

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training
Foreign Affairs Oral History Project
Foreign Assistance Series

DR. JAMES B. HENSON
&
DR. JAN NOEL

Interviewed by: Sam Butterfield
Initial interview date: May 26, 1996
Copyright 2020 ADST

The oral history program was made possible through support provided by the Center for Development Information and Evaluation, U.S. Agency for International Development, under terms of Cooperative Agreement No. AEP-0085-A-00-5026-00. The opinions expressed herein are those of the interviewee and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Agency for International Development or the Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background

Dr. Noel – Pacific Northwest, Veterinarian
Dr. Henson – Texas, Veterinarian

Kenya – 1974-1978

Worked at the new International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases

Return to Washington State University

Enhanced WSU Office of International Programs
Importance of Foreign Assistance Act Title XII
Styles of Collaboration w/ USAID
Integrating academia and USAID needs
Program in Malawi
Program in Russia
Program in Jordan

KEY WORDS

biological research
Bunda College of Agriculture
FAO
International Rice Research Institute (IRRI)
International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases (ILRAD)
Israel
Jordan
Kenya
Malawi
strengthening grant
Title XII
University of Jordan
veterinarian
Washington State University
West Pakistan Agricultural University
Wheat and Maize Center (CIMMYT)

INTERVIEW

Q: Today is May 26, 1996. We are sitting in Pullman, Washington, at Washington State University in the office of Dr. James B. Henson, (DVM and PHD), who is the Director of International Programs at WSU. Also with us is his wife, Dr. Jan Noel, (DVM), the Associate Director of WSU's Office of International Programs and head of Development Cooperation within the Office International Programs.

Jan, let me gather some background. What is it that got you into international work? Where did you begin in any event? Where were you born and raised, what was your schooling and how did it all come together?

NOEL: Okay, I was born and raised in Portland, Oregon, a west coast resident most of my life. Always from a young childhood I wanted to be a veterinarian. But, I was told it was impossible at a young age because I was a woman, and that sealed it for me, that was what I was going to be. I earned a bachelor's degree in animal science/pre-vet medicine from Oregon State University in 1969. After completing my DVM at Washington State University in 1973 I went on to do post-doctoral work in immunology and pathology and concurrently was involved as a race track veterinarian, in fact I'd been working for the

state in terms of drug testing for race horses, which was interesting, but I soon realized that was not the way I wanted to spend the rest of my life.

Q: Is this Oregon or Washington?

NOEL: This is in Washington, the state of Washington, right. In concert with Jim Henson I had the opportunity to go to Kenya to establish the International Laboratory For Research On Animal Diseases (ILRAD) which was my first international exposure of any kind, including Canada or Mexico.

Q: What year was that?

NOEL: 1974. In fact, I finished work at the racetrack at midnight, caught a plane to Nairobi, at one o'clock in the morning. I was really struck by getting off the plane in Nairobi and finding how different it was from anything that I'd ever experienced. The International Laboratory for Research on Animal Diseases (ILRAD) was a research organization at that time, involved in trying to develop a vaccine for new diseases, such as trypanosomiasis, east coast fever, or other important economic diseases throughout Africa.

[ED: ILRAD was established in Nairobi in 1973 by agreement between the Government of Kenya and the Rockefeller Foundation acting for the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research. The mandate of the Laboratory is to develop safe, effective and economically feasible control measures for livestock diseases which seriously limit world food production.]

[Ed: Trypanosomiasis, a parasite caused illness, is transmitted by the tsetse fly. In humans it is called sleeping sickness. The parasite is devastating to livestock herds.]

Our involvement was basic biological research, extremely stimulating, extremely exciting work which we were involved in for four years. At the end of that time we had to make a decision, I think, of whether we would stay internationally overseas in this kind of a track, one of the international agricultural research centers, or if in fact we would like to do something else.

We did some thinking and thought research is extremely important, very interesting, but it's not enough to complete the research. It's got to get out to end users and the whole world has a responsibility to do that and that the university has a key role to play in operationalizing this dream. So, we felt that perhaps it would be an opportunity to do something back in the U.S. on a U.S. university campus to continue the dream of relevant international research, but also to link it in with education for people from developing

countries and for the U.S. So, we came back to Washington State University to establish the international programs house.

Q: Before your venture into Kenya, you said that was your first exposure to third world.

NOEL: Any world.

Q: Any world, first exposure out of the U.S., golly, okay. That was quite a leap. Were there any faculty members here or persons whom you knew other than Jim Henson who began to get your mind turning on this sort of thing, or did you start off tabula rasa?

NOEL: The interest came from National Geographic and as a person in an obvious interface between wildlife and veterinary medicine. There were no, at that time particular role models or anyone that was very influential. I would not have guessed it was what I was going to be doing at all.

Q: Yeah, and you've now been at it for over 20 years.

NOEL: Right. 22.

Q: Jim, let me also ask you about your background and interest in international cooperation?

HENSON: I was born and raised in Texas. Went to Texas A&M for my DVM degree and for a couple of others actually and then came to WSU to do a PhD on leave from Texas A&M, went back there, and then ultimately came back here. So, I was born and raised in a small farming community in West Texas, which now is practically boarded up. There's no one even there.

I was interested in my early years in foreign places. Now I don't remember the name of them, but there was a series of little red bound books on the different countries of the world. Most of the libraries had these and they were kind of concise little books. I can remember looking at those and thinking how it really whetted my interest. Then after I returned to WSU after my appointment at Texas A&M, then our research activities primarily in immunology and virus diseases began attracting some attention overseas by colleagues and institutions. So, we had some early opportunities to go work with people in other countries professionally and attend international meetings.

Q: From WSU?

HENSON: From WSU. From the base here. From our research program. Then as Jan has indicated we had an opportunity to go to Kenya. It's interesting, I don't know if you gave the details for it.

NOEL: No, I didn't.

HENSON: Okay, continuing that. We had made a decision that we'd like to change. I was departmental chair and had been the departmental chair for several years and so on. We had a number of activities ongoing, including Jan's professional activities with the racetrack. But we had an opportunity to go to Israel to help establish a new university in Israel and in a research project to go up to the northern part of Hudson Bay doing some kidney studies on some of the indigenous people and so we were trying to decide which one of those to go to and a letter came across my desk asking if I'd be interested in the director's position at then to be established ILRAD, in the Consultative Group (CG) system and we looked at it and said well seems like Africa would be a nice place so we explored it further and in a very short while we're standing in Nairobi. In fact, it was about a two-month time period. All this transpired and we were there and then became enamored, interested in the whole concept of development and so on and then ultimately when the construction of ILRAD was completed and it was going programmatically we again reached a point where we needed to make a decision or we thought we needed to be either commit long term to that kind of activity or to come back here and we have always been intrigued by the concept of the internationalization of universities and enhancing the international dimensions.

So, we made a decision to come back here but we didn't know where we would return. We knew we were going to return to the Northwest, so we looked around at the universities in the Northwest and decided we would come back to WSU. We did and started a new office which we now call development cooperation which dealt primarily with development assistance, projects and programs and that was at the early stages of Title XII. So that's the way we became involved and since that time have been full time doing international work with a base from campus.

