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Warren: Today is the twelfth of July, 1999. I am Mame Warren. I’m in Baltimore, Maryland, with Barbara Bonnell. Barbara, I know nothing about your history with Johns Hopkins. Start at the beginning. What brought you to Johns Hopkins in the first place?

Bonnell: I came to Johns Hopkins to study for a graduate degree in political science. I graduated from Wellesley College in 1952, had a Fulbright year in Paris, and then came in 1953 to study at Hopkins and to work on a master’s in, actually, international relations.

Warren: Why Hopkins? Why did you choose Hopkins?

Bonnell: Well, my parents were in Baltimore. I had grown up in Baltimore, but I had been away for five years, and I really wanted to come back home. Of course, the fine reputation of Hopkins was what attracted me initially. Had it not had the wonderful reputation that it did, I would have applied elsewhere, but the combination of the excellent reputation and the fact that it was my home, and I needed to be a little bit careful about finances. It meant that I could live at home, which would save me money, walk to school, because I lived only a few short blocks from the university, and pursue my studies.

Part of the arrangement, because I did have a scholarship, was that I would teach as a junior instructor some of the sections of Dr. Malcolm Moos’ class. This was really a challenge for
me, because the field was not international relations, which was my field, but, rather, the basic

course in American government. I was one of, I think, five junior instructors. The responsibility

could not to take a section of students, following an introductory lecture once a week by Dr. Moos. So

I think there were five of us junior instructors. We would go and attend Dr. Moos’ lecture and
then we would have our own classes twice a week thereafter. So that was my introduction to

Hopkins.

I came back from Europe where I had been somewhat of a queen bee, and found myself as

the only woman junior instructor and with students, most of whom were Korean War veterans.
They were older and bigger and smarter than I, and they knew it and I knew it, and it was a very

interesting first year.

Following that first year–

Warren: Now, wait a minute. Let’s talk some more about that.

Bonnell: [Laughter] All right.

Warren: Tell me about that. Tell what you mean by that.

Bonnell: Well, I can remember going to my first section meeting, and I was full of great

excitement and enthusiasm. This is the first time I ever had my very own class to teach. At

Wellesley College, where I had gone to school for four years, a small women’s college, where
individual attention had been given to every student, where classes were extremely well prepared,
where there was a syllabus for everything, I arrived at my class thinking that that was the way I
was going to handle things with my section.

So I can remember writing on the bulletin board [sic], as I walked in, my name and the
room number in Gilman Hall where I could be reached if there were any difficulties. I had a
seating chart, passed around the seating chart, and there was just not a very orderly feeling to what was going on. So the seating chart came back and I can remember saying, “Thank you very much. Now, if you’ll be kind enough to stay in these seats for the first two weeks, then I will get to know your names and then, of course, you can sit anywhere you wish.” I said, “Are there any questions?” This tall, rather large person in the back row raised his hand, and I looked down and I said, “Ah, yes, you’re Mr. So-and-so, and what is your question?”

He said, “What did you say your telephone number was?”

Well, of course, the whole class erupted. It really went from bad to worse.

So at the end of the class, I decided I was going to tough it out, and so I said, “We will now settle down. We’ll talk about the first class and what I expect of you,” and all the rest of it. When the bell finally rang, I fled back to the office in Gilman Hall. We were all up on the fourth floor in a heavily eaved room, and I came in and three, I think, of my four buddies were there and they said, “What happened?”

I said, “It was not a good experience.”

At that moment, we looked—I heard something coming up the stairs and here was this great creature who had asked me what my telephone number was, standing in the doorway. He said, “Is Barbara here?”

I will never forget my wonderful friend junior instructor, who was an older man, married with children, said, “Miss Johnson is here. What do you have to say to her?” And, of course, it put a whole new cast on things and the person went away.

Well, really after the end of, I would say, two or three weeks, things began to settle down, but it was a baptism by fire. Fortunately, I had the support of my fellow instructors, and if
anything started to get out of line, I knew that I had them to fall back on. And I’m not a shy violet. I realized that this was part of growing up and I had to get control of the class, and I did, and I made some wonderful friends.

Interestingly, two trustees were among my students that first year. And I tell this story. One of them was a man named Ben Civiletti, who has gone on to really great heights as an attorney. He has remained in Baltimore. He came to Hopkins from Long Island, I believe, and stayed on and went to law school at the University of Maryland, went to work with Venable Baetjer & Howard. In the [Jimmy] Carter administration, he was selected to be Solicitor General of the United States. So that was really a wonderful honor for Ben. He’s also been very active in the state of Maryland, trying to improve education at all levels.

Well, Ben was a kind of student that you dream about. He came to class, he wrote his papers on time, he aced every examination, he was polite, he was charming. It was obvious he was going to go places.

My other student, however, Pierce Linaweaver. Pierce Linaweaver came to me fairly early and said, “Miss Johnson, I have to talk to you.”

I said, “Well, that’s what I’m here for.”

He said, “I’m an engineer.”

I said, “I know you are, Mr. Linaweaver.”

He said, “I have to take this class.”

I said, “I know you do.”

He said, “I’m not very good. I don’t understand this.”

I said, “What kind of an engineer are you?”
He said, “I’m pretty good.” [Warren laughs.]

I said, “Well, that’s fine.” I said, “Now, what we’re going to do is this, Mr. Linaweaver, we are not going to let you out of my sight for more than a week at a time. If you have to come here every day and review what we have talked about, we will do that. We are going to get you through.”

Well, I wound up loaning him my syllabus with all of the notes attached to it, and he, again, was a persevering student, but he really didn’t get it and he really didn’t like it, but we were going to get through this course together and we did. I believe he got a gentleman C.

Well, I lost track of Pierce Linaweaver. I knew that he had gotten his bachelor’s degree and had graduated. The next time he turned up on my radar scene, I think was about ten or fifteen years later when he was head of the Department of Public Works for Baltimore City. [Laughter] This was really quite amusing. I think I went to a Board of Estimates meeting to present something to do with Charles Center-Inner Harbor, and there he was sitting in judgment on my proposal, and we smiled. And I went up to him afterwards and said, “Well, isn’t this wonderful. How are you?”

He said, “Well, I’m just fine.”

I said, “Well, I had read about you, but it somehow hadn’t clicked.” I said, “You have your Ph.D. now, don’t you?”

He said, “Yes, I do.”

I said, “I believe that you were a presidential scholar last year and spent the year in the White House.”

He said, “Yes, that’s right.”
So I said, "Well, don’t ever forget that you learned it all from me, Pierce." [Laughter]

So those were two of my students who grew up to be trustees, as you know, and we joke about our origins back in the 1950s.

Warren: I’ll bet you do. That’s such a great story.

Bonnell: Then I took a year. I did my one-year baptism by fire, and then I took a year and went to Goucher College and it was very interesting, because here I was teaching international relations and international law, and it was a breeze compared to my first year.

When I came back to Hopkins the following year to again take up a junior instructorship, it seemed a great deal easier. At that time, too, I had a very interesting assignment. While I was still doing international relations and that was what I was headed toward, I began to realize, because it was the [Joseph] McCarthy era, that I was not going to pursue a career in the State Department. So, in a sense, I was treading water trying to find out what I was going to do with the rest of my life. The professors who had been my advisors for the first two years were becoming less important in my life, as they realized that they were not going to be really supervising me.

So into my life Dr. Malcolm Moos, who was professor of politics, who had then become chief speech writer for President [Dwight D.] Eisenhower in Washington, took me aside and he said, “I have a very important assignment from Dr. Milton Eisenhower,” then president, “who wants me to be the staff person for a commission, a Ford Foundation-sponsored commission, that he, Dr. Eisenhower, is going to head up. There is going to be a research study done on states’ control,” meaning the fifty states in the United States, each state’s control on higher education within its geographic boundary. He said, “It’s a very high-powered commission, Barbara. It
includes James Bryant Conant of Harvard, it includes the president of the University of Minnesota, the editor of the *Washington Post*, your own president from Wellesley College, Margaret Clapp, and Sargent Shriver," who was then head of the Merchandise Mart in Chicago.

