” Putting it very simply and somewhat diplomatically, after I was selected to be chancellor of the University System of Florida, which occurred in September 2002, I was supposed to go down to become chancellor on January 1, 2003. I went down a couple days a week so I could hit the ground running. Over time, I discovered that what had been described to me as the job was not the job. Did I say that diplomatically? I guess it’s nicer to say that than to say people lied to you.

DY: Right, the passive voice works well [laughter].

DP: So that’s basically why I stayed up here.

TS: There was something about an Amendment 11 that I didn’t understand in the announcement.

DP: Yes, Amendment 11 actually had nothing to do with my decision. What Amendment 11 was all about, a couple of years before I went down there, Governor [Jeb] Bush eliminated the Board of Regents in Florida and he created something called UBOTs—University Boards of Trustees.

TS: Universities. Each one is going to have a separate board?

DP: Exactly correct. Now Amendment 11 was poorly worded, but Amendment 11 was an effort on the part of Bob [Senator Daniel Robert] Graham and others to recreate the Board of Regents of Florida. Amendment 11 passed in fall 2002, so there was real uncertainty about where things were going, but that could have been fun if the amendment were a little bit more clearly worded.

TS: But that’s just the excuse for the public, is that what you’re saying?

DP: Absolutely correct, and I did not put that statement out. The governor and his people put that statement out. The truth of the matter why I did not—and I’ve never published an article on this, although I’ve been urged to—I’ve talked about it—but in Florida politics the article would be nothing other than muckraking, I guess is the right word. There were three or four parts to my decision. Things seemed to be going nicely until shortly before Thanksgiving. I’d been going down all of October, most of November and in the middle of November, or so—there were four university presidencies open, and my memory is

that there are eleven universities in the system—so that gives a Chancellor a chance to put his mark on the system quickly. I was told that the Chancellor of the University System of Florida would have a significant role in determining the presidents, not final say-so; that would be held by the UBOTs, but you would have a veto over the list of two or three names that you send out to the UBOTs. Okay, that's okay. The four universities were the University of Florida, Florida State—two flagship universities—Florida Atlantic University and the University of North Florida. So its the middle of November, I get called aside by the Commissioner of Education for the state of Florida, and he said, “Dan you're not going to have a role in the decision at Florida State University.”

TS: What's a chancellor do if a chancellor doesn't have a say in the president?

DP: Yes. And by the way the new president is going to be the former Speaker of the House, who was the previous president of Tallahassee Community College, who also happened to have headed Democrats for Bush.

TS: Do you think there might be a little politics involved there?

DP: Okay. So I won't play a role in that. I've still got three. And then the Monday or Tuesday before Thanksgiving I got told, “Oh, by the way, you're not going to play a role in Florida Atlantic's new president. We're going to stop the search there because the lieutenant governor has let it be known that he's interested in the position.” His previous claim to education was that he was superintendent of a county system before he went into politics. And then a day or two after Thanksgiving, I get told, “The North Florida position is going to go to the mayor of Jacksonville, so you're not going to get a role there either, but you will be able to help with the University of Florida.” Well, that's okay, but you've got three politicians who are not qualified to be there, so that's part one. I'm a slow learner; I didn't resign then. Again, about the same time I get told about North Florida, just after Thanksgiving 2002, I get in the office and discover that the governor's transition commission from his first term to his second term had fired about 33 percent of the university system of Florida's office staff.

TS: Sounds like [Governor] Gene Talmadge in the '40s in Georgia.

DY: That's exactly what I was thinking.

DP: That's exactly what it was. They said, “We did you a favor, Dan, now you can bring your own people in.” I said, “My own people are doggone good. Which one of them is going to come in knowing that I don't hold the final authority over whether they stay or go? Not a single one of the people that I'd bring in. You did me no favors whatsoever.” At the end of that week I get called in on Friday morning and get told that I need a gap analysis in by Monday close of business of all the needs of the University System of Florida for the next five years. “What's this for?” “Well, it's so the governor can put together his strategic plan for his next four years and the year after.” We've never done a gap analysis, plus I'm operating on two-thirds staff. “Well, we need it by close of

business on Monday.” I said, “I’ll see what I can do.” So I went down to my office and told my secretary to call up Delta and make an airplane reservation home to Atlanta.