NOEL: We might just mention, Jim and I had the discussion all the time and they'd say well you're veterinarians why are you doing this? And for us, medicine and veterinary medicine are such a great analogy to development because if you're not careful you could just treat symptoms. You can make a lot of money treating symptoms. But in actual fact the exciting part is disease prevention, symptoms when necessary but also what's the health of this animal worth in economic terms and social terms. How do you make the whole picture in a holistic fashion and it's very analogous to the development situation so we think it's good training.

HENSON: I think the other, another aspect of it that's been very worthwhile to us is that in medicine you deal with systems. That is the orientation. You deal with the cardiovascular system, or the digestive system and I think that mindset really prepares people with a medical background to better address some of these problems that we face in development.

Q: When you two returned to WSU, you returned not to the College of Veterinary Medicine but to ...

NOEL: To the central administration, to the international programs' office, right.

Q: And it was in existence to some extent for...?

NOEL: This particular office was a new office that was established in concert with another international programs' office, which was involved with student exchanges and those kinds of activities. Our involvement was really focused on development and was at the beginning of the Title XII university days and was the first time that the university had centralized development focus rather than that being done as an activity on the side.

Q: Title XII. Would you remind our audience what Title XII was?

NOEL: Oh, yes, Title XII was legislation that mandated a partnership for the first time. Allowed and mandated a partnership between USAID, Agency for International Development, and the university community. Specifically, land grant universities.

Q: It was Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act.

NOEL: Of the Foreign Assistance Act, that's correct. Which is supposed to mandate that and some resources to make that possible.

Q: You've probably worked with Irwin Long, with AID.

NOEL: That's right and a number of others, right. It was an exciting time for the university community.

Q: How so?

NOEL: I believe it was an exciting time for the university community because many of them had not been heavily involved, many universities had not been heavily involved in international development per se, especially in a partnership mode with AID. For there actually to be resources available to do international work overseas as well as the work that most of these universities that were already involved with in terms of training

students, foreign students, mostly short courses and things. It was a very different approach and integral to the Title XII approach was the collaborative assistance mode of design and implementation where universities were involved with USAID in designing an activity and then implementing the activity. So, you really ended up with a long-term involvement. You got into it with AID and you knew you'd be into for an extended period of time. Five to ten years. Of course, some of these went on for much longer than that. But the universities were able to plan and to do development and to develop their own capacity to do development. For the faculty to have language training, to have programs in place to increase their international competence. Specifically, to do these services overseas.

Q: And prior to that the typical model was a contract with the university to do some work overseas, without the university necessarily being able to prepare itself. Sending its faculty over for brief periods maybe two years and then returning and then disappearing into the university again or I don't want to make too stark a contrast but...

NOEL: There may not have been a single model before. It may have been all different things, including some long-term projects that started in the late 50's. For instance, WSU was involved in Pakistan in the 1950s for an extended period. But there was not really a feeling that we were in this with USAID for the long term and that we would evolve together and be committed to work together to do this.

Q: Partners in contrast to contractor and then contractee. Okay, we were talking about Title XII and why it was different.

NOEL: We might mention that we both had stars in our eyes, USAID and the universities at that time. In the early 70's when collaborative mode and Title XII first started.

Q: How many years did the stars remain?

NOEL: Oh, I don't know? What would you say?

HENSON: I think they're still there occasionally.

Q: Wonderful. After 20 years that's pretty good. Let me ask: You used the initials CG which we three know that it means, Consultative Group, but would you comment a little about the international consultative group mechanism and the international research centers that have been developed or assisted through that system and your sense of its significance? I'd like to hear from both of you on this.

HENSON: Well, it's the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research, which was actually founded by, or the stimulation for its founding, came from the

Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation. With Ford's activities in Asia and their interest in Asia, in rice and food production and the Rockefeller Foundation's interest in Latin America with a focus in Mexico and corn and maize and wheat. As a result of the interest and some of the early successes on wheat and rice breeding and the potential for enhancing food production in the developing countries it was decided by group interaction that it would be worthwhile to focus the best minds and the best research capabilities in the world on a few selected commodities. The initial focus being on wheat and maize, in Mexico and rice became IRRI, the International Rice Research Institute in the Philippines and CIMMYT, the Wheat and Maize Center, in Mexico.

As a result of that then there were contacts made with a number of development agencies in different countries in international organizations and they formed the group called the CGIAR, the Consultative Group of International Agricultural Research in which there would be established centers around the world focusing on specifically identified commodities and a group of donors would be brought together to provide the resources to do that. Whenever we went to ILRAD at that early stage a number of centers had been newly established or were being established. ILRAD was one, INCRASAT had just been established, ILCO and ILRAD were established simultaneously and so on, the rest of it. Now there have been many of, whenever we were at ILRAD we were supported by nine different donors. AID, the World Bank, Saudis, Germany, the Dutch, Belgium and the later, latter part Japan, Norway and so the result was the so-called grain revolution and that was the rationale to be able to make that sort of contribution. In actual fact in recent years there have not been those dramatic returns that were initially encountered with CIMMYT and IRRI. So, it's been a very significant organizational mechanism for mobilizing resources and other capabilities and focusing on constraints and opportunities for enhancing food production.

HENSON: What I think we perceive, at least for this university, and we study other universities as well, is a very different orientation to what we call the internationalization process - making this truly a global and grand university. In that process, of becoming a global university, we see evolving different kinds of relationships than in the past that encompass what we call development cooperation as well as a whole host of other kinds of activities like exchanges of students, internships, and faculty sharing, joint research, and so on. As we have developed a strategy here and a commitment on the part of the university as a priority for the international activities it is really based on the concept of strategic alliances and partnerships in which we identify institutions that have strong congruence, similar philosophies and approaches and interest as WSU in which we can establish a true partnership which has a very different meaning than collaboration. We identify those institutions and establish those partnership relationships. These are very key to us for the future because it allows us to access information, to share resources, to leverage our own capabilities, to enhance our own core competencies. We see a part of this being development cooperation, we think that our participation in development

cooperation, development assistance, in 1954 we have contracts and activities with AID or its predecessor organizations continually since 1954.

So, we see that having played an important part in our evolution as a university from a global perspective. We see it being important for the future. We have to understand how you do economic and sustainable development in all those terms that we use are just as relevant in the state of Washington as they are in some other place, some other country. So, we see our participation as being an opportunity to learn, to experience, to have people and students involved to share experiences, to work with collaborators.

NOEL: Back in the early 1980s, we, along with some colleagues in the international development management center at Maryland, came up with a definition of international development that was international development is a cooperative, evolving process whereby nations and their peoples are better meeting today's needs while building the capacity to meet tomorrow's needs. It seemed like a really useful definition at the time, and as time has gone on it has become more and more useful. In fact, we came to the point in this university where the name of our office was initially the International Program Development Office. International development, we felt, was a great term to incorporate internationalization, development cooperation, sort of everything we do in that area. The definition is equally valid today, but international development, to a lot of people, means a paternalistic development assistance, so we backed away from that in terms of an overall name for our office. But I think that the concepts are more valid than ever.