He said, "The research is going to be done here in Baltimore at Hopkins. I’m going to head the research team. You, my graduate students, are going to be the people who do the research, and the commission, these wonderful high-powered people, will come in three times a year to review our findings and to tell us what direction we should go in."

So he said, "I don’t have a secretary for this, and I want you to be the secretary. You will have to move to our offices, which are going to be in the Winwood Towers, off campus, and you are going to have to learn to use an electric typewriter."

And I froze, and I said, "I don’t know if I can do this job."

He said, "Why not?"

I said, "I’m just not very good mechanically."

He said, "You *will* learn to use the electric typewriter."

I said, "Yes, Dr. Moos."

He said, "By the way, as a reward, you, of course, will go and do interviews in two of the states and," he said, "I’m going to pick the states that you’re going to do. I’m going to give you what I think are the two most interesting states. One is Louisiana and the other is Wisconsin."

I said, not knowing anything about this, and really not knowing very much about local politics or even politics in the United States, I said, "Yes, Dr. Moos, whatever you say."

Well, it was a really wonderful year and I got to see—Louisiana was chosen because at that time Governor Huey Long was governor. Prior to that, of course, his brother, this was Earl
Long–Huey Long had been senator, and the state controls on higher education in Louisiana were extreme and extraordinary. The legislature had really kind of a love-hate relationship with the universities and, indeed, controlled them through purchasing and through appointments and through a whole bunch of things.

The other aspect that was very interesting was that there were de facto black universities in the hollows and in the bayous of Louisiana. I got to go to two of those. The difference between LSU [Louisiana State University] and New Orleans–Baton Rouge, rather, and a place called Natchitoches, which was a de facto black university, was extraordinary. I can remember it was a hateful time—and I'm digressing—a hateful time in the '50s in terms of civil rights.

I was staying at a hotel near Natchitoches and there was no public transportation out to the school, so a rather battered station wagon came to the hotel to pick me up. I naturally opened the door of the front seat to get in, and the student who was driving said, “Oh, no, Miss, you have to sit in the back seat.”

I said, “No, I don’t have to sit in the back seat. I want to sit in the front seat, so you can tell me and help get me oriented.” [Telephone rings. Tape recorder turned off.]

Warren: All right. We are in the car.

Bonnell: We are in the car, and he said, “Please sit in the back.”

I said, “Look, we’re leaving town and I think we’re going to out to school. I’m really much more comfortable and I insist upon sitting here.”

So off we went and down many country roads, finally arrived in the dirt-poor area, and I was greeted very warmly by the president of Natchitoches University. And as I went into his very modest office, I noticed a diploma on the wall said, “Ph.D., Harvard University.”
I said, "Oh, Dr. So-and-so, I’m so pleased to meet you, not only because of the research, but because I went to Wellesley and how wonderful to find a fellow New Englander here."

He smiled and laughed and he said, "Well, it was a wonderful experience going to Harvard, but now I’m back here where I belong."

I said, "Well, I’m sure you could have gone anywhere that you wanted to."

He said, "Well, I felt that I really had a responsibility to return to my roots and to encourage others to follow the path that I did."

When we came back, I again sat in the front seat and he said, "This is not wise."

I said, "But I have to do things the way I think I would behave at home or anywhere else, and I would sit in the front seat with a student and do that."

He said, "Well, you’re on your own."

So when I drove back to the hotel and somebody came out from the hotel to help me out, there was just dreadful hostility, and I realized, I guess, for the first time how deep-seated racism was at that time in that part of the South.

On a lighter note, the governor—what I did was to interview key state legislators, usually the governor of the state or, at the very least, the comptroller, the president of the university and any faculty members. Because the Commission was such a high-powered commission, because it had Ford Foundation attached to it, when we wrote ahead of time to set up the appointments, we always got what we wanted.

In Louisiana, Governor Earl Long at that time was having, shall we say, a dalliance with a Baltimore girl named Blaze Starr, who was a famous stripper. He had disappeared, and so instead of meeting with Earl Long, I met with the chairman of the board of trustees, a wonderful man
named Theo Cangelosti. Theo Cangelosti was one of the most charming and intelligent men, and it was he effectively who was kind of covering, I realize now, for the governor.

But any rate, what I found in Louisiana was that there were some very strict controls on higher education there based in part on race. In other words, the *de facto* African-American schools were not getting money in proportion to those of the whites, which was hardly a surprise, but it was a very depressing kind of judgment for me to make.

The other university that I went to was just the exact opposite, and I think that is why Dr. Moos had chosen these two for me. The other was University of Wisconsin, one of the great land-grant institutions which came into being as part of the Morrell Act of 1861, which set aside federal money to create these institutions. They were largely in the Midwest, and because of the time at which they came into being, and because of the rapid development of a professional class in the Midwest, many of the students that went to the Universities of Wisconsin and Minnesota and Illinois, etc., were the people who became the leaders of their communities. Very strong legal presence, medical presence, professional presence. And because these young people had gone to the university to get their education and then become successful, there was a great love of the institution.

So when they got to the legislature, of course, the funds came in and they were reluctant, really, to put strings attached to it. So you found typically that in a place like Wisconsin or Minnesota, there was a love-love relationship. Symbolically I can remember that I went down to interview the governor of Wisconsin, who was at one end of a very long boulevard which ended with the university at the other end. I thought, yes, I can see the ties that bind right here. So I found in Wisconsin that here indeed there were very few state controls on higher education and
indeed the legislature, having, most of them, been alumni of the university, thought of it with great fondness.

Warren: Let's pull this back to Johns Hopkins and what your impression is about the relationship of Johns Hopkins to being involved to this kind of national work.

Bonnell: It was very different. Johns Hopkins was very different from Wellesley College in that Dr. Moos was willing to give his graduate students enormous freedom to do things on their own. I was just—it kind of blew my mind that I could be trusted to go off and interview people who were very important people, and I was not yet twenty-five years old, which today doesn't seem so difficult. But the fact was, in a university, as distinct from a women's private college, a great deal more latitude was given to graduate students, and I did realize that.

Not only did I have this assignment, but Dr. Moos asked at the same time that he was writing President Eisenhower's speeches, was also the chairman of the city Republican party. So each of his graduate students was given a precinct and a district to operate, because Dr. Moos could not really be supervising that properly. So this, again, was a terrific learning experience.

I have come to realize since then this is really what the Hopkins tradition is all about: you recruit students whom you feel can do, exert initiative, and then you turn them loose. You do supervise them to a degree, but you give them the freedom to learn. Certainly, in the three years that I was here, I had a number of experiences I never would have had elsewhere, I don't believe. They were learning experiences and it is part of what comes with a great university.

Warren: Well, thank you. I can see that on the page. [Laughter]

Now, let's get back to your teaching. A lot of these guys, and you've mentioned this, were veterans from the war. Did you have any sense of how different a time that was on the campus?
Bonnell: Yes, I did.

Warren: You were in the middle of it. Did you understand how different that was?

Bonnell: I did, and I tell you why. Dr. Moos was a little bit older than my advisors, Dr. Rourke and Dr. Tucker. I can remember one time going to one of these large lectures that Dr. Moos was giving, and typically the instructors would sit at the back of the room and listen, and we would take notes also to understand what our subsequent classes should follow. I went one day, and as Dr. Moos walked down the steps of this amphitheater to the desk where he was going to lecture, there were a series of really rude calls. They were trying to imitate a moose, and for some reason everybody thought this was hysterically funny. I didn’t think it was funny at all. I thought it was just dreadful.

