



EAST-WEST CENTER
COLLABORATION • EXPERTISE • LEADERSHIP



EAST-WEST CENTER ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

Allen Clark Interview Narrative

2-22-2006 interview in Honolulu, Hawaii

Please cite as: Allen Clark, interview by Terese Leber, February 22, 2006, interview narrative, East-West Center Oral History Project Collection, East-West Center, Honolulu Hawaii.

These narratives, which reflect interviewees' personal perceptions, opinions, and memories, may contain errors of fact. They do not reflect positions or versions of history officially approved by the East-West Center.

The **East-West Center Oral History Project** strives to capture the Center's first 50 years as seen through the eyes of staff, alumni, and supporters who have contributed to its growth.

Co-coordinators: Terese Leber and Phyllis Tabusa

Narratives Editor: Susan Yim Griffin

Copyright East-West Center, 2007.

Allen Clark

2-23-2006 interview in Honolulu, Hawaii

Personal Background

I'm actually a farm boy from Iowa. I'm one of four children but I'm the only one that ever left home, seriously -- my two brothers live within three blocks of my folks. And my sister lives within about 10 miles and I'm in Hawai'i, so that's going to tell you something about me. But by background, I basically grew up and was always interested in geology.

So I became a geologist at Iowa State University and then migrated out to the University of Idaho where I worked on my master's and Ph.D. I finally graduated out of there in 1966. Prior to that time, I grew up building bridges with my father before I went off to college and started working in the geologic profession. The big seminal event in my life I guess was in 1966 when I went to work for the U.S. Geological Survey.

And I went to work with them in the Alaskan branch. So, I had this really tough duty. I lived in Menlo Park, California. I worked in Alaska during the summer and then I came back to Menlo Park for the winter, but I spent the winter primarily working in the Gulf Coast on marine geology.

It really wasn't what you call a hardship life. So I was with the survey in Menlo Park for about seven years and then I was transferred back to Washington, D.C. At that point in time, I took over and started up something called the Office of Resource Analysis. And it was a very auspicious time because the energy crisis had just hit for the first time and my group was really the one that was responsible for making the estimates for worldwide

resources of oil and gas. And that has some applicability to why I ultimately ended up at the East-West Center.

Anyway, after I had gone back to Washington and set up the Office of Resource Analysis, I was in international geology for about eight years. During that time I had another one of those very difficult posts in that my job was basically to travel anywhere in the world I wanted to go -- to set up projects in geology for the U.S. Geological Survey. So that's basically how I started off on my sort of travels around the world.

I went to just about every place you can imagine and, I think by actual count -- at least by my secretary at that time and my secretary now, Lillian Shimoda -- I guess I've been to every country in the world except perhaps four or five. A large part of that had to do with the fact that when I was in the Survey, I really had a license to go anywhere I wanted to go. So I did, and that was it for my activities with the U.S. Geological Survey for the better part of about 16 years.

Life Before EWC

Austria to EWC

In 1980 I resigned from the Survey when I was asked by the OPEC Fund to take a job in Vienna, Austria. That job was to set up an institute called the International Institute for Resource Development.

This was really because there had been such a negative on developing countries from high oil prices leading up to that time. As a result, the OPEC Fund and others were trying to set up an institute that would begin to go back into these countries and develop resources that could be used for economic development.

I was in Vienna, Austria, for three years. Just prior to my leaving the Survey and going to Vienna, however, Dr. Harrison Brown, then the director of the *[East-West] Center's Resources Institute [Resource Systems Institute]* -- Harrison asked me if the U.S. Geological Survey would assist in putting a specialist out here in resources.

It just so happened that at that time, the chief geologist of the U.S. Geological Survey, Dick Sheldon, had just stepped down from his post and was looking for a place to take a sabbatical; he thought Hawai'i would be a pretty nice place to go.

Anyway, that's how I originally got associated with the East-West Center, through sending Dick Sheldon out here for four years to work, and how I met Harrison Brown and became familiar with the Resources Institute *[Resource Systems Institute]*. So, when I left the Survey and went off to Vienna, Dick Sheldon was still working here at the East-West Center.

Life at EWC

Resource Systems Institute (RSI), Early to Mid-1980s

I actually ended up at the East-West Center because Harrison Brown had made the mistake at one time of saying to me something to the effect that "if you ever need a job just stop by, and I'll have one for you," and I said OK. My contract with OPEC was for three years and when my contract was up, I was actually going to go to work for the UNDP in Indonesia but I had about a nine-month hiatus before the position began. So, I passed through Hawai'i and I said to Harrison Brown that I was going to take him up on his offer for about nine months. That's actually how I ended up at the East-West Center: I was sort of transitioning through for nine months.