Q: Would you state the name of the office today?

NOEL: The overall office is International Programs for Washington State University and the sub-office which I am head of is called International Development/Development Cooperation.

Q: But why development cooperation?

NOEL: Well, development cooperation is taking the international development definition and recognizing that it is done in a collaborative manner with institutions, individuals, public and private, overseas and here. It is to do international development, i.e. do more and be more, but in a collaborative manner because we feel strongly that working together has been shown that both sides gain and that a cooperative effort in order to sustain over time, you have to be generating benefits to both sides and you have to go into it with that as a goal.

Q: Does this link back to a point that Jim made, a few minutes ago, that partnership and collaboration are not the same? I wonder if you can expand on that and help us because

you spoke of the emerging ideas of partnership as something deeper I gather, than collaboration of the past.

HENSON: We have been very interested in a number of issues related to participation in development activities and one of these is the whole topic of institutional development and change whether that be in an institution in a developing country, research organization, or an educational or a group of producers or whatever it is. We felt early on that we didn't know what that meant, we didn't know how to do that. How do you bring about institutional change? Jan and I, with colleagues elsewhere, Marcus Engle and others, have really been looking at those issues. As we have looked at institutional development and change, it has become more evident or more prevalent in the media and in our discussions, we are talking about the twentieth century and the changes the world experiences, so what does that mean to us in terms of an institution and what we're saying in terms of the model that we talked about a little earlier is that we have no choice but to interact in the world. The world must become the campus if we are going to become a relevant university for all the reasons that we have talked about. The mechanism for doing that, there needs to be a framework within which one has those interactions and share those activities and benefits. As we have done research on the private sector and other sectors in terms of models, what has struck us, is how such partnerships have evolved and have been having an impact in the private sector. If you look at the private sector, based on our assessment of it, you find that 1) the world is a marketplace, you have no choice. To be a player locally, you have to be global to be competitive both locally and globally. You have to have access to information that is competitive in comparative advantage, all those kinds of issues which are directly relevant to the university. If you look at the private sector also, you find that they have been experimenting with relationships. They are contracting, they are joint venturing, but also there is a very strong emphasis on global alliances and partnerships and partnering with other private sector firms, frequently with competitors as well as colleagues.

The focus of those relationships, as we observe them, is to do several things. 1) To enhance core competencies. The private sector firms as well as the universities need to interact with others to enhance their own internal capabilities by learning and sharing with others. 2) To leverage resources. We in the university, just like a private sector firm, need to be able to leverage our resources to enhance the impact of those resources, and if we can do that through a sharing or partnering arrangement then we hope that both will benefit. 3) To get mutual benefits with the universities and the private sector, that has to happen. One of the really important factors in the private sector is in fact learning. The educational process of working with a partner in a firm or firms wherever they might be is learning. As we look at the university, we find that they are completely parallel. There is really no difference. So the model that we are implementing is a partnership model, based upon congruence of interest in programs, similar philosophies, benefits to both

partners, both partners put resources on the table, and they share them, and we want that to be sustainable over time. Frequently, the short-term activities have less impact.

NOEL: I think a key point in all of this is the whole issue that the fact that these partnerships and alliances will evolve over time. If you don't do this joint learning, and if you don't let the relationships evolve with the kinds of benefits mutating over time as both organizations change then it is doomed to failure. I think that is an important message as we are looking toward the future of development cooperation or development assistance.

HENSON: That is there has to be lots of flexibility and no rigid expectation about either the process time or the process direction.

NOEL: Even the products. Especially, this has been the case in the private sector, and we have certainly found this with USAID and with other agencies. That is, there is a tendency to want to get everything in contractual and legal terms early on, deliverables completely locked in concrete, and to second guess, if you will, what's in it for each partner or to have the biggest partner or the one who is providing the most resources making all the rules and calling all the shots. Then you lose all kinds of opportunities for leveraging, synergism, for evolving over time. The private sector is finding this out in a big way, and I think many of our federal agencies are finding the same thing.

HENSON: I think one of the considerations we need to keep up front is the question of what is the benefit. As an educational institution, and this is one of the advantages I think of a university working with AID or those sorts of agencies or organizations, is that we have not addressed benefits in the way it has to be addressed to form a real partnership. But one of the potential advantages, is AID for example, has some benefits and some impacts that they want to achieve.

In a partnership arrangement, the benefit to Washington State University, may in fact be very different. Or as we work with a private firm, the private, commercial firm, profits. But we may be willing as a university to participate in a partnership arrangement with them, and our benefit may be opportunities for students, that may be enough for us. Just like with AID, we can sit down, we think, at the table and define these benefits and we have a spectrum of benefits at the university. It may be students, it may be faculty, it may be money, it may be learning about economic development, it may be any number of things and those have not been taken into account. As one defines those benefits, and if they are sufficiently important, then what I will do, as a university, is begin committing my own resources to this activity which is essential that I have this commitment to the partnership. So those relationships, in this theoretical partnership activity, did not take a different dynamic and a different direction and it offers opportunities in which to

mobilize a whole different array of resources that can really focus on common shared agendas.

Q: I want to ask if one or both you would go back and contrast what you are talking about with what you perceive has been the situation when you worked with AID and tried to have the university's interests represented.

NOEL: That's what I was going to say. A classic example of what Jim just said was the title to our strengthening grants. Because when those were negotiated and designed the indicators for success from AID's side, what they wanted the universities to provide was long-term technical assistance for two-year assignments. That was what the university had to put up on the table. The assumption from AID's side is what universities wanted was a maximum volume of business and so those were the two criteria that each side was using and they were completely inconsistent with the mechanisms that would involve the maximum benefits to both partners.

Q: How so?

NOEL: AID doesn't need tenured, and they wanted tenured, long-term faculty overseas on its programs. It can get through other sources. It can get them through the private sector, senior qualified people. The advantage to the university for AID is leveraging all the other sources. Access to graduate students, free research, places to put their foreign trainees, many, many other things like access to the clientele in the U.S. to sell USAID.

HENSON: There was nothing unique about the universities as the source as long-term technical advisors, and these other things are quite unique.

NOEL: . . . they are quite unique in terms of the things that the university could bring to USAID, but that no one else could bring in quite the same way.

HENSON: We minimized their significance.

NOEL: They were not mechanisms built in to allow that to happen. In fact, putting the focus on long-term tenured professors and a lot of stress happens when tenured professors or permanent faculty weren't involved, making a disincentive for the universities to be involved. Because what they would like to have is some younger faculty to have the chance to have an international experience, or perhaps some older people. But what often happened but some very end-of-career people, who were sort of expendable from the university stand-point ended up going out.

Q: AID claimed that that had happened also, and it was disappointing when that happened also.