To make things worse, as he got down close to the platform, a set of firecrackers were set off. Dr. Moos never blinked an eye. He had a wonderful pompadour, and he kind of took his hand and pulled back his pompadour and said, “Thank you, gentlemen, for that twenty-one gun salute.”

Well, it was absolutely—it blew my mind. I thought, imagine having, you know, the savoir faire and the cool to respond in that way. Didn’t miss a beat, went right into his lecture, and that was that. And it seems to me for the rest of the semester things were pretty quiet.

But I was upset by that, and I went to see him, and I said, “I hate to bother you, but I just don’t understand that.”

He said, “Barbara, in your classes have you not found that these are very bright people?”

I said, “Well, when they come to class, and, frankly, they’re not all that good about that.”

He said, “Well, how about their papers?”

I said, “Yes, some of the papers are really wonderful.”
He said, "How about the exams?"

I said, "Yes, but I know they don't read. I know they're not doing their assignments. This is just bewildering to me."

He said, "Trust me." He said, "Overall, the students who are coming to us now are older, they are more mature, even though they do occasionally act out as they did today, but," he said, "this is an exceptional group and I have never enjoyed teaching as much. I wish I were here really more. I wish I weren't being pulled to Washington quite as much in many ways, because this is an exceptional, exceptional group." He said, "Watch, you'll see, they will go on and they will become a whole generation of teachers and faculty members. They will publish wonderful things."

I remember one student in particular, Stan Kelly, who had served in the Navy and had come back. My first year was his last year. He was completing his dissertation, and I think he already had an appointment at Princeton, to teach at Princeton. His thesis was on—and I won't get this quite right, but it was how the media affect elections. The thesis was that television and new ways of composing photographs so that you could make a composite picture transferring people in a picture and making up a whole photograph that really didn't exist in real time could be manipulated and used by candidates for their own benefit or to defeat another candidate.

The dissertation had selected three areas. One was a composite photograph in Maryland that had helped to defeat Senator Tydings. I think it was Earl Browder, a Communist, who was slipped into a picture, and the implication was that someone who is under the cloud of Communist threat or union leader was allied to Senator Tydings, and Tydings, for whatever reason, was not reelected. There was another campaign in which the media had been used, and Richard Nixon had used this in his congressional campaign to win. I’ve forgotten what the third was, but Dr. Moos
said, “This is a seminal work that Stan Kelly has done.” He said, “This is the wave of the future.”

I kept thinking, well, I’m an international relations major. I don’t believe one word of that. That is just tacky stuff, and who knows, but if Dr. Moos says so, I’m glad that Stan is getting a wonderful job at Princeton and his book is going to be published and he’s going to rewrite it for the general public so that it doesn’t sound quite so much like a Ph.D. dissertation.” Well, how wrong I was. [Laughter]

But that was the kind of student that Dr. Moos saw, and he said, “I don’t think when this group, this wave of Korean veterans and World War II veterans are gone in probably another five or six years, I don’t think there will be a comparable wave of brilliance that will be here.”

So I was told. I didn’t truly understand it. I chafed at it in the classroom because I knew these were not your average bear students who would read the assignment, come with those kinds of questions. They were questions with a far larger significance that I didn’t often understand and would have to say, “I’m really not sure. Do you have an answer since you asked the question, or are you really just doing this to show off? Or if you really have an answer, I would like to hear it.”

So it was an exceptional time. I was told that. I did know it in my bones. I perhaps didn’t profit from it as much as I might.

I also have to tell you, Mame, we had the older students, but we also had among the junior instructors a young man who had graduated from the University of Chicago at, I believe, fifteen years of age, might have been sixteen. But he was not only young, he was very slight and skinny. He had recently lost his father, and his widowed mother lived in New York, and that was about all we knew about Stephen Henry Hess. Steve was very smart. He always looked underfed. We knew his mother was a widow. For some reason or another I decided that we really had to
take care of him, that it was our job here in Baltimore to be sure that he got enough to eat. That was what I was most concerned about. He looked so frail.

Another friend of ours, who is not a Hopkins student, but was very active in Republican politics, a man named Arthur Sherwood, and who is a friend of mine, I said, “Arthur, I’m going to take him once a week home to have dinner, if I can, and maybe you can do something to see that he really gets enough to eat, because I’m worried about him.”

Well, the rest is history. Stephen Henry Hess also was a politics major. He graduated with a brilliant dissertation and found his way to Washington thanks to Dr. Moos. He worked in the Nixon administration. He’s now at Brookings [Institute], and whenever I turn on the television set to find a particularly brilliant analysis of a political foible, here is Stephen Henry Hess, now quite gray, rather plump, certainly healthy-looking, who is doing just fine, thank you.

We did find out at the end of the year that Steven’s widowed mother was perfectly well off and Steve was perfectly well off, and I wonder if he, in his own impish way, did not realize what we were doing, but figured he had a good thing going. [Laughter]

But this was the other end of the spectrum. Hopkins had recruited people who they felt could stay the course and would make a contribution to scholarship. At one end was Stan Kelly, the brilliant veteran, but at the other end was Stephen Henry Hess, who again, very young, a wunderkind, but who has done wonderful things.

Warren: You’ve alluded a couple of times to being very much in the minority as a woman. Were you really the only?

Bonnell: The only junior instructor. There were two other women in the department over that three-year period. One was getting her Ph.D., Eva Redfield Rubin, whose husband, Louis Rubin,
was head of the Writing Seminars. Eva had had a very distinguished career at Goucher College, was president of college government, had married Louis Rubin, who was very dashing and young and doing a wonderful job and making quite a national reputation as head of the Writing Seminars.

Eva was writing her Ph.D. thesis on, I think, [U.S. Supreme Court Justice] Felix Frankfurter. At any rate, she was a student of our department chair, whose name I will think of in a moment, who was the leading constitutional law scholar in the country. He, the chairman of the department, Carl Brent Swisher, was in the process of writing a section of Supreme Court history for the U.S. Congress. I don't think before or since I have read writing that was as beautiful, fluid, and concise as Dr. Swisher writing about constitutional law issues. He had just an amazing gift for writing himself. He was also a wonderful teacher. However, he had a reputation for being very difficult when it came to dissertations, and the two women whom I knew never did get their Ph.D.s.

Eva went, Louis left to go, I think down to LSU, and she left without her Ph.D. and—no, I take that back. The other woman, Shirley Williams, did get her Ph.D. She, too, was a Goucher graduate, got her Ph.D., but then died a few years later of a disease.

But at any rate, the scholarship and the teaching varied, but I can remember Dr. Moos' gift for writing books was extraordinary. In politics we used his textbook, Binkley and Moos, on American government, and Dr. Swisher's constitutional law books were, again, used, I think, throughout the country.

Warren: So how about women students? Did you teach women students?

Bonnell: No, we didn’t have any women students in those days.
Warren: Did you see them on campus?

Bonnell: Only graduate students.

Warren: Were there any of them? What was your feeling? Were you a total minority or did you have a sense that there were other women?

Bonnell: No, I didn’t. I felt that I was a minority. I, frankly, felt I was very privileged to have been there. I have not been a feminist, Mame, because I—well, somewhat a feminist. I have felt that my superior education put me into places where I could do things that many other women have not had an opportunity to do before me. I always felt I’ve got to work very, very hard in order to justify the trust, really, that has been placed in me.

On the Hopkins campus in those days, there were no women full professors, that I did know. When I left Hopkins later on and became somewhat active in the alumni association, I was very concerned about it and I used to be very vocal and say, “I do not understand. The place that I came from, Wellesley College, our college presidents were always women, our faculty for the most part were women. I don’t understand why you can’t recruit women to head up these very important positions here. There certainly are capable women out there.”

My own Wellesley College president had served prior to becoming president of the college. She was head of the WAVES during the war, a very high administrative position. So in terms of ability, I knew that women had ability, but I didn’t see that reflected in faculty or administration on the Hopkins campus, and that kind of rankled, and it rankled after I left more than it rankled during the time that I was here.