TS: Good for you.

DP: And I’ve not been to Tallahassee since. So I was a slow learner, and that’s what happened. Amendment 11 had nothing to do with it.

TS: I appreciate that.

DP: It would have made an interesting article. It would have caused a firestorm for about a week and a half or two weeks, and then

DY: Well, maybe on down the line you’ll have an opportunity.

TS: I’m surprised that SACS isn’t interested in that.

DP: [Sigh].

TS: You are too?

DP: Yes. If SACS were to do what SACS should do, they wouldn’t spend as much time looking at institutions like Kennesaw and UGA and giving good institutions hard times, they would look at things where there’s clearly political intrusion. They would look at the store front operations that are thrown up around Georgia and the southeast. I’ll give SACS credit, they did do at Auburn exactly what they needed to do at Auburn; when you have whatever that guy’s name was that basically determined who the president was going to be. I think Belle [S.] Whelan is going to help turn SACS around where it ought to be. SACS, by the way, is the best of the regional accrediting agencies by far.

TS: Well, I know we’re getting short on time.

DY: We want you to get to KSU [laughter]!

TS: I wonder if we could do that. I know last year we had two major searches going simultaneously for the chancellor and the president of Kennesaw, and I guess you had to apply for both of them about the same time, didn’t you?

DP: Yes.

TS: I know you’re disappointed on the chancellor’s position, but let me just ask maybe as kind of a question at least leading up to a closing question of why Kennesaw? Why did you want to come here? What did you see here that attracted you to Kennesaw?

DP: Kennesaw is an institution on the verge of greatness, putting it bluntly. It has everything sitting here to become the next great higher educational institution in the United States.

So it was a pretty easy call. We've got a great faculty. We're in the midst of a growing economic region of Georgia; we've got good students, excellent community support.

DP: It's got everything that is needed to take it to the next level and maybe beyond the next level. When Betty announced her retirement, it was sort of a no-brainer. After I was told that I was nominated, I said, "Of course, sure I'll keep my hat in the ring." It was easy.

TS: Any surprises since you've gotten here?

DP: Not really. The reason I say it is that I've lived in Cobb County for thirty-three or thirty-four years, I've known a lot of the faculty members and a lot of the administrators and staff here because I've been in the system for so long. I've worked in the system office for five or six years and talked frequently with President Siegel, and with Lynn Black [Lendley C. Black] and [Belton] Earle Holley and Nancy [S.] King. I knew the institution pretty well even before I came here. I've still learned a lot. I know that I have a lot to learn, but I haven't seen any real surprises so far. If there was one thing that surprised me, it was the extent to which business and finance operated in a silo. I was aware that it was not well connected, but I was surprised to the extent at which it operated in a silo. I was surprised the extent to which there were things happening that shouldn't happen. I had an indication of that though, and the indication was a year and a half or two years ago when we were asked to approve the movement of HR [Human Resources] from Business and Finance to Information Technology. Let's just say that having a vice president for Information Technology and Human Resources is a unique organizational structure in higher education [laughter]. So that was an indication that there were issues.

TS: And you've already made personnel changes and I guess also structurally for the provost position, not necessarily that particular problem, HR, but the provost is going to have more say, I guess, in financial matters.

DP: Absolutely.

DY: The faculty is very glad to see the changes. The faculty knew this. The faculty had been knowing this.

TS: When you see us positioned for, I guess, greatness, just elaborate maybe as a closing question from me, just elaborate on where you see our greatest strengths or maybe the greatest needs that we can really fill to do something that's better than anybody else.

DP: Let me start with general education. I think we're in a position where we can review general education and find ways to put some things in general education, and not just general education, but also the majors as well. I've said this on numerous occasions—information technology, everybody who graduates from here needs to be literate in technology. Everybody who graduates from KSU needs to have an understanding of globalization and internationalization. Those two are the easy two, quite honestly. The third one will be more difficult. I'd like to see everybody who graduates from Kennesaw State have experience in community/civic/corporate engagement before they graduate.