NOEL: But if the criteria are that only tenured professors are allowed, and that's when tenured professors are available to go, they are not available to go in the middle of their most grant producing, financing years, they are available to go later. It was doomed. It was a mechanism that set-up, not at all, what either the university or AID should have gotten out of the relationship. I think that that has haunted us for a long time.

HENSON: I think that the other dimension of that is that the university, and still many universities, have not defined their participation in development assistance/cooperation in the way that I think that we're talking about here. The university is still impacted to a significant degree by a mind-set that was established here and at other universities by those relations.

Especially in agriculture, the response still is, and we continue to fight to overcome it, is international means faculty on long-term assignments overseas and under contracts or you have to have other money to do it.

NOEL: . . . jeopardizing their careers, and detracting from rather than adding to the university's program.

HENSON: And tenure has always been an issue, and there have been many efforts on a lot of universities to say that we need to have special dispensation for tenure for people who are in international. What we say, is that is exactly the wrong way to go about it. International activities and programs ought to be such an integral part of what we do, that where it is done geographically, which is the usual definition of international, shouldn't make any difference. It is the content that is important, and what a person does or doesn't do.

NOEL: I think there is no question that this other part of the equation, which was volume of business is what universities wanted out of it, was the wrong assumption. In fact, it drove universities to keep their MOUs or their strengthening grants, or memorandum of understanding, to take on projects that were large and not necessarily suited very well to the universities own domestic needs. They were enormous contracts like AID's contracts were in those days because AID was in the business of moving money. You know more than anyone that mission directors are rewarded for how much money you bring in and how much money you move not for development results, particularly, or certainly for sustainable development because you are gone by the time any indications of sustainability are there. Which is a fact.

Q: It's not my fault it's my predecessor.

NOEL: That's right, you can take credit if the guy was good, but you don't get the blame.

Anyway, so you ended up with a situation where universities were over committed or doing the wrong kinds of things that did not flow benefits back. They were so busy trying to keep the deliverables going, and keep the money moving and eventually fighting with USAID for this divergence of their needs. That for a lot of universities involvement in development assistance became a negative. There was a perception of negativity on that. Whereas today, I think that a lot of the more creative experiments that USAID has been doing, such as the university linkage program and more involvement in terms through collaborative agreements, memorandum and grants, rather than contracts, are smaller, much smaller and yet there is a lot more flexibility within those for the missions in the host country and universities to find common grounds and do things over a longer period of time that end up having more impact than this frantic large sort of a project.

HENSON: So, we see then, as a university, our participation with USAID as one of multiple types of activities that need to be integrated and produce a synergism and a broad array of inter-related benefits, and benefits that drive commitment - clearly, they do.

Q: These concepts and the sub elements of it are contained in your pamphlet that you just handed me called "Washington State University, a global land grant university, the Concept, Strategy and Implementation," put out by the International Programs Office of Washington State University.

I am going to make a confession here, and that is I am really sort of getting back in stride with AID's current operations of work because for about four years since I came back from my last consulting work in Nepal I really have been focusing on community work -- my community contribution. I have been a little bit out of it, so this is a great experience for me to hear what you are saying and it is helping a lot too. Or I hope it will help me a lot too to get back in stride.

NOEL: It seems that there are so many changes going on in the last five years, that the development environment has changed enormously. That means that new approaches and new mechanisms are desperately needed. When I am speaking of the development environment, I am talking about out there in developing countries and here and globally; the global economy. We need new mechanisms, that our university is very interested in defining and experimenting with those. That is one thing that we love to do at a university is test things.

Q: Have you an example of an alternative model that you would like to cite?

NOEL: An example that is showing quite a bit of promise is in Malawi. It is a brand new approach for us in that we are involved as a university, working with the Ministry of Forestry and the Ministry of Agriculture in Agri-forestry technologies.

Q: Funded by?

NOEL: Funded by USAID, and Rockefeller and others, but USAID has been a partner with Rockefeller and others for an extended period of time -- for eight years in fact we have been involved in this particular activity, evolving from AID funding to Rockefeller funding, to AID funding -- here and there. It has gone from being a Ministry activity in isolation, bi-lateral agreement, to being a cooperative agreement with Washington State that involves now two Ministries and USAID. It is moving into a new phase where it is called a collaborative, agri-forestry partnership activity. This activity is using the university and its linkage with the Ministry to facilitate and support agri-forestry activities by a huge number of partners all the way from the Carlsbad beer company, to the largest state tobacco company, to Malawi wildlife services, European Community is involved, a very collaborative activity where everyone is forming mini-partnerships to say this is what we would like out of it, this is what our agenda is, agri-forestry will contribute to our agenda, can you help us out? In what way? Maybe just partnership grants or maybe just technical advice? Or maybe an opportunity to plug our student into your program. The Peace Corp, for example, is providing three Peace Corp workers who were assigned to the project to do specific different community development things. So all kinds of leveraging of resources toward a common goal.

Q: Now for AID's information, a couple of questions. What is AID's role both in Washington and in Malawi?

NOEL: It is a little bit sensitive now because we are in the process of negotiating the next phase.

Q: Well, what has their role been in the past then?

NOEL: There role has been that AID sponsored a large research and extension project called the Malawi Agri-Forestry Research and Extension Project, MARI Project, for a number of years that had an agri-forestry component. We were a collaborator through the consortium for international development, not even the lead university, but a major collaborator. We had a number of volunteer and technical offices. Then we were involved with Rockefeller continuing the activity especially focusing on agri-forestry research because it was showing a lot of potential. AID bought back into that process and designed a Malawi agri-forestry extension project under an agreement with WSU and we continued that. That is now moving from an agricultural project into their new focus which is natural resources which agri-forestry plays an important role in. So AID has

been a major funding partner for most of this period of time and always been a collaborating partner with Rockefeller even when they were not funding it.

Q: The AID mission, sort of in a day to day, month to month way, does what? They observe or primarily sort it out here in the States and it takes place in Malawi with the mission having an integral part? Or is it a fairly light touch in Malawi.

NOEL: In the early phases it was a contract, but in our experience it was one of the lighter touch contracts we have experienced with a mission. There has been a tremendously strong leadership in the mission over an extended period of time. There has been an unusual set of continuity to programs where you have eight years of continual investment in the same major area. As it moved to the collaborative agreement instead of a contract, then AID's role has changed. They had much less of a day-to-day management role. They have to approve certain things, but they have a very light touch. They approve the work plan, they make sure that we meet contractual obligations, equipment or payrolls or whatever, but that has become lighter and lighter over time because there is a lot of confidence built-up. I think it is a very productive relationship that allows the decisions to be made and they are almost all made in country, under in country leadership with strong ties back here so that they can plug into students and capitalize on what we have to offer.

Q: And the role of the host government institution is primarily at the Ministry level not a university.

NOEL: Right, in this case it is a Ministry. Although there is a collaborative agreement between the project and Bunda College. In fact, we have another collaborative agreement with USAID on the linkage program that we are involved with Bunda College. So there is a university there, but this particular agri-forestry activity has primarily been with the Ministry.