Again, by the time I became really active as an alumna, the whole world had changed in terms of women’s issues. So I think later as I came back to Hopkins as an alumna, there were
things that I would see that I had not been active in, certainly, when I was a young faculty member here and a student here.

I would say, I think that Hopkins has come a long way in forty years, and that is the time span that I have seen Hopkins. I would encourage, however, I still think Hopkins has a way to go, perhaps, but I've been thrilled to see women trustees. That is where it begins at the top level. I'm sure that as women trustees have proven themselves, that this is filtering down through the ranks. I think a great institution, particularly a global institution such as Hopkins, must demonstrate diversity at all levels—at the governance level, at the administration level, and at the teaching and student level, too. They're getting better.

Warren: You've mentioned a couple of things that I wanted to follow up on. You said you were here in the McCarthy era. Did you know Owen Lattimore?

Bonnell: I did. I had a very bad experience, Mame, with the McCarthy period, and I'll tell you about it very quickly. It was what, in part, convinced me that I was not going to become an ambassador or the first women Secretary of State. [Laughter] At Wellesley College I had had an extraordinary women teacher, M. Margaret Ball, in international relations. She was known, again, for her scholarship throughout the country. In journals such as Foreign Affairs, she was frequently a contributor. She was also a wonderful role model and she was my advisor, my senior honors thesis advisor.

Imagine my delight, I thought, my first year as a junior instructor up in the fourth floor at Gilman Hall, there was a knock on the door and I was up there by myself. I opened the door and here was a very nice-looking man who said, “FBI,” and showed me his badge. He said, “I’m looking for Ms. Johnson.”
I said, “Well, I’m she.”

He said, “Good. I would like to talk to you. Is there a place that we can go and be quiet?”

I said, “Yes, come right in here. None of my colleagues are due back for an hour or so.”

He said, “Well, that will be plenty of time.” He said, “I’m here to talk to you about a professor of yours at Wellesley, M. Margaret Ball.”

I said, “Oh. Oh, I’m delighted. I’m so pleased. Won’t you come in and sit down?” I said, “She was my favorite professor.”

He said, “I’ll ask the questions.” So he started off and he said, “How well did you know her?”

I explained that, and that as a senior I had been to her house probably three times a week.

He said, “Well, did you ever notice any strange men coming and going?”

I said, “No, she wasn’t married, and she took care of a sister who was mentally retarded. So, no.”

He said, “Well, did you notice that she had a drinking problem?”

Well, this kept building in terms of these negatives, and finally I said, “You’re asking me all these very strange questions, and I want to know why you’re asking me these questions, because I’m not going to say anything more to you.”

He said, “Well, she’s being considered for a very high position at U.N.”

I said, “Well, now we’re getting somewhere.”

He said, “That will be all.”

I said, “No, it won’t.” I said, “Please open your notebook.”

He looked at me and I said, “I’m a taxpayer, and I pay your salary and I want you to open
your notebook and then I'm going to tell you some things that you should have asked me.” I said, “First of all, she was one of the finest teachers in a generation at that school, and there are people all over this country who will tell you that. Second, her scholarship is beyond peer, and I don’t know what position at the U.N., but she is the expert on Arab relations in the U.N.” I said, “In terms of being a moral individual, she could have shut up her sister in an institution and she didn’t; she took care of her. She was a role model for everybody,” and I said, “The U.N. would be lucky to have her.”

Well, I was trembling by the end of this, and he got up and left, and it all kind of suddenly came back to me. I’d read a letter to the editor in the New York Times which told about background of an individual, and it sounded like a man, who had been hounded out of his State Department job. And the end of the letter said, “I do not have the courage to sign my name. Anonymous.”

And that did it for me, because I had been raised by parents who thought I had a good mind. I had been trained by teachers at high school and college to express my opinions, and I thought, “They did not raise me to be anonymous. I cannot be anonymous. I will not be anonymous, and I will change my field.”

So Owen Lattimore at that time was on the fourth floor.

Warren: Hold on. I’m going to turn the tape over.

[Begin Tape 1, Side 2]

Bonnell: Owen Lattimore was a kind of a ghost who roamed the fourth floor. He was not permitted to teach and didn’t have any classes, but he was permitted to come to the oral examinations of Ph.D. candidates. There was a student from India who had a topic that not very
many people understood or knew anything about. She went to defend her thesis, and her advisor—I guess it was his advisor—said, “I don’t think many people will show up for this, because not many people have an interest in the area, nor do they know enough to really ask you questions. So this will probably be a very brief oral examination.”

Well, Owen Lattimore showed up for this, and evidently—I was not there, but I heard it second-hand from the candidate, who said he asked the most penetrating questions. They were just extraordinary. He said, “We went on for two hours and at the end,” he said, “I felt so good, because I’d really had a very interesting and challenging conversation with someone whose mind I respected.”

So that was the Owen Lattimore that I heard about. He was really only kind of a shadow who would come up and down the fourth floor, but evidently a brilliant mind, who was cut off from sources that he had been accustomed to seeing.

You mentioned the McCarthy era. I had had a very enlightening experience when I went to France and found all kinds of sources available to me at the University of Paris that I had not found in the Wellesley-Harvard libraries, because the U.S. Government had forbidden their display. So that was my first exposure to the fact that the country that I loved and had given me so much, and that I did love and do love, indeed was practicing censorship. That was really quite an interesting thing.

I didn’t know Owen Lattimore well, but he had a reputation for showing up occasionally at the Ph.D. oral examinations and, in a very kind and gentle way, not intimidating way, showing the wealth of information and background.

Bonnell: Yes.

Warren: Tell me about Milton Eisenhower.

Bonnell: Milton Eisenhower was a man of enormous energy. Of course, his brother was President of the United States, and so this, again, was very exciting. Here you were in the presence of somebody who dined at the White House and was a consultant to the President on Latin American issues, because Dr. Eisenhower was an authority on Latin America.

I knew Dr. Eisenhower or saw him with, I shouldn’t say frequency, but dealt with his office with frequency on the Ford Foundation study on state controls on higher education. I realized that Dr. Eisenhower, with his great energy, was not cut in the same mold as the college presidents, Dr. Lowell Reed, who had been there prior to this, and I’ve forgotten the name of the very brilliant president who had gone on to, I believe, head the Carnegie Foundation.

Dr. Eisenhower was a people person and he recognized that the university, for all of its wonderful scholarship, was not attracting the kind of financial support that it should. I was aware that Dr. Eisenhower was spending a great deal of time off campus trying to raise money and to raise the visibility of the alumni in terms of support.

I saw him because three times a year the foundation, Ford Foundation group, would come to Baltimore and would be entertained, and it was my job to set up the dinners at the Elkridge Club where the members would forsake their academic duties and get off campus for a while and have time for a nice dinner and a little conviviality. So Dr. Eisenhower would approve the menu and he would approve the date and the time. So I would go in with the instructions and be sure that that was all right. He would always have a little twinkle in his eye and he would say, “How does it feel to be the only woman staff member of the Foundation?”
I said, “Oh, it’s just wonderful, Dr. Eisenhower. Please don’t change a thing,” and we would laugh.

But he was very nice to me and he said, “Is there anything in particular that you would like to do with the commission that you’re not doing?”

I said, “Yes, I would be so grateful if you would let me pick up Dr. Conant at the train station. I have such reverence for Dr. Conant,” who had been High Commissioner to Germany at the end of World War II, “and I would just love the opportunity to pick him up and be able to drive with him up to campus and then take him back again.”

He said, “Well, I don’t think you’re going to find that Dr. Conant is a very informal person. You may find that you are traveling in silence.”

I said, “Well, I would love to have the opportunity to find out.”

So he said, “Fine. I was going to send the chauffeur to pick him up, but if you want to go pick him up, go right ahead.”