That was in 1982. I left the Survey in '79 and I went to Vienna, Austria for three years and then I came out here. Supposedly I was transiting at the time.

There had been established at that point in time within the Resources Institute [*Resource Systems Institute*] two groups besides the Economics Group. There was a Minerals Group and an Energy Group. And so I came out here basically to work in the Minerals Group, but I had overlapped with Fereidun Fesharaki and others in Energy so I sort of ended up going back and forth across those two programs.

That's a quick review of how I ended up at the East-West Center and in the Minerals Group.

I should note that at that point in time Harrison Brown had, right as I was being hired, retired and Dr. Seiji Naya took his place. [*1982-Harrison Brown, 1983-John Bardach as acting director, 1984-Seiji Naya*] Also, at that time the Resources Institute was renamed the Economics and Politics Institute [*RSI remained until 1992; there was a Program on International Economics and Politics*]. Seiji was primarily an economist but had inherited this group of minerals and energy specialists. He basically wanted to have somebody who would look after what was going on in those two groups. So that's how I became the assistant director of the Resources Program [*Resource Systems Institute*]. I had that job for about five years while Seiji [*Naya*] was the director.

Pacific Disaster Center (PDC)

Anyway, that's how I got into the East-West Center. Started off in Minerals and Energy and then the rest is sort of this long history of doing all sorts of other things with the East-West Center but basically went from the Minerals and Energy [*group*] in the Resources Program, then the Resources Program morphed into Politics and Security

[1999] and so I went along into the Politics and Security group. There I started working primarily on a comparative analysis of poverty alleviation programs. I suppose that may seem like sort of a strange switch but actually, when you look at it, a lot of the problems that are associated with large-scale resource development projects, whether they be minerals, energy, forestry or whatever, the biggest single problems are that the revenues generated from these activities never really accrue to the people that are most impacted by those activities or are used for the public good such as reducing poverty. So it wasn't a great stretch. It was just a sort of a lateral transition if you will, from kind of the technical side of things to the social side of things.

So I found myself very happily engaged in looking at the comparative analysis of poverty alleviation programs when Charles Morrison [*EWC President*] walked in one day and said that the EWC was thinking about bidding on an RFP to take over the management of something called the Pacific Disaster Center and asked if I would help put together a proposal to do that.

So basically a core group of us -- myself, Ralph Carvalho and Eileen Shea -- put together the required proposal and the end result was that the East-West Center became the managing partner of the Pacific Disaster Center. That was a reasonably good contract for the East-West Center.

We started in November of 2001. It was about a \$7 million-a-year program. The total value of the activity was about US\$35 million over five years.

That's basically what happened and how I ended up getting involved with PDC. After about a year into the effort of managing the PDC, Charles decided there should be a

change in the leadership and he asked if I would take over as the director of the PDC, sort of a “take one for the team” kind of thing.

That’s how I ended up being [*executive director*] at the Pacific Disaster Center where I will be until the end of December 2006. The contract comes to an end at that time and then it will be re-bid.

But I think that as soon as they make a decision on the re-bid that we will immediately begin to look for a new executive director as I intend to return back to doing what I was doing before. Some day I plan on retiring but somebody told me one time, if you find a job you really like, you never have to work the rest of your life. So I don’t really see any reason for retiring until I get to the point where I’m too senile to do anything. I suspect that is being debated already in some quarters.

Best Memories/Downsides

I think I would go back to the statement I just made. And that is that if you find a job you really like, you never have to work the rest of your life and I think my best memory is -- I found that job here. I have been very fortunate in being able to do a very, very wide variety of things and so I think probably my best memory of the whole organization would simply be the opportunity it gave me to do all of the very interesting things that I was able to do here. That’s kind of the overarching answer to your question.

I think the things we’ve been able to do here were/are unique: We were amongst the first people to actually be able to go into China and work on resource issues at a time when few Westerners had been able to work there for decades. That was an unprecedented opportunity to see a country that was just emerging and there were all kinds of problems, all kinds of potential. So, that was certainly one of the highlights of being here.

I think the other thing that is particularly -- at least in my mind -- outstanding goes back to the association with people and in particular the students and the student programs here. I had the opportunity to work with a lot of the students. I mean, actually work on projects and that's been particularly rewarding at least from my perspective. One would hope that they got something out of it as well. I always had a rule that anybody who worked with me on a project always got one publication at least. That's another highlight of the time here.