It is an exciting one, at this stage, because here we are working with Peace Corp, the Wildlife Society of Malawi, with Carlsbad brewery, and with the tobacco industry, all work together toward a common goal which is the adoption of agri-forestry technology.

HENSON: There needs to be a framework for this, and I think what Jan hasn't said explicitly, but there is that initial effort and its continuation really provides the skeleton for this to occur. That continuation is necessary to continue to provide that framework in which all these different players can be brought together. The milieu that allows them to partner and do things and be dynamic. It so happens that we have an outstanding faculty member who has been there for eight years to provide that leadership.

NOEL: There are some concerns and maybe there is another part of the interview where we should look at what AID is doing now, what is happening in re-engineering, and what the new focus is, and how that might have the potential to detract from some of the more innovative thinking.

Q: Are there other examples?

HENSON: Let's talk about our activities in Russia.

We have an interest in Russia. That interest began because of the proximity to the far east of Russia in the trade and the economic relationships, potential rather than real. It is real now and evolving. So we felt that the university needed to be involved in that country and the former Soviet Union for a whole variety of reasons like culturally, historically, economically, and so on. We then began looking at where are those congruences that can develop these mutually beneficial relationships. So six years ago, we established while it was still a closed city actually, a relationship that still goes on today and is being expanded with Far Eastern State University in Vladivostok.

We began looking at Russian science which, some of it, is very top quality. So, through a number of connections, we identified the biological research center which is at Pushchino, Russia, 60 miles south of Moscow. It is one of their premiere biological research centers through the Russian Academy of Sciences. As we began some discussion with them and with colleagues at Berkeley, ultimately what happened was the development of a relationship between a consortium of universities, Washington State, University California- Berkeley, University California-Davis, University of California-Riverside, now currently expanded to Texas A&M, and the University of Tennessee in which we have been able to identify cost-cutting interest, common activities, we begin sharing and doing a lot of things. The primary focus is institutional change. In Russia, this institution was probably how many thousands of scientists, I think it's about 2,000 PhDs.

NOEL: At one time, there were 2,500. I'm not sure what it is today.

HENSON: It was a closed city, not even on the map. So it's 24,000 people more or less. As the new Russia is evolving, our interest and real concern, that if one looks at development and there must be a balance between public and private, there are certain things that the private sector can and does do, and things that they don't do and will never will do. There are also certain things that the public institutions need to do and have the responsibility for. This balance, the interface of the public and the private, in terms of economic development, sustainable development, involves a significant institutional change component. So as we have worked with our colleagues in Pushchino, what became very evident is your talking about a need throughout Russia for institutional

change. It is not just the privatization and the evolution of the market economy. That can only be developed and sustained by appropriate and effective public institutions as well.

NOEL: Public institutions which are fundamentally different from any public institution than they ever had in the past. They are very different in terms of their mandate, their funding structure and everything else.

HENSON: As we worked with them, the question became, how can a group of universities work with them to help them reorient this great technical capability to serve the public. They never had to do that before. Also to be sustainable, there was never a question there either. To deliver new types of programs in new ways. We have been conducting this experiment in trying to help them do that.

NOEL: With the slogan being "Science Serves Society".

HENSON: . . . and that is different for Russia. The reason we are doing it, is that we are going to be a better university for having done it. That is the reason why we are doing things in Malawi as well. As we have been working with our colleagues in Russia, we were able to apply for and get a grant from AID to implement this institutional change project.

NOEL: Or for a two year window of it anyway.

HENSON: So we have been working with them, and they have provided resources. This has been extremely important, and I think that we are talking about a different kind of relationship, different orientation, in which we can hopefully partner in a sustainable way with this group of U.S. universities and this great technical capability and professional capability, personnel in Russia, to do development in a different way. We want this to be a model for Russia in terms of how their institutions can function.

The example is in the area of the environment. They have significant capabilities in environmental disciplines and ecology and so on.

NOEL: . . . and in environmental biotechnology.

HENSON: They have some that we don't have. So what we are beginning to do and have done is to really integrate these. The perfect example which is an outstanding success is the biological control of diseases of wheat and barley. If you look out this window, and as you drove from Moscow over here, clearly that is important here.

Q: Clearly that is important. Wheat and barley count . . .

HENSON: What became evident was that we were doing research here in our faculty of agriculture and home economics on biological control. They have technical capabilities that we don't have or capabilities much more in depth. What has happened is a program of biological control, in which we work together to identify potential organisms that can protect the roots of wheat and barley against diseases. That initial work is done here, material is collected in the U.S. and in Russia. The Pushchino Center also has the all Russia collection of microorganisms. They have the national collection so they have thousands and thousands and thousands of organisms from the former Soviet Union.

Anyway we identified potential organisms that would be useful, that would protect wheat from diseases. The initial characterization is done here, material is sent to Pushchino, additional activities are done there. . .

NOEL: . . . because they can bio-sequence and do things cheaper there, faster, and better than we can.

HENSON: Then the results are tested in the greenhouse there and they are tested in the field and we are reaching a point now where it looks like that material is going to be commercially viable. What has happened is that it is a win-win situation. We are beginning to do the same thing in environmental policy and planning -- looking at how one addresses the sustainability issues and the uses of the environment and natural resources. There are other examples that can be made, but we are beginning to talk about a different kind of relationship, a different kind of project, in which AID is playing an important role from an economic sense and they are in fact leveraging significantly their investments. Because every one of the universities that are involved are sending their own people over there, they're doing things at their own expense. If you look at the amount of money being spent from AID and compare it to the universities, it is probably better than a one to one match.

Q: There is a lot of energy per U.S. federal dollar put in as compared to other more traditional efforts.

NOEL: . . . and a lot of products coming out on both sides.

HENSON: Then what it addresses is sustainable development, privatization, democratization . . .

NOEL: . . . economic development, they're integrating economics for the first time. Economics and science had nothing to do with each other and now they have established a land grant university, it's got economics in it, and you are fundamentally changing a significant part of Russia.

HENSON: Today, we are training forty people in the economics of a market economy in Pushchino.

Q: As a university funded by Washington State, how does the legislature look upon these programs? Have you found a change in the legislature today as opposed to five years ago? Are the arguments about the same? Are the positions about the same? Because it has always been a problem with state legislatures to get them to feel that international work is anything other than a siphoning off of their tax dollars which ought to be going to their students, their research and so on.

HENSON: There is a change, and there is a great difference between the state of Washington and the state of Idaho.

NOEL: . . . because we have ports.

HENSON: One of the big factors is that the state of Washington is that it is the state that is more dependent on exports per capita of any state in the U.S. So there is a great orientation. 85% of the wheat is exported. 54% of the Boeing airplanes, over half of the Microsoft products. 75% of the hops. So there is that background. I think the primary issue here is trying to help people understand that we are not talking about development assistance. Development assistance produces a different response from the concept of development cooperation. That may be, in some peoples' mind, a subtle difference. So we don't talk about doing development. We talk about the international dimensions of the economy of this state and the role that this university plays in enhancing that competitiveness and the benefits. Those benefits impact a broad array all the way from being global citizens to being economically competitive.