So we did and, of course, Dr. Eisenhower was quite right, Dr. Conant was not a very chatty person and was not an informal person at all. But over the year I would pick him up and take him back to the station, and I got to know him a bit and found him to be a wonderful individual. Of course, again the Wellesley connection was what helped to do that.

But Dr. Eisenhower was sensitive to even a graduate student, who was certainly a very minor part of his life, and I thought it was very thoughtful of him to let me do that.

**Warren:** Tell me what you mean about the foundation. What’s the foundation?

**Bonnell:** I’m sorry. It was the Ford Foundation-sponsored committee to investigate state controls on higher education, and Milton Eisenhower was the chairman, and that is why the
research staff was effectively concentrated at Hopkins. There was a book that came out as a result, called *The Campus and the State*, which is a wonderful book, and does chapter by chapter on the various states and their controls.

Dr. Eisenhower, I also remember, had a picture on his desk of a very beautiful woman, and it was his wife, and I believe that she died while he was here. There was another picture, and this is how the continuity in Baltimore, there was another picture of a young woman, and she became my friend at the Union Memorial Hospital. Her name was Ruth Snyder. She was his daughter. She became chairman of the Women’s Auxiliary at Union Memorial Hospital. She married a wonderful radiologist, Tom Snyder. So I kind of would keep in touch with what her father was doing through her, as I had left Hopkins.

But Milton Eisenhower was a very different, very different breed of cat in terms of understanding the needs of the university, that it was not enough simply to be the best in scholarship, but that in order to continue to be the best, you had to have the financial underpinning. And he went out and did a magnificent job.

Warren: Okay. Let’s move on in your life and talk about your other associations with Johns Hopkins through the years.

Bonnell: I seem to think that it was in the early ’70s that Johns Hopkins needed to acquire land, or needed to acquire buildings for dormitories. They decided to acquire an apartment house across Wyman Park, and I’m forgetting the name of it, but it will come to me. They acquired two apartment houses.

Warren: Across Wyman Park?

Bonnell: Across the Wyman Park dell, so it would have been across Charles Street. They’re the
apartments now that have Xando’s and all the rest.

Warren: Oh, that’s where my other office is.

Bonnell: Oh, really.

Warren: Hopkins Square.

Bonnell: Exactly. Exactly. Well, they were two very large, very elegant apartment houses. I had a connection with—I had a beau who lived with his mother in one of them. I was accustomed to going for dinner once a month or so to the apartments with my friend. One day he announced, to his horror, that his mother had been told that she was going to have to leave the apartment within six months or whatever the period was and find another place to live. I said, “Oh, my goodness. Why?”

He said, “Well, Hopkins has acquired the apartments, and those are the rules and the agent who manages the apartments has given everybody notice.”

Well, my friend was able to relocate his mother, who was in her seventies, if not her eighties, and had lived there as a widow for pretty close to thirty years, was able to find another place for her to live, but it was traumatic for her. I knew that many of the people in that apartment house were widows like herself for whom the move really was traumatic.

I found out about how traumatic because I was then president of Family and Children’s Society, and one day the executive director said, “Barbara, we have gotten a contract late in the game to try to help relocate or give counseling to people who have to relocate from one of the apartment houses that Hopkins has bought.”

I said, “Well, thank goodness. I can’t imagine what was going on in their minds to think they could simply purchase two apartment houses without having made plans for how people
were going to be relocated.”

I think the executive director said, “Well, you know, Hopkins. They’re in their own ivory tower. They have no concept of what their decisions can do in terms of the world outside their boundaries.”

So I agreed with the executive director, and whether it was fair or not, I did say one time to Steven Muller, “Steve, I can’t imagine what you were thinking of in not planning that more carefully. You have traumatized some elderly people who really didn’t deserve that at this stage in their life.”

He said, “I don’t know what you mean.” And he really didn’t know what I meant, and I suppose that was what was even more unnerving to me, that one could change other people’s lives, such as the tenants in these apartment towers, and not have any thought to it beyond the fact that one was acquiring a good piece of real estate which would benefit the university.

So then began a period of somewhat disenchantment with Johns Hopkins. It wasn’t anything that I ever wrote a letter to the editor or effectively tried to change through talking to my friends who were trustees, but it was a feeling that Hopkins is a big institution, it is a powerful institution, and be very careful because it could hurt you, perhaps and probably not meaningfully, but simply by exercising that power without real understanding of consequences.

Now, as I have grown older, I have been very pleased to see that Hopkins has realized—and I can’t speak for the East Baltimore campus, because I don’t know that as well, but certainly the Homewood campus, Hopkins has become greatly more sensitive to the fact that it is part of a community. It is certainly a dominant part of the community in many ways. But I think again through the people that have served in administration, I do not expect a president of
Hopkins University, with all the complexities that that involves, can be knowledgeable about any of the communities around it, but I can expect a president to have on staff people who can apprise him of that.

I think Hopkins, through Ross Jones, who was an alumnus, who went away for a very brief period of time, but then came back to serve as an advisory, an executive advisor, to, I think, seven presidents or however many, Ross Jones did have a feeling for the community and he was able to transmit that at the highest level to others. So I have seen a marked change from the early ’70s, when I don’t think Hopkins was as sensitive as it should have been, to an enormous change. I really credit that to Ross Jones’ leadership.

Also in the last nearly two decades there’s been a wonderful director of Volunteer Services, Bill Tiefenwirth. Bill Tiefenwirth, again, has a remarkable understanding of the dynamics of the community, its problems and its strengths. He’s been placing students as volunteers, and I’ve been seeing that in the last two years through my work at Greater Homewood, does a remarkable job in matching the interests of the students with the community needs.

I cannot tell you what a difference it makes to have young people who are Hopkins students, going to communities and saying, “We’re your neighbors at least for four years. We hope that you’ll invite us in and that you won’t view us with hostility. We are here. We’re going to be your good neighbors for four years.”

I can remember a young man standing up at a community meeting, and he was handsome and articulate and attractive, and I thought, boy, I wish everybody at Hopkins could see who your representative in the community is today. You’d be very proud of him, and this is Hopkins at its best.
Ross Jones was largely responsible, with a wonderful woman named Dea Kline, in organizing the Greater Homewood Community Corporation some thirty-one years ago. Greater Homewood Community Corporation, as envisaged by Ross and by a group at Union Memorial Hospital and by a group at Maryland Casualty, those were the three institutions convened by Ross to help put up a little money and to create leadership initially, to create an umbrella organization of residents and businesses and institutions in the area to try to help improve the quality of life.

Initially the geography covered, I think, went from about 25th Street on the south, up to possibly University Parkway on the north, Greenmount Avenue on the east, and I’m not too sure of the western boundary. But at any rate, it was something that one would associate pretty much with Charles Village.

Among the early needs that were, aside from coming together and talking about problems, early on was identified adult literacy and English as a second language as being a necessary training. Over time, that particular wonderful work and the Greater Homewood program and adult literacy and English as a second language became known citywide as a premier program, the largest number of volunteers involved and a very high-quality program.

Over time, the tail began to really wag the dog and many other issues were left alone which needed to be addressed. The Greater Homewood Community Corporation over time did not draw the financial backing that a more ambitious program would have required, nor did it draw the leadership that would have been needed for a more ambitious program.

So about five years ago, Ross came to me, representing Union Memorial Hospital at that time, and said, “Barbara, Greater Homewood comes to Hopkins as it comes to Union Memorial, usually with a crisis, looking for money, looking for volunteers, looking for leadership, and,
frankly, we at Hopkins are not going to do it on that basis anymore. How do you feel about it?”

I said, “Tell me more.”

He said, “Well, I think that there should be done a survey to show what the needs are in Greater Homewood, that they are far beyond literacy, that they include crime and drugs and failing schools and vacant housing and all that.”