Additionally, there's a whole lot of little things that happened as you go along working in the region and things you were able to do.

The downsides to the activities have been minimal and haven't been many. On the downside, the kinds of things you would normally think such as the bureaucracy, administration, etc., have on occasion been a bit irritating but never inhibiting in terms of what I wanted to do. So I don't have those kinds of complaints.

I think the things that have bothered me most in the Center are the things that we haven't done. For example, I think one of the biggest single gaps in our program is in the area of water resources. They are absolutely vital to the region and yet we basically do not have a capacity to do anything in that particular area. I think the other thing that is now a bit of a negative, primarily for the younger research staff, is that there is not a critical mass of people in their areas of expertise that can/will sort of mentor them. I think it's a bit of a disservice to have them here for an extended period of time when they haven't been able to grow professionally as much as they probably should have. But as far as just flat out negative, something that just drove you right over the top -- I haven't yet experienced that.

I've been very fortunate. Every place I've ever worked I've had nothing but total support and the things that bothered me probably were things that shouldn't have bothered me anyway.

Institutional Transitions

Evolution of Institutes

I've always thought of organizations as sort of living and evolving entities that -- as you look back at them and you ask why did it grow to be what it grew up to be? I think that part of this has to be -- keeping in mind that my association with the Center really began in about 1978.

So I am not familiar with the really early initiating history of the EWC. During my time a couple of things have impressed me.

First, the name out front: a Center for Cultural and Technological [*technical*] Interchange really sums up the essence of how the Center was supposed to evolve, and has seemed to evolve and serve the region. The EWC began in a period right after the Second World War when many, if not most Asia nations were emerging from primarily feudal societies. Appropriately, if the region were to grow and the nations develop, this would have to occur through cultural and technological interchange. I really believe that the people who focused on those two things were very, very visionary, and saw that we had to have a better understanding of the cultural dynamics of Asian nations and at the same time, there was the recognition of a substantial technological gap with the Western world. In order for Asia to grow there was a need to transfer Western technology but within the cultural context of Asia nations. So it fit into a very necessary niche and it began to do that.

But how it did it is important. The thing that impressed me most was, if I understand the Center's history, that it really started off with a significant education component. Yes, but backed up with a strong research program initially in the area of population growth and technology and how they would impact overall development.

Then, I think it began its evolutionary history around those two paths and their convergence. The population path led you to understand that -- you had to know more about the culture and how you communicate with those populations. And at the same time there came the realization that the sustaining of these populations was a critical issue.

The initial population and technology focus evolved. The first led to the development of the culture and communications institutes [*Culture Learning Institute and Communications Institute*] and the other led to the development of the Food Institute – the former largely a social path and the latter was largely a technological path. The critical point here is that the Center, and its programs, evolved to meet the needs of the regions – as defined by the region. This evolutionary development continued with the Food Institute ultimately being replaced by the Resources Institute and the Environment Institute [*Resource Systems Institute and Environment and Policy Institute*]. This evolution was in response to the growth of the region and the increasing importance of natural resources and the environment.

So in that sense, I think the Center evolved by essentially morphing into those areas of most importance to the development of the region as it grew – not as pre-determined basic building blocks but through osmosis and response to the region's needs. For example, the Food Institute became the Resources Institute [*Resource Systems Institute*]

when the Center realized it wasn't just an issue of food but was an issue of fertilizer minerals, such as potash, that was associated with food generation. This in turn was a technological issue that had to be resolved.

Subsequently the Food Institute became the Resources Institute [*Resource Systems Institute*] headed by Harrison Brown, previously a nuclear physicist on the Manhattan Project, of all things.

So here you have a nuclear physicist coming in but his real concern was really with respect to the issues of social well-being in the region and how to build the region in such a way that you could feed everyone, you could protect the environment and have technological growth. In essence you had an extraordinarily talented technical person who had an amazing, and I think broad, social agenda that he was trying to bring to improve the region through using all of this technology. At the same time the population, culture and communications activities were providing a common basis for social development. So these two parallel tracks merged very nicely and then there were some common grounds and environment was one of them that went across both of these. And so, as a result of this response to need, evolution.