NOEL: When you say economic development cooperation, we say economic development and that is not threatening, but when you say development assistance, that is threatening.

HENSON: What we find is that the Legislature is supportive. There was legislation introduced and passed this year that enhances our international activity. Whenever we look at the legislature passed funds for enhancing distance education capabilities. Although that is targeted domestically, it was recognized that that could also reach out to other parts of the world and bring information and experiences back to the state, which is not available here. In short, we have found in every instance in which we have had an opportunity to interact with a group, sometimes not supportive, they have always been able to turn them around.

NOEL: In the Pushchino instance, the state organized the trade mission, they went over there, and they were talking about potentials for joint commercial ventures in

bio-technology; the legislature and the state are very much a part of that. It is a bit unusual. It is not the same in Malawi as it is in Russia.

Q: How would you summarize the current state of play?

NOEL: I guess what would wrap it up is to discuss the future for development cooperation and who is going to be involved.

HENSON: We feel very, very strongly and are concerned about the direction of U.S. development policy and programs.

Q: . . . meaning USAID program and policy?

NOEL: Well, not only USAID, but the Congress and others.

HENSON: So, we have a real concern about and we shared with you a draft of a paper we have written and are in the process of writing others. We think that things have to be changed. We see USAID is going through the throes of another re-engineering, although it was not called that in the past. We are very concerned, and we think that many of the people in AID, and obviously some very excellent people are so bound by the bureaucracy, and are tending to look at themselves and are not taking into account the rapid changes that are outside. For example, as we look at the developing countries, the development activities have primarily focused internally to the country. If you look at Nepal, the activities have been inwardly focused. They have to develop that capability, human resources, etc. What we know from development now, that successful development is really focusing on three different general areas. One is the intellectual capacity to generate ideas and concepts.

Q: . . . intellectual capital . . .

HENSON: Yes. Two, is capabilities. They have to have the capabilities to produce goods and services and to interact at an international standard.

NOEL: Translate that into goods and services and basically that is intellectual capacity.

HENSON: Thirdly, is that success is determined to a very significant degree on what we call connections. They have to be reaching out. They have to capture ideas and information, just like we talked about the reasons why we have to be global, so do the developing countries. So we think that it needs to be different, in that development needs to be focused internally to develop that capacity, but a significant part of that capacity are these sustainable relationships and connections outside.

NOEL: But you can contrast Africa and Asia. In Asia, people had both a history and an absolute requirement to reach out and do their trade and economic ties and others. Contrast that to Africa where the bilateral aid has tended to be very introspective. There are not a lot of corporations. There has been ties to Francophone West Africa, as you know, until the recent evaluation, the CFA (?) was so tied to France's economy that they were functioning as colonies. They were not encouraged to look out. That has some significant implications for development investment. As far as we are concerned, Africa is a basket case partially because of development. There is no question of the donor mentality, the dependence on the continual input of donor funds has been destructive...

Q: Crippling to them.

NOEL: Yes, and continues to be.

HENSON: In terms of the future, we are obviously biased by our own experience and ideas which we think are valid. It is just going to take a different type of relationship, and we think that this concept in this document here is completely valid for U.S. development. What is happening, Sam, and we are going to overstate it, but what really is happening is that we are going to do development, we are going to do development cooperation. We are willing to do that with USAID, but we are going to do it whether they are with us or not. Not only that but we are going to get the money to do it. Because, it is so important to us, and these people that we talked about in the state of Washington, see that as important. I am not saying that in a challenging way at all . . .

Q: Well, you're saying that the train is leaving the station if it hasn't already left, and you need to get on board.

HENSON: We think that this particular model is one model, only one, for university participation. We think that it is important for universities to be involved in development along with other players like the private sectors, PVOs, and so on. We put this forward to AID, and they were not very receptive to it. There are a number of reasons for that. One of which is that it may not be a good idea.

Q: I would like to sum up our conversation by asking what if ILRAD didn't exist would things be different? Either scientifically or in terms of a larger development picture?

NOEL: I think the ILRAD, many of the international centers have allowed a caliber of research to be done in a location with a set of people that it would not otherwise have happened. I think that's an extremely important thing in the African context where for a lot of logistic and other reasons it's very difficult to do state of the art, cutting types of research and I think it's very important to the continent in their development strategy to have had access to that. I think that they have probably as they have evolved over time

like many institutions and matured that they tend to become a little inward looking. I think that they've tended to become somewhat isolated perhaps from the rational of being onsite and tend to let some of the partnerships between especially some of the national agri-research organizations and themselves as being sort of the overviewer and the leader and the national agri-research organizations often have been testing things for them, becoming their outreach arms, without really being full partners. Without ever gaining their own capacity rather than the capacity of being somewhat centralized in the centers and others did not develop the way that they had hoped to anyway. But I think that they've played an important role, I think like any other research institution anywhere else in the world, they are searching for their own role in a time of declining resources. I think there's still a need for them. I think that their own mandates are going to evolve if they have from narrowly focused biological research to the social sciences and much more outward, and the economics.

Q: Thank you, thank you for tolerating this aside but it's an important aside and I feel it would not otherwise get into this oral history report.

HENSON: In those early days, in the very early formative days in times of many of the centers and the CG system generally, was dominated by Americans. That is no longer the case. Americans are actually in the minority, rather than the majority. If you look back at the first, probably those early years, the first 8 or 9, 10 international centers, that the director generals were all from the U.S. That's an interesting situation that's no longer the case.

Q: It is indeed and are the professional staff and the hierarchy from all over or are they primarily third world, or are they primarily European, or mixed?

HENSON: Mixed, I would guess that the majority of them are probably from Europe now. As we find in the FAO I think in other international organizations is that many of the countries have focused on their participation and tied their donations if you will to the degree of participation and other sorts of bureaucratic manipulations which are not necessarily negative but they have resulted in their nationals having places. Our government has not taken that stance.

NOEL: I think that's a very key point in terms of the interactions between universities and the CG. Why a tremendous amount of AID or foreign assistance money goes into the international centers, a lot of it by default has to be for those infrastructure and support kinds of activities rather than programmatic collaborative activities and so as Jim says the other governments and their scientists and their students, and graduate students have had much more opportunity to participate. Whereas the U.S. money has gone to support the institution and not activities.

Q: Interesting point, yes, thank you. Anything further on that?

HENSON: No.

Q: Okay let's turn to WSU's history as it has worked along with others both collaboratively and partnerships and so forth. I know Pakistan was an early area of activity for WSU. Would that be a good place to start?