The first two will be easy because you can move those into classes, but the third one will be a little bit more difficult because that's almost additive as opposed to incorporative. I think Kennesaw has a chance to be among the leaders nationally in that area.

TS: We do have academic programs like our public history program, and so on, that could certainly move in that direction.

DP: Oh yes, no problem having some of our programs move in that direction. I'd like to see it be universal.

DY: This is sort of incorporating what has become the gap-year experience for many students—going out and having community service, incorporating that into the education that they have here and into the curriculum. That's wonderful.

DP: It'll be difficult to do for lots of reasons, money being one. I think most faculty would say it's a wonderful idea. We ought to take the extra time needed out of that department, but not this department.

DY: It depends on the faculty. You're probably going to have better reception to that than you think you will.

DP: The easy way to do it would be simply to add three-hour requirement, except that means the Board of Regents would have to buy into it.

DY: Somehow it needs to be discipline related, or maybe if not discipline related at least related to curriculum in some way. I applaud that.

DP: We'll broach it and bring it forward.

TS: We could ask a million more questions, but I think we've exhausted our time. What I really wanted to do in these three interviews is to kind of set the scene of who you are, where you've come from, and where you see us now. What I'd really like for us to do is hopefully come back in two years and interview you again and see what has changed, and then two years after that and two years after that, and after you've been here twenty years somebody else will be doing the interviews.

DP: I promise you I won't make it twenty years.

TS: Anyhow that's our goal, but we really appreciate it.

DP: Ten, fifteen. Let's see, if Betty retired at seventy-five and if I can make it to seventy-five that'll give me sixteen years.

TS: That's good. We'll shoot for that then. Thank you.

DP: Thanks, Tom and Dede.

INDEX

- Adams, Michael F., 34
Andropov, Yuri, 7
Atlanta, Georgia, 9, 26
- Barnes, Roy E. (Governor), 34
Bayor, Ronald H., 22-23
Black, Lendley C., 40
Board of Regents, University System of Georgia
 Growth of research in system, 10
 Establishment of in-state tuition for military personnel, 19
 Yamacraw project, 34
 Statewide assessment and development of Carnegie research intensive institutions, 35
 Budgeting process, 35-37
Bowes, Bill, 35-36
Brown, Carlton E., 34
Bush, John Ellis (Jeb) (Governor of Florida), 37-38
Butler, Frank A., 35-36
- Carlisle Indian School, 19
Chernenko, Konstantin, 7
Cheshier, Stephen R., 27
Clayton State University, 36
Clough, G. Wayne, 23-26, 34
Comparative Interdisciplinary Studies Association, 16
Crecine, John Patrick (Pat), 21-22
- Dartmouth College, 1-3, 5
Davis, Errol B., Jr., 36
DuPree, Tom E., Jr., 24
- Emory University, 9-11
- Filer (Henry H.) Junior High School, Miami, 4
Florida Atlantic University, 38
Florida State University, 38
Fowler, Joel C., 28
Freaknik, Atlanta, 26
- Gayler, Richard A., 31
Georgia Institute of Technology (Georgia Tech)
 History of Technology program, 9, 21
 Pettit (Joseph M.) administration and development as a research institution, 10, 22, 31
 Liberal education and engineering education, 10-11
 School of Social Sciences, 10-11, 15-16, 31

Teaching loads, 14-15
 Rugby Club, 16, 20
 M.S. in Technology and Science Policy, 21-22
 Crecine (Pat) administration, 21-22
 Sam Nunn School of International Affairs, 21-23
 Clough (Wayne) administration, 23-24
 SAE fraternity controversy, 23-24
 Alexander Memorial Coliseum naming controversy, 24-25
 Yamacraw project, 34
 Georgia Perimeter College, 36
 Georgia Southern University, 35
 Georgia State University, 9
 Giebelhaus, August (Gus), 22-23
 Gorbachev, Mikhail, 7-8
 Goure, Leon, 8-10
 Govorchin, Gerald, 8
 Graham, Daniel Robert (Bob) (Senator), 37
 Gromyko, Andrei, 13
 Grube, Bruce F., 34

 Harvey, Mose L., 9-10
 Haynes, Marcus, and the Harlem Magicians, 4
 Holder, Thomas M., 23-24
 Holley, B. Earle, 40
 Huke, Robert E., 5