The Center has been a key player in all aspects of the region, and in particular in Southeast Asia which has become a real economic power. Along with this rapid economic growth came the realization that the Center had to begin to play a larger role in the economic and political arena. As a result you saw the Resources Institute [*Resource Systems Institute*] merge into something which kept technology and resources as a core but with an increasing emphasis on economics, politics and security. So you had this combination where the technology sort of became a supporting pillar underneath it.

As the Center moved on to a greater emphasis on politics and security, the Population Institute expanded its training capabilities and began to focus more on specific population-related issues in overall regional development.

And became the preeminent population research and training center that it still is to this day.

Even more recently, you see some of the more important issues that they're beginning to look at are health-related issues: HIV/AIDS and the issue of an aging Asia and these sorts of things. All this is happening while the politics and security activity of the Research Program is beginning to look at things like dispute resolution, human rights and these kinds of things.

Ongoing Evolution/Focus of Research

So as you go along with this, the Center has evolved into what it is today simply by being responsive to the growth of the region and the needs of the region, and I don't know that it predetermined these in any way. But it does show that as the region developed, the East-West Center was capable of developing along with it and staying pretty much on the front edge of where the new needs are for these things and still retaining the core. So it's been an interesting growth of this amoeba, if you will, that's been incorporating all these things. By and large, I think it stays pretty much on focus to what the real needs in the region are. So that's how it came about.

Now do we want to give some credit to some great administrative genius who saw all this? Probably not. No offense to anyone.

But I do think that the growth and the direction of the Center have been determined by the research agenda, which was able to recognize and interface with trends in the region.

And when it became obvious that these were important trends and issues we should be doing something about, people here then were both flexible enough and quick enough to say, “Yeah, that’s right. Let’s go do this.” And so that’s sort of how we’ve evolved and we continue to evolve.

Environmental Issues/Future Issues

If you look at the sort of scenario of how many of the things we’re doing now become core activities, I think that we’re not going to get away from the environmental issue. Certainly, this is going to become a bigger and bigger issue in terms of issues related to global warming, water security and those types of things. I go back to what I said earlier about one of my frustrations. I think water is an area where we’re going to have to really do something if we’re going to be able to meet some of the needs out there that tie into all these other things. So I think there will be increasing environmental concerns and of course, population-related issues as well as security issues -- in the broadest sense -- are always going to be an issue. And so they’ll always be dealing with these and their manifestations.

The other side out here is I think that the Center probably is going to have to begin to look at the impacts of the new communication technologies, availabilities and impacts. This is something we were actually a leader in for awhile. As the whole field kind of stabilized prior to the internet explosion, I think appropriately, we didn’t emphasize it as much as we had. But I think now it’s starting to come out again and I think we’re beginning to look at some of these issues such as technology parks and information economics, but I think this will become a bigger and bigger issue. We’ll have to begin to go back to our roots.

I think a lot of the other issues are more ephemeral and will come and go and we'll respond to those as we go along.

The other thing is that I think a lot of the social dynamics of our societies are going to have to be looked at in much more detail. So we're going to have to go back and start dealing with those kinds of issues because you've got -- for better or worse -- the emergence of religious, economic, resource, environmental and security issues over which there is a significant difference of opinion throughout the region.

I think you're looking at evolving trends that are much broader, much less specific. You have to look at a much more general picture of what's happening and get a better grasp on that. I wouldn't say that's something we haven't been good at doing but our real expertise is going down in detail on an individual effort. I think we're going to have to become much broader in terms of how we look at these things and so many of our, sort of, internally stove-piped activities are going to have to start going across the spectrum if we're going to be efficient in the future.

Victor Li's Presidency

I think that there had to be some very good leadership early on to even start the Center -- and get it going. So the founding fathers and the activities they did -- they put together an incredible institution. In some ways it's a bit like the Constitution, you know. It has fundamental principles, but it's how they get interpreted that's the important thing. The East-West Center really is remarkable in that sense. So whoever did it, more credit to them.

I came here with Victor Li [1981-1989]. He was the first president [that I knew]. When Victor was here, I think that one of his best attributes was simply that he was able to go

out into the region and bring Asia into the Center in the context of an Asian perspective – much more so than a lot of the presidents had been able to do.

I think he had extraordinary networking skills and I think he was obviously very articulate and could present the Center in a positive way. I think he probably, in terms of solidifying the Center in the region, he had a lot to do with that. So I would give him high marks for that. Subsequent presidents, until the selection of Charles Morrison, were more or less in a care-taking mode for much of the time they were here. So I don't have a positive or negative with that. I just think that they did their job. We were, we were kind of going along at a fairly even keel at that point and then we hit this major hiccup in the middle of the 1990s with the budget cut, downsizing and the whole thing.