HENSON: I think the way to start or the place to start is even earlier than that. WSU's involvement with the predecessor of what is now AID began in 1954 when we signed the first contract for the development of the West Pakistan Agricultural University in Lahore. But if you look back historically at the university there was an international interest in the university before then. We had a president whose name was Compton who the student union building as you understand is named after. Who had a keen interest internationally and actually was an alternate member to the U.N. in the early days and before that perhaps even the League of Nations, I forgot, I think he was involved in some of those discussions. As an example of the activities, he then was away from the campus for extended periods of time in this responsibility that he had assumed and he then wrote letters back to the students that were published in the Evergreen, the student newspaper. So you can go back there in the early 50's and the late 40's and read those letters that he wrote to the students about the world and what was happening, and the political situations. So there was that sort of an interest. Whenever Truman made his famous point before his inaugural address in 1949, I think.

That started the wheels rolling here and it created building on this previous interest. Compton then wrote a letter to someone, I'm not sure, in the State Department saying we think that this thing called, which was called development assistance or economic assistance, is something that the university ought to be involved with and we want to be involved. That results ultimately in the signing of this contract. At that particular time the university had no structure or organizational unit that dealt with that sort of issue and what happened was that we had long term people, short term people going to Pakistan. Many of them Pakistanis coming here for training and what have you. One of our deans then went to Pakistan and served as the chief of party and then when we left he had to resign the deanship. So he went over there and whenever he came back he didn't have a job. So, he had all of these students and so somebody said, well why don't you be the coordinator for these students and get them placed and do whatever needed to be done with these Pakistani students that are here. That actually is what happened and that was the first organizational unit at WSU that dealt specifically internationally. That then evolved and became the Office of International Education which dealt with student related things, exchanges and study abroad and those types of issues and then when we came back in late '78 we established the Office of International Development, what did we call it?

NOEL: International Program Development Office.

HENSON: International Program Development Office which dealt primarily with development assistance with AID and donors and those sorts of issues. Then in 91 all those were joined under one administrative unit which is what we now call the International Program.

One event that was very very important to us personally and I think has impacted the university to some degree was our experience in Africa, in development and the CG system. We developed some ideas which we then brought forward. A very significant event with the advent of Title XII or the strengthening grants, they became available in '80 I think or late '79. We applied for one of those and were turned down because our program was deemed by the evaluators of being too diverse. We didn't agree with that because we felt that development was multidisciplinary and not a single programmatic area and that to focus on one would ensure that you're probably not going to be very successful in development. So, we revised our proposal and sent it back in and was turned down again. Then the third time it was approved. Later on that approach was deemed to be the best approach and became the general rather than the unique in terms of strengthening grants. We focused on utilizing the strengthening grants to provide an opportunity for faculty to gain international experience, which we felt, and have now been shown conclusively as represented by our research. That if you want to change the university you get faculty off in another country doing another thing. What we viewed as strengthening grant funds and later follow-on programs is a mechanism for us to mobilize our faculty, gain experience and at the same time contribute to AID programs and our participation in it. So, we were then, after we'd been implementing the strengthening grant for a while we were approached as one of five universities by USAID and asked if we would be interested in signing a memorandum of understanding which was called Type One MOU. Type One MOU's were those universities that were actively selected by AID to participate in a different kind of contractual arrangement than the MOU. So, there were only five of us that were ever Type One. There were some Type Two's that had some other details but the whole point being is that the availability of those resources had a very very significant impact on this institution and our participation and development in AID's programs and on the whole university program. I mentioned to you I think earlier, we went back and did a retrospective examination of our participation during a 10-year time span in which we were implementing the MOU and the strengthening grant and we had over a thousand of our faculty participate.

Q: That is an extraordinary figure.

HENSON: And the average volume of business was between 5 and 6 million dollars and some things like that. So that is probably from the standpoint of this university's international activities and programs the most significant thing that ever happened.

Q: WSU is now different as a consequence.

HENSON: WSU is very different as a consequence and we continue to become more different all the time. It is, don't you think so too?

NOEL: Right. One of the things that it did was our strengthening grant and then our memorandum of understanding which was a multidisciplinary problem solving systems focused kind of approach. Got people working together from the College of Agriculture and the College of Business and the College of Veterinary Medicine and the College of Agriculture in ways that they had never done overseas and then back on campus. I think it has fundamentally changed the programs on this campus. The interdisciplinary focus which is very strong on this campus can be traced back in most instances to people who served on these international assignments. That is fundamentally different. One thing we had lost with the demise of the MOU's however was the flexibility that that afforded us to have faculty members available to go at a minute's notice. To do USAID's bidding which generally comes at a moment's notice. We had our international faculty positions who were permanent, long-term, WSU faculty members but they did not have to take on teaching assignments. The research they did allowed them flexibility to come and go overseas. So, we were able to be responsive. One of the major USAID issues with the university community was not being able to be very responsive and now that the MOU resources are no longer there and in a time of shrinking resources, flexible funds are very hard to come by. So that's something we have lost.

Q: This is a thing of the past as of what, two years ago?

NOEL: Three years ago.

HENSON: Another significant factor for us was the leveraging of those resources to mobilize state support. There's nothing that generates support as much as success and so we were able to show success, involvement, and a volume of money coming in from, extramural funding coming in and that then was one of the factors that enabled us to mobilize significant state support. Which we now have. So I think that those are some of the pivotal things, I think another aspect of our program that I think is unique and continues to be very worthwhile because I think of our early research background we have approached this from a research perspective. Our participation with AID beginning early on, we saw it as a research activity in which one is always defining hypotheses and relationships and evaluating activities and accomplishments and then redefining the experiment. In actual fact when we came back from Kenya the idea was that we would

design and implement a grand experiment which is called the internationalization of Washington State University. So we are still playing this experiment out. For example, we just completed, Jan wrote the paper, a study on the internationalization of Canadian and U.S. veterinary medicine. We've done similar studies in some other areas.

Q: Well, thank you that's a I was going to say a nugget but it's too big to be a nugget. I think it's a unique report. Now I would like to ask also if you would indicate some of the, if you would illustrate this general proposition with some of the specific activities that WSU faculty have been engaged in over the last say, during the last ten years or so. For example, earlier you were discussing the Malawi project which has been ongoing now for, among other things you've had a faculty member on that project for eight years. Very unusual.

NOEL: In fact nine now.

Q: Nine now. Are there other activities that are worth noting as activities?

NOEL: I think the Malawi activity and the Jordan activity are two that we consider among our most successful. Because they have been so long term and so flexible and so evolutionary in what they've done and the kinds of involvement for the university and the kinds of benefits that the host country people have seen from it. Those are the kinds we really have enjoyed. Are either a serial bunch of U.S. (unsure) projects or a serial bunch of U.S. plus foundation plus host countries, plus third donor kinds of projects, so you can continue the involvement at greater or lower levels and explore new avenues from farming systems that what we started in Malawi then we moved to agri-forestry and then from there agri-forestry research to agri-forestry to extension. Now to collaborative agri-forestry partnerships with NGO's. So, an evolution of allowing different people from the university to be involved. Different organizations in Malawi to be involved, different donors to be involved. A lot of chances to try things and build on those things that did work rather than stop start, stop start. Same in Jordan.

Q: Could you review the Jordan experience?

NOEL: Okay, the Jordan experience. The first project in Jordan, AID project was a faculty of agriculture. What was the start date on that Jim?