I said, “Well, why don’t you do it?” He smiled at me, and I said, “Look, you’ve got the Institute for Policy Studies, you have the resources, you have the money. Why don’t you just go ahead and do it.” He looked at me, and I said, “Oh, yes, you’re looking for cover, Ross.”

He said, “Exactly.”

I said, “You’re worried that here is the 800-pound gorilla loose again, and that if Hopkins does a wonderful study, which it will do, it will be viewed with suspicion and hostility as here is Hopkins trying to get something on its own to benefit itself rather than the community,” and there is some of that still lurking.

He said, “Yes.” He said, “What I’d love to do is get the original three organizations,” Hopkins and Union Memorial, but there isn’t any Maryland Casualty anymore, so it’s down to the two of us. “Would you be willing to put up half the amount to pay for the study and to really become involved in it?”

I said, “Yes, I think that’s a wonderful idea, and clearly this is bigger than Hopkins and Union Memorial. It’s going to affect a much larger area.”

Ross said, “Yes, I don’t know how much larger, but let’s do the study.”

The Institute for Policy Studies had a wonderful sociologist, Patricia Fernandez-Kelly, who was available. She used her graduate students to do a spot analysis of what we called Greater
Homewood, and at her suggestion—she said, "I am finding that many of the problems which affect Greater Homewood do not begin at 25th Street; they go much farther south, really below North Avenue to Penn Station. And since that is where many of the problems that are affecting the quality of life are originating, I think we ought to define those as part of Greater Homewood."

She said, "To balance that out, I think we ought to go north of University Parkway or Cold Spring Lane to the city line, because there you will incorporate a number of the very well-educated, affluent people who have positions of power in city government or in the business community, who could bring those resources to bear to help the southern area." She said, interestingly, on the east and west, if you look at the present stable areas of Waverly and Hampden, you find that racially they are mere images of one another. One is probably 60-40 African-American—that would be Waverly—and Hampden is just the other way. So this is an interesting point of view from the sociological aspect.

So she said, "What I would suggest is that we recreate the boundaries and enlarge them and that we try to bring in the resources from the north." This is too simplified, but we included the north to try to help address some of the problems in the south.

At that point we had within about a year, year and a half, we had a very comprehensive analysis of data showing crime statistics, under-performing schools, vacant housing, the demographics, racial demographics, and the employment demographics. And at that point we thought we had a kind of a working plan.

When Ross, I believe, spoke to a good friend of his, Tim Armbruster, head of the Community Foundation and the Goldseker Foundation, and Tim said, "What you’ve done is fine so far, but," he said, "it will not get the buy-in that you need to really recreate a new Greater
Homewood Community Corporation, which is the way you’re tending. What you need is to take
the study out to the neighborhoods and to show what some of the recommendations are, but then
to ask people to react to that and to either throw out this study completely and put up their own
needs as they see them, or whatever they want to do, but to give it a free-flowing opportunity for
people to comment and even revise drastically what the scientific study shows.”

“Well,” we said, “That costs money and staff, and we don’t have that.”

Tim Armbruster said, “Well, Goldseker Foundation thinks this is important and we’re
going to support this.”

Again, I think it was the Hopkins connection. I know it was the Hopkins connection. I
know it was Ross Jones as an individual whom Tim Armbruster trusted and realized could bring
greater resources, and not only financial resources, but a moral commitment to the process. That
is how I see Ross Jones as being the moral kind of wellspring of all of this.

To make a long story short, Goldseker came up with the money and provided a staff
director from the Development Training Institute to create a series of community meetings over a
summer, which did indeed react to the study, and from that came about a plan which was adopted
by, the depending upon who’s counting, either 400 members of the community—I think a great
deal more were involved, and I tend to say it represents the thinking of 1,500. Be that as it may,
an awful lot of people participated, not only in large meetings, but in smaller subcommittees,
resulting in thirty-two recommendations which were boiled down to five critical areas and a $32
million-five-year master plan.

So, implementing that master plan at the moment there are volunteers and support from
everywhere. When I say everywhere, I mean volunteers from College of Notre Dame, Loyola, and
Hopkins leading the parade. Volunteers from the neighborhoods. Volunteers from the business communities, the small business communities of Waverly and Hampden. We don’t have an organization, I like to say, at Greater Homewood; we have a movement and we are going to transform this area over the next five years. We’re going to transform it in terms of environmental issues. We are cleaning up the Jones Falls.

We have an extraordinary—Japan has its twelve treasures in its artisans. The United States has its own treasure in a retired biophysics professor, Michael Beer, who has systematically been cleaning up the Jones Falls since his retirement. He is like the pied piper, he goes out and says, “Come with me on a weekend. Take a bag. We are going to clean up this wonderful resource,” and the people follow him. Michael is my favorite new person in the world. He’s everybody’s favorite new person.

But last fall we closed down the Jones Falls Expressway for four hours on a Sunday—this is really quite a story—so that families could take their bicycles or take their legs and simply walk on the Jones Falls and see what they never see as they are whizzing by in their automobile. To see the natural beauty of the greenery, to see the cleanliness of the water, not only did we close the Jones Falls, but we had kayaking on the water itself and we had rock-climbing led by Outward Bound along the sides.

At one point, before the day arrived on the nineteenth of September, I think it was, I said to Michael, “You know, I have staked my reputation, you have staked your reputation with the mayor and the head of the Department of Public Works, who really did not want to close down an interstate highway for anybody. Suppose nobody comes?”

Michael said, “Don’t worry about it. You worry about too many things. Don’t worry
about it.”

Well, we counted and there were over 6,600 people on that expressway, and they came from Annapolis, they came from all over the place. But what I loved was seeing my neighbors and especially some of young neighbors with this wonderful jury-built contraptions to take the whole family on a bicycle. So you would have a tandem bicycle tied to a small truck, a child’s truck, with the baby in the back, and you’d see them all strung out along, pedaling very carefully, but the whole family with their helmets on, looking around to see all of this. I’ve never seen such ingenuous contraptions for carting the family around in my life. Fortunately, the press captured it and we do have it on film.

But the environment—and that is one of our great successes and it was a great visual opportunity that brought Greater Homewood to the attention of a whole audience. What is not yet attention is something that is critical and is the most important mission of the Greater Homewood Community Corporation, and that is improvement of the elementary schools. Here, there will not be any one great moment a year when you can bring together people and celebrate and see something. This is a time-consuming lengthy process. It has taken the city schools probably thirty years to get into the very difficult position that they are in today, and it’s going to take a long time, probably a generation, to get out of there.

Warren: Do Hopkins students help with that process?

Bonnell: Do they help and does Hopkins help and does the name “Hopkins” being behind it make all the difference in the world. We have a wonderful example. In an area on Greenmount Avenue in the 2300 block, this is where Hopkins students are involved and where Bill Tiefenwirth in particular has been of great service to us.
Twenty-second and 23rd of Greenmount Avenue looks like Beirut. There are drug deals going down at all hours of the day and night. There has been for a time an outpost there, it is a Roman Catholic church, St. Anne’s Church. The sisters, in particular, there have tried to provide a haven for children after school to come and to be in a safe place until a single parent—and it’s practically all single parents, hopefully working—will come and pick them up, or somebody will come for them. At any rate, this is one of the worst areas in Greater Homewood.

One of the Greater Homewood board members said, “I have been head of the park department for the city. There’s an old rec center right across the street from St. Anne’s. I think I can get that opened, the city to open it—the city doesn’t have any money—if we can get some volunteers and some paint delivered.” Well, that was arranged, so the rec center got open, we got a part-time rec person to come back and be there. We got some battered old computers donated, and we were in business now to have a place open where volunteer students from Hopkins could come and tutor these children after school.