In a way it was kind of a crippling blow for the Center. It could be argued that there was some upside to it and we could talk about that but I think during that point of time we really had more or less a survival mentality for the Center. The fact that it exists today is certainly a credit to people during that period of time. But we didn't, couldn't really advance very much during that period and so the Center was kind of in this hiatus, if you will.

Charles Morrison's Presidency

My personal opinion is -- and I don't have to worry about job security -- but I think that a real shot in the arm for the Center came when Charles took over. Charles [Morrison] had a very good vision of where he thought the Center ought to go and I think he was able to articulate that very effectively. And more importantly than anything else, he was -- and probably is, as far as I know -- the best president we've had in terms of working on the Hill, working with the people who really give us our money. Washington, D.C.

Working with the senators, both sides, and also liaising with the Department of State. Because of his background, basically a political scientist and a very good one, and having spent a lot of time working on the Hill, he knew a lot of the people. He knew how the system worked and he understood how budgets are made and not made, so I think he's been very effective in being able to increase our budget, which he has done significantly. The other thing is, I think he's been able to sort of pick up on the hot-button issues as they come along and bring the Center along on some of those. Now that's somewhat different than what I've been talking about before in which these things were more evolutionary. I think what we're looking at now are a lot of the hot-button issues, not so much the evolutionary issues but ultimately they may be one and the same. So there has been that bit of a change, and that's probably what's required at the present time because of the nature of the funding process and earmarks and all the rest of this. So there's nothing wrong with that but it is one of the areas I think that -- is somewhat distorting to this evolutionary trend. But it's short term, so the long-term effect I don't think will have much impact.

That's a logical transition but it is a little bit more of a functional, I think, change in how we view things. Keep in mind, also during that period when the budget was cut, we adopted somewhat of a different philosophy for the first time. In particular with respect to the issue of actually bringing in money.

Accountability was one of the terms. That wasn't a word I heard very often from some of the people here. But no, it really was that many of the people here, the researchers in particular, had a different view of their role and were loath to change the kinds of work they did. Specifically, all they were really being asked to do was to go out and bring in

money, a certain proportion of their salary. It wasn't mandatory but it was highly desirable and so I think for the first time an emphasis on bringing in outside money became somewhat ingrained in the culture.

Not that we weren't bringing in money before. We were, but it raised a personal accountability issue that hadn't been there before. Overall, it certainly wasn't onerous on anybody, but on the other hand, it did bring in different kinds of programs than those that we were working on before.

I was, as you know, probably one of those that it didn't bother me much one way or the other. There was always a ready source of money out there. We just hadn't gone after those kinds of projects, but with that change it was a matter of saying, OK, well, we'll go out there. And so we began doing a whole series of projects, at least in my group, with respect to the Asian Development Bank.

So that, that was kind of a change particularly in terms of emphasis. We also began focusing more on increased funding from agencies such as the U.S. Trade and Development Agency and the United Nations.

There was a core of people who said we shouldn't be doing this sort of thing. Well, we shouldn't be going out and just doing contracts. The contracts really weren't contributing to science and the rest of it.

There are lots of arguments with that. We don't need to go into it but I think that was a particularly difficult period of time in the Center's history and we had to deal with that.

Overall, I believe the total number of people who were not trying was very small.

Perhaps very vocal, but very small, and I think by and large, the Center weathered that particular issue very well. Today I think there is a very balanced approach to how we go

about looking for grants and money and opportunities. There was never any great distortion of the Center's mission. That simply did not occur, and that's a tribute both to the administration and the people.

Opportunities for Multidisciplinary Work

Well, I've toyed with the idea of retiring, but I always come back and ask myself the same question. If I retired what would I do? I most likely would do the same thing I'm doing now. I would just do it as a consultant.

And so the question would be why would I want to do that?

You certainly have restrictions on what you can do and when and how you have to do them here as well. But if you're out there and you're a consultant, you're at the beck-and-call of whoever wants to have something and within their time-frame – which is almost always short -- so the other parts of your life sort of go on hold.

Here you have to be responsive but you can marry those activities in such a way that they're not totally disruptive. The other thing is that for many of the things that I like to do, which are primarily multidisciplinary, those are not the kinds of things that most people want to pay for.