HENSON: It was probably in the 80's, I think in 1980 or 1982.

NOEL: Before then, I think, maybe. Or at least it was at the collaborative mode and early work was done in early 1979 I think. But we established work for the University of Jordan, to establish a faculty of agriculture of which it had not had before and develop that. It was quite successful. Over a period of time the Ministry of Agriculture was very

interested in putting links together with the University of Jordan so we worked with the Ministry of Agriculture to establish a research and extension system in the Jordan River Valley, which is extremely successful in economic terms and other terms. Expanded from that to a third project which was a national as opposed to the valley, ag research and technology transfer project jointly done by the University of Jordan and the Ministry of Agriculture with some other collaborators. Also quite successful but interrupted by the Gulf War. In the interim different kinds of involvement be they sabbaticals or short-term relationships with the University of Jordan faculty and Washington State faculty and then one of the recent university linkage programs with the University of Jordan focusing on the environment and natural resources as opposed to agriculture. It's been 25 years and the president of the University of Jordan was just here along with the new former dean of agriculture now what is his new position, vice rector or something, anyway very senior people who are, some are WSU graduates. Many have strong ties to the university, very appreciative of the spectrum of things we can do together, whether through the exchanges, joint research. Very very productive.

Q: And the WSU faculty think of it and find it now what? Just sort of passing interest or substantial value?

NOEL: No, no, substantial value. Certainly, involving collaborative research. Jordan agri-logically is very similar to the State of Washington in a lot of other issues in the environmental area so they're doing collaborative research. They're able to gain grants from third sources by virtue of them working together.

HENSON: And perhaps one of the most important parts of it as we have developed our strategy around the world and have a presence and activity around the world. That is the focus of our activity in the Middle East. So that is really a key institution to us.

NOEL: An entree for us.

HENSON: In which we are able to carry out things, work within, but then spread out to other institutions and organizations, governments, and what have you.

NOEL: So we may be involved in a project that involves natural resource management but we may be demographic studies on women's roles in Jordan at the same time because we're very comfortable in working together as institutions and both institutions are investing resources.

Q: It may have some AID support or may not. That's just one of the sources of support.

NOEL: Right.

HENSON: In the same sort of thing in Kenya. We began our activities in Kenya in 1974 and we were the ILRAD; a number of our faculty here at WSU were ILRAD and those activities have continued to this day, non-stop, since 1974. We have graduate students there and we just had a faculty member who came back who was there for 10 years I believe. Developed some innovative graduate programs with the University of Nairobi and within the ministry.

Q: I know that one answer to this proposition question I'm going to ask you is well it all depends and that's certainly true. But, have you found that these sorts of long-term link, connection, is really THE way to go or have you also found short term, ad hoc activities have been of great value to individual faculty members and have had considerable pay-off as well?

HENSON: We maybe even more so now in recent years than in the past, but to some degree in the past, we have had a hierarchy of relationships. At one level there is an institutional commitment with another institution and generally speaking that is broad based, involves different programs and disciplines, and we see that as being sustainable over time.

NOEL: An investment of resources from both of the participating institutions.

HENSON: We commit resources, and they commit resources in what we now call the partnership for development cooperation. Then there is another level of commitment and participation which might be a unit, might be a college or it might even be a department and we encourage and support that but we are not committing this institution to that relationship. Then there are those individual or small groups of ad hoc sorts of relationships and activities all of which can be constructive for you and we are supportive of them all but only the inner institutional relationships are we going to commit significant institutional resources although we will provide resources to the other kinds of activities.

NOEL: Especially to explore if they can go up to the (inaudible).

HENSON: One of the most important things that you can do, we think anyway, number one we said is to provide opportunities for faculty and then the major benefit of that is for them to identify potential. They need to understand what the potentials are in terms of collaboration and what it can mean and the benefits therefrom. So that's the most important thing that we can do is put them in a circumstance so that they can understand what the potentials are and then make a determination of whether that's worthwhile or not. That's the only way it works anyway.

NOEL: It can be professionally and personally very rewarding to an individual faculty member to go over and do something one time. To be a consultant to a private firm or do whatever that might be, but institutionally that's not likely to have a whole lot of impact. It has a higher impact on the students for the earlier in the faculty career you can do that because that sort of gets them interested. But if you're going to have an impact on the campus, on what they're doing then there needs to be a mechanism for their continued involvement in some way. That becomes at the beginning of a research interest or becomes a funnel for information to come back to incorporate in the reports that they do, that doesn't happen in a one-month assignment. Someplace because you got pulled out.

HENSON: And you generally have taken leave from another responsibility that somebody's having to cover for you.

NOEL: Right, your peers aren't very supportive of continued involvement if it's a one-time shot.

HENSON: We mentioned I think Sam, before, we did a survey a couple of years ago, maybe two and a half years ago now, of the impact on the campus of those kinds of experiences and it was really surprising how much impact that there has been in terms of incorporating information into courses, enhancing competitiveness for research money, peer recognition was very positive. It had no detrimental impact on tenure. A whole host of things. So, our relationship and the impact of our participation in U.S. development, has been extremely significant and we feel as we've said to you before that this university and its faculty and students need to be involved in economic development activities because in so doing you learn how the world really works and can assist in defining your role as an individual or as an institution in it. So, we think that again, as we've said to you before, we have to be involved in economics, we have to be involved in the world, can't do it sitting here and we have to be involved in economic development and we're going to.

NOEL: Two days ago Sam, I'm thinking of it because it's fresh in my mind. A young man came into my office that we had sent over to Malawi. He's a graduate student in the department of human development and is looking at societal change and mechanisms for community change, and he's working with the Indian tribes in the State of Washington primarily. Made some really exciting work there and so we thought we'd plug him into the agri-forestry project and to another relationship that WSU has there with Bunda College; one is with the ministry and the other is with the university. He went over there and came back just ecstatic. He's plugging into his department's research agenda, he's getting information for his research, he helped out trends and the activities out in the field. He's bringing home some excellent ideas that he's going to incorporate with his work with the Indian tribes. It all fits together. It can actually happen and it happened

with minimal AID funding in that particular situation but with linkages that AID was involved.

Q: So you're going to be in the world and with AID if possible; but if that's not possible you're going to be in it anyway?

HENSON: Yeah, sure.

NOEL: Uh, huh.

HENSON: In the beginning we said before we continue to reemphasize that it needs to be a partnership arrangement because of the changing world, the changing circumstances, declining resources. There are some really win, wins that can be defined.

NOEL: You might mention that when I began to talk about this last time but one of the situations is with AID and a host country and a university you have to create a win, win, win, situation. And we're finding it's hard enough to create a win, win, let alone a win, win, win. That really does complicate the issue when you're having three partners, with three sets of expectations which may be complimentary but are almost always not identical.

Q: Okay, well, thank you both very much. I think that we have hit the main points. Are there others that you would like to make into this historical record that we've not touched on?

HENSON: I can't think of any.

Q: Alright, thank you.

End of interview