 International Studies Association, 16, 21
 Ippolito, Dennis S., 9

 Jones, Thomas Z., 34

 Karcher, Barbara C., 22
 Kelly, Pat, 9-10
 Kennesaw State University
 Applied doctorates, 9, 35
 Governance structure, 31-32
 Yamacraw project, 34
 Camelot image, 35-36
 Funding formula, 35-36
 Potential for greatness, 39-40
 Strengths and needs, 40-41
 King, Nancy S., 40

 Lam, Tonya R., 35
 Lutheran Church of the Resurrection, Marietta, 20

McClain, Charles, 5
 McMath, Robert C., Jr., 22-23
 Mekong River Project, 5
 Meredith, Thomas C., 36
 Miller, Mark, 9
 Murphy, Michael G., 28

 Nunn, Sam (Senator), 23

 Ormsby, Robert B., Jr., 11

 Papp, Daniel S.
 Background, 1
 Undergraduate education at Dartmouth, 1-3, 5
 Decision to major in international affairs, 2
 Trips with students to the Soviet Union, 2, 6
 High school teaching, 2-3
 Doctoral program at Miami, 3
 Mentors, 4-5, 8
 “From the Crest All Directions Are Down,” 6-7
 Interest in applied research, 8-9
 Reasons for accepting a position at Georgia Tech, 10
 Visiting professorships, 11-12
 Research on military utility of neutron bomb, 12
 Research on Soviet policies in the Third World, 12
 Dissertation, 12
 First book, 12
 Autobiography of Dean Rusk, 12-13
 Outstanding Faculty and Distinguished Professor Awards, 14-15
 Views on teaching, 15-16
 Thoughts on research and service, 16
 Professional service activities, 16
 Faculty advisor of SAE fraternity, 16, 23-24
 Director of School of Social Sciences, 16-17, 31
 Reason for going into administration, 17
 Administration and finding time for scholarship, 18, 25
 American Foreign Policy textbook, 18
 Outstanding Civilian Service Medal, 18-19
 Community service, 19-20
 Value of community service, 20
 Founding Director of School of International Affairs, 21-23
 Naming of Sam Nunn School of International Affairs, 23
 Executive Assistant to the President of Georgia Tech, 23-26
 Chair of diversity forum, 25
 Interim President of Southern Polytechnic State University, 27-31
 Information Age: An Anthology, 32-33

Study of technology's impact on international affairs, 32-33
Yamacraw project, 34
Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, 34-35
Reasons for not becoming chancellor of Florida system, 37-39
Reasons for coming to Kennesaw State University, 39-40
Thoughts on KSU in 2006, 40-41

Papp, Stephen (father), 4-5
Patton, Carl V., 34
Pearce, Britt K., 28
Pettit, Joseph M., 10, 22
Pfeiffer, William Sanborn (Sandy), 28
Portch, Stephen R., 34
Pyles, Charles B., 9

Reagan, Ronald, presidential administration, 6-8
Reed, Germaine M., 22
Rice, Homer, 24
Rossbacher, Lisa A., 32, 34
Rusk, Dean, 13
Rusk, Richard, 13
Rutherford, Rebecca (Becky), 28

Savannah State University, 34
Sawyer, Forrest, 33
Siegel, Betty L., 34, 40-41
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), 39
Southern Center for International Studies, 13, 16
Southern Polytechnic State University, 27-32, 34
Soviet Union, 2, 6, 7-8, 12
Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), 2

Thorpe, Jim, 19
Travis, Harris, 27-28

University of Florida, 38
University of Georgia, agricultural research, 10
University of Miami, 3-4, 8-9
 Center for Advanced International Studies, 8-9
University of North Florida, 38
University of West Georgia, 35-36
University System of Florida, 37-39

Valdosta State University, 35
Vizzini, Edward A., 28

War College, U.S. Army, 11-12, 19

Warren Wilson College, 28
Whelan, Belle S., 39
Whelan, Bob, 22
White, Peter C. and Julia A., 13

Yancy, Dorothy C., 23
Yow, Lawson, 24

Zion Baptist Church, Marietta, 28