They want to pay for special projects on special points to what their needs are and that's fine, I understand that and am perfectly willing to do that. On the other hand, that's not what really drives me. I would prefer to work on something that has technical, social and cultural components and has some derivative benefits to it. It doesn't have to have a finite product in the sense of answering a specific question. It may raise as many as it answers so that is a very good environment to work in. Other than that, if I ever really, really retired, the only other things that I'm really interested in are primarily

photography, woodworking and building things. So I would probably spend a lot of time going out and making a pest out of myself taking pictures.

Secretary Extraordinaire, Lil Shimoda / Merit Pay

I have been in this organization and I've said it before and I say it again: I've been blessed by having probably the best secretary anybody could ever have in this business. I am not a particularly well-organized individual and so somebody who can keep me on track and keep a certain amount of my life organized -- is absolutely essential to me. She [*Lil Shimoda*] has been the secretary here for me for about 23 years and much of my success is directly attributable to her support.

It's a special tribute to her that she could put up with me for that long, but I think the other thing is that she's not really just a secretary. One of her greatest assets is that she is constantly learning new capabilities, particularly computer skills, has an incredible motivation to do high quality work, undertakes independent research and verification on issues and above all is organized -- if you want to be organized, she is the lady to organize you. She could organize cats and that's tough to do.

Most importantly is that for over 20 years -- she's always been there. It doesn't make any difference whether it's 8:00 to 5:00 or if it's Saturday, Sunday. Whatever needs to be done gets done. Also, when you travel as much as I do, you really have to have somebody who can insure continuity of everything that goes on back here: Either it is taken care of or gets transferred to you and that's something that she's absolutely indispensable in terms of doing.

That is her personal initiative and a perfect reflection of her capability and value to the Center -- specifically in terms of computer technology and mentoring others. She was

doing things with computer graphics before most people even knew there were computer graphics. I'm reasonably sure that the first PowerPoints that were produced here in the Center were produced by her. She's been extremely alert to those kinds of things and not just learning how to run them but actually understanding them. So as you would well know, I mean, the number of people she's actually trained in these things at the Center has been enormous. I know for a fact that most people who have real problems come to her to find out how to resolve them.

As an example, we were doing PowerPoints a couple of years before anybody else was. In fact, the real problem was we couldn't find a projector for PowerPoints, you know. And that also gives you some idea of how much use there was of the technology at that time. You cannot overestimate the value of somebody who just stays absolutely steady and pleasant all the time dealing with all kinds of stuff -- that basically is her attribute. She is just truly outstanding.

Oh, something I don't like about the Center. Now that you mention it, and I have been on this horse for a very long time. I do not like the way the Center pays its exceptional secretaries.

We have some of the best secretaries in the world and I believe that many of the secretaries in this building ought to be at least one if not two grade levels higher than they are at the present time.

Overall we have the most competent group of secretaries and in my opinion they are underpaid. I really believe this and I've gone through this innumerable times and I continue to scream and holler about it. Some of the most capable secretaries I've ever seen are here and they're here because they love the work and they love the organization.

Unfortunately I think we take advantage of that dedication and there ought to be a way to change the whole scale or to more adequately compensate the truly exceptional secretaries.

We used to have that [*Merit awards, called Makana Awards*] and we all know what happened to that system. There should be one that we could put in place and we would be able to handle that.

EWC's Impact

Outreach to Students and Community

Well, I'm sure that I've frustrated an enormous number of people at the Center. I've infuriated a limited number but some -- I would like to think that I positively impacted on some along the way as well. You know, that's always hard to say.

But I do think there was a period in time in the late '80s to the mid '90s when we actually had a very interactive and positive program with the students. From that period of time, I still get all kinds of visits and cards and notes from those people, and I think that was a positive impact, a very strong positive impact on people.

We don't quite have that now, for a variety of reasons, particularly in terms of some of our abilities to bring in younger people to work with us on programs. I think we had several of those and I think that was a very positive impact on those people as well.

So I'd like to think that, through a lot of the things we've done with the schools, you know, the children and these sorts of things that that's had a positive impact. I was dragging around my dinosaur eggs -- you know, for a while to -- I think I made about every school on Oahu and everybody wanted to see the dinosaur eggs. That's not a big deal but on the other hand I think it has a positive impact.

I got them in Mongolia. We showed them up here [*at the Center*] a couple times and then people kept coming back and asking if we could go here and there. For a period of almost a year I dragged the eggs around.

And I think that I had other positive impacts in terms of getting people interested in science and research. You can't always measure those things but I think in general you can point to a lot of things that have been positive impacts.