So this was a triumph in my mind, a real triumph, because it showed that there was not a single outpost, St. Anne’s Church with a group of nuns, and very few of them, but that the community was going to take back some of the things that the vacant houses and the drug dealers and all the rest had ruined. What I didn’t know was that one of the students who was tutoring and who was hoping to go to medical school—and you know that medical students are so focused, they have no time for anything other than their studies—well, here is a kid who was taking time and volunteering, which we heard about. We thought that was pretty remarkable. The other thing we knew was, he was very good with computers, I mean really exceptionally good. And later we found out that after the children had gone home, he would stay at the center and would type an e-
mail to Bill Gates.

Now, you understand students often do not understand all the restrictions that are out there that we adults know that make it impossible for anybody to reach Bill Gates, that make it impossible to do a lot of things. We adults can see those strictures pretty clearly and we operate within them and we do our thing. Well, not some students at Hopkins. And so this young man for a month would write an e-mail to Bill Gates every night saying, “These kids are terrific. I really like this young person, but this is a bunch of junk I’m trying to teach them on. This equipment is for the birds. I don’t know, it fails one day. I can restring with chewing gum and string, but this is a worthless bunch of junk. If we had some decent equipment, we could really do a terrific job with these kids.”

Well, finally at the end of a month or six weeks or whatever it was, there was a call from Seattle which said, “Mr. Gates has received your e-mail and you are to be the recipient of $100,000 of state-of-the-art equipment.”

Well, this was before the university had gotten this fantastic gift from Bill Gates, and I truly believe that Hopkins University came up on his screen because of this student who got the equipment. Now, you can imagine what that has done to that group of people. They’ve got state-of-the-art equipment. Because people are poor does not mean they are stupid.

The woman who is the president of the rec center is very active in her Barclay neighborhood, which, again, is in a very precarious location. She, herself, has worked at the National Security Agency for twenty-five years. This is a very stable, energetic, vital woman. She said, “Well, obviously if we have this kind of equipment, we can lease it out to other people. We can make some money. We can then plow it back into the center. We can expand it.” So they’re
on a roll, but it is the Hopkins students who made the different in that. No question about it.

I’ll tell you one other Hopkins story. We have at Greater Homewood enlarged our staff exponentially by recruiting young people who are called VISTA, Volunteers In Service To America. They are paid a stipend by the Corporation For National Service in Washington, D.C., through the AmeriCorps Program. Last year we recruited a student from Hopkins, Anand Das, who was interested in the whole welfare-to-work movement. His job with Greater Homewood has indeed been to work in this southern area to create job fairs and to bring people together who had not really considered going out into the work force, to consider it, to link them up and whatever.

But among the other things Anand did in terms of education, because education is so important to us, he belonged to a fraternity at Hopkins, and in my days fraternities were the four-letter word. [Laughter] Fraternities were bad. Fraternities were places where young men, in particular, drank excessively and did unspeakable things to the neighborhood. Well, times have changed, I gather, and fraternities are really wonderful outfits, at least the fraternities that I know about today.

Anand went out to a very troubled high school which is the feeder for the school to which our elementary school feeds students, so that is the connection. You get through our six elementary schools and you will frequently go to Northern High School. Northern High School had been through a very, very evil situation with disciplinary problems, and Anand’s idea was to go out and see if he could start a basketball program, initially to go out and organize basketball at Northern after school, because there were no programs.

And you would have each fraternity adopting a group of students so that you could get
really a rivalry going. But the point really wasn’t just to occupy these kids after classes were over, but to bring them to Hopkins to show them what a college environment was and what it would mean to you, where you could go other than doing drugs or sitting at home watching television after school, that there really was a great deal more to life, and that university campuses were not elitist and white, that indeed there was great diversity. So the idea was to bring these kids on to the Hopkins campus where they could have role models and where the fraternity brothers themselves were being role models.

Well, that program was initiated by a Hopkins graduate, young man, Anand Das. It was enormously successful. What you worry about with the VISTAs is after they leave, and they typically leave after one year, would it all fall apart. No, Anand has left the structure in place. But evidently, fraternities are going to continue this. I’m not sure how at Greater Homewood we’re going to do the staffing, but we will continue it. But this is a major contribution that a young man has made.

Now, as I understand it, Anand has received offers to go to graduate school, Stanford, Princeton, Yale. I’ve forgotten. He’s going to Princeton. My hunch is that we will hear of him in the future, that he will be an extraordinary leader, but he’s already shown that here with the one year active in the school system.

Warren: That’s a great story, especially saying positive things about fraternities.

Bonnell: I know. Can you believe it?

Warren: Where I come from, you don’t usually hear that.

Bonnell: I know. I know.

Warren: I want to ask you a general question. Do you think John Hopkins has a personality?
Can you say that? Can you say an institution has a personality?

**Bonnell:** Well, there are institutions that I know that have personalities. Well, they tend to be women’s institutions. Wellesley certainly has a personality. It is hard to describe it. It is feminine, it is energetic, it is global, it is positive, it is diverse, it is forward-thinking, it is leadership. I mean, I know the institution very well.

**Warren:** That’s how you see Wellesley?

**Bonnell:** That’s how I see Wellesley. Hopkins I— [Telephone rings.]

**Warren:** We’re going to switch to another tape.

[Begin Tape 1, Side 1]

**Warren:** This is tape two with Barbara Bonnell on the twelfth of July, 1999. I’m Mame Warren. We’re talking about the personality of Johns Hopkins.

**Bonnell:** Right. Well, Johns Hopkins is a relatively new university, and I think of it as perhaps not yet having a personality that is gelled. I tend to think of it perhaps as an adolescent. It shows great promise, but that will be a full-fledged personality perhaps in another twenty-five, fifty, a hundred years.

The different aspects of the growth of Johns Hopkins are the residing fact that it has a city campus and it is part of a complex organization which pushes in on it. Students do not have the luxury of concentrating solely in a quiet environment on what it is they’re studying. I think the urban environment adds a particular dimension to a student’s university experience that is not necessarily true in more of a suburban location.

The other aspect, or another aspect, which makes for great complex situation is the number of schools and the fact that traditionally arts and sciences and medicine and engineering
and on and on and on, public health, have really been separate entities and have been viewed as such. So that one came to Hopkins to the School of Medicine rather than to the university, and one’s allegiance was to the particular discipline that one came to.

That has got to change, and it has begun to change, I think, with Dr. Bill Richardson, who made a very concerted effort to try to make the different schools understand that they were interrelated and they were going to have to become increasing so in terms of financing in particular, and in terms of political outreach as well.

So I think this is a very interesting time for the university in that it is struggling to find its personality, to bring together all of these diverse strands so that in some years from now there will be a clarity about what the university is and does.

I think I would say that certainly it strives for excellence. It is global. I think that the whole new technology is going to shape what it is and how it is seen, and with Dr. Brody’s leadership we will be exploring the universe in a virtual way through computers that we have not yet done before. That, again, will bring us to a different audience than we have in the past. So it is a work in progress. It does stand for many good things and it does stand for a very wide range of things, but I’m not sure that I’m completely clear on its personality at the moment.

**Warren:** When you were here as a student, have you seen things change?

**Bonnell:** Yes.

**Warren:** Would you say it is a different place then than it is now?

**Bonnell:** Well, it’s still struggling with what I—well, its great strength was always the caliber of the faculty and the caliber of students. That I recognized as a young person. I felt that when I was here that there was not the diversity in terms of gender that I would have liked or perhaps
expected. I felt that there was not enough attention paid to the individual student as an undergraduate. I was somewhat shocked to come here and to find that the students whom I was teaching, especially the third year out, who were not so much the veterans, but were more of a mixture, some of them really floundered and did not seem to have a close relationship with the faculty members. That was totally foreign to my feeling of what an undergraduate education was.

I think Hopkins is getting a great deal better at this, but it still does not have the warmth towards the undergraduate body that it can have. I am thrilled to see the new building program going forward with a center for community, a community center. That will make a big difference, I think, to have something where students can come. I think the interfaith center is, again, another wonderful idea, to have a building. You really need a building where students can come and interact in a positive way.

But I feel that the undergraduate experience has not been all it might be for students, and I give as an example when I would come to alumni meetings or to reunions, there was a phrase, probably overdone, which said, “I got a wonderful education here at Hopkins, but I sure hated every minute of it.” And I think that is a tragic—I think it is overstated, but I think it’s tragic to have even one person say that. My own undergraduate experience was a very rigorous one, a very challenging one. I probably didn’t love every minute of it, but my overwhelming feeling is one of enormous loyalty and love of an institution. I don’t think that that can be said of my peers at the undergraduate level here.

There are a number of things which I have suggested to the administration, that you could have the best of the small independent colleges as an undergraduate experience here, if you would go and model what a Williams, what an Amherst, what a Wellesley, what a Vassar, what a
Goucher, how do they treat a group of young people whom they are not going to keep forever to go on to wonderful graduate studies, but how do you recruit them? Then how do you mentor them and then how do you celebrate them and how do you keep in touch with them? I come from a tradition where you are an alumna the first day you set foot as a freshmen on campus. You’re reminded of that allegiance for four years. When you graduate, you are reminded one more time and then all of the material for the rest of your life follows you.

Hopkins is getting much better with that, I might add, starting back at about 1989 with the creation of an alumni association, which is trying to cultivate that. I think we’re getting much better at it, but I think we have a way to go there. I will be thrilled in my lifetime to see an undergraduate class graduating and feeling the closeness to the university that many of the graduates of the smaller colleges feel.

Tell me again the question, Mame.

Warren: Oh, no, that was just fine. One question I didn’t ask you, which I should have a long time ago, and you certainly mentioned faculty members. You were here as a graduate student. Were there any people who made a big difference to you? You mentioned Dr. Moos.

Bonnell: Yes, Malcolm Moos.

Warren: Tell me about him as a person.

Bonnell: Oh, what a wonderful man. Let me tell you how I see him. He was a good writer. He was not a very good teacher. He was not a very good teacher because he didn’t spend the time in the classroom with his students. He was too busy out doing other things. His way of teaching, I now realize, was not in a classroom setting, it was to set you free into a community and then bring you back at the end to see that you’d gotten something out of the experience and were able to
write a proper report and put it in writing.

But above and beyond that, he really cared about his students and he placed his students in positions for their careers. Not everybody did that. I think some teachers were either unconscious, they were so focused on their own research, that when their graduate students went off, they simply replaced them with somebody else who could do work for the research and they were glad that the person had been here, but there really wasn’t a very close connection. Or I think in some areas there may have even been a bit of professional jealousy, and professors did not seem always to be as active in promoting their students.

Dr. Moos was exactly the opposite, and he would come very quietly and say to you, “I’ve heard there’s going to be an opening on the White House staff and I think, Steve, you might want to look into it. Here’s the person. I’m going to give you a letter of recommendation.”

So by the time Dr. Moos moved on from Hopkins to the Rockefeller Foundation—he went to the Ford Foundation. He wrote speeches for Nelson Rockefeller. He then went to the foundation world and—wham!—he wound up as president of his own alma mater, the University of Minnesota. And this was a glorious and triumphant moment. The only trouble was, it was the height of the Vietnam War protest, but I thought, boy, if anybody can handle it, you can. If you were seasoned at Hopkins with the veterans and the twenty-one-gun salute retort, you can handle anything. And he did. The University of Minnesota went on to even greater strength under his regime, and he was able to keep calm, where many other presidents were being besieged in their offices and resigning right and left.

He came back into my life after he’d retired and I was head of the advisory board of the University of Maryland School of Social Work. The president of the university, a wonderful man
named Johnny Toll, came to a School of Social Work board meeting and I did not, at that moment, know Dr. Toll very well and I had several introductions of him and I picked the middle one, which was not too inflammatory, nor was it too praiseworthy. It was kind of in the middle. After he had said some good things about the School of Social Work and the university, I ended with the more praiseworthy one, rather than the middle one or the rather negative one. [Laughter]

At the end of the meeting, he said, "I heard you talk about your Hopkins experience. I’m looking for somebody to do a long-range plan for the University of Maryland. Would you have any thoughts on that as a political scientist?"

I said, "Yes, as a matter of fact, I would. I have a professor who’s retired, whose name is Malcolm Moos, and I think he would be wonderful. He’s a political scientist by training, but he’s also been president of a major university." I said, "I know a little bit about the University of Maryland from this work that I had done, The Campus and the State."

He said, "Can you put me in touch with him?"

I said, "Yes, I can," and the rest is history.

So Malcolm Moos then came East, had an office down in Adelphi, Maryland, and we would talk from time to time and have a really kind of a nice relationship. So Malcolm Moos, to me, embodied the finest in human character. He was a very intelligent man, but he was a very caring man, and he cared certainly about scholarship, certainly about administration, but he really cared about his students and we know that, and he looked after us and we were grateful. Formative influence, I think.

Warren: Sounds like it. Sounds like it. How has Johns Hopkins changed you?

Bonnell: The immediate, I suppose, and compelling answer is that at Johns Hopkins I realized I
was not going to have a career in international relations or foreign affairs, and that there was nothing wrong with a career in local government and in doing community work. And I don’t think I would have had that feeling if it had not been for the fact that Malcolm Moos insisted that I do work in precinct organization or that I saw through his class in politics that there was great value in doing things at the local level.

So because I had had the experience at Hopkins, I was asked to work at the Greater Baltimore Committee for the business community to organize the first bond issue, which led to the redevelopment of downtown Baltimore. It was the resume which said, “She has worked as a graduate student with Malcolm Moos in Republican party politics,” that was really the fact that brought me to the attention of the Greater Baltimore Committee.

The executive director at that time was a very active Democrat and a man, and I think he felt that it would be useful to have someone who had had training in the Republican party, and who also was accustomed to getting up at all hours of the day and night, and going to meetings at all hours of the day and night, and doing an organizational structure based on competing personalities.

So to the extent that Malcolm Moos opened the whole world of local politics to me here at Hopkins, that has meant that I’ve had a very rich and wonderful professional life, first helping to rebuild downtown and now helping to rebuild this community around Hopkins itself. I think I am employing many of the skills that I first learned about here.

**Warren:** Well, you did get a Hopkins education, didn’t you? You have benefitted from it.

Well, what haven’t I asked you? What would you like to say here that we haven’t talked about?
Bonnell: I suppose that Hopkins will always understand its history as an institution in the European model that is founded on graduate study. I hope that it will take that model and perfect it, but I hope it will try to keep on improving and perfecting the undergraduate model, because I feel that there is still work to be done there. I feel that when the undergraduate, every undergraduate as an individual, feels worthy and cherished and fostered, that then Hopkins will have really gone beyond its original mission, to be the finest in graduate education, but will be the finest in undergraduate education as well. I think we’re well on our way, but I think there is still some work to be done there. Of course, now the world is our campus, so that making the individual undergraduate student at Homewood feel welcome will be spreading all across the world, and that really is a challenge when you get into the different cultures and the whole different governmental structures. So I know that graduate education always must remain the first mission and first goal, but I think that there’s value in supporting it through the strength in the undergraduate, as well.

And, of course, this new dimension that Hopkins is exercising both at Homewood and at East Baltimore of becoming the community leader is a thrilling one. Hopkins is now the major employer in Baltimore City, and it recognizes what that means. So do all the political forces. So the opportunity for Hopkins to really apply its knowledge and its students and its faculty to the laboratory right at its front door, namely its community, I think offers enormous promise both to the university and certainly for the community.

Warren: Bravo. Well said. What a conclusion. Hire this woman. [Laughter]

Bonnell: Yes, hire this woman. [Laughter]

Warren: Thank you, Barbara. [End of interview]