

## **Please Note**

**This oral history transcript has been divided into two parts. The first part documents the presidency of John Kemeny and is open to the public. The second part documents the presidencies of David McLaughlin and James Freedman and will be open to the public in 2023.**

**This is part one.**

**Jeffrey P. Hart '51**  
**Professor of English Emeritus**

An Interview Conducted by

Jane Carroll

July 15, 1997

July 18, 1997

Special Collections  
Dartmouth College  
Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: Jeffrey Hart '51  
INTERVIEWED BY: Jane Carroll  
PLACE: Baker Library  
Hanover, New Hampshire  
DATE: July 15, 1997

CARROLL: Today is July 15, 1997, and I am speaking with Jeffrey Hart, Class of '51 and Professor of English, Emeritus. I am curious how you came to choose Dartmouth as the institution for undergraduate learning.

HART: It was chosen for me. My father went to Dartmouth, Class of 1921 [Clifford F. Brown '21]. Then he went to Columbia School of Architecture and got his Bachelor of Architecture there; but he was extremely loyal to Dartmouth and I felt that his four years at Dartmouth were probably the happiest of his life. He always seemed to be seriously connected with Dartmouth and I was, as a matter of fact, registered or enrolled in the Class of whatever, enrolled at Dartmouth when I was born. So I grew up understanding that I would go to Dartmouth. However there was a bump in that road since I got heavily involved with junior competitive tennis and felt that I probably would like to go to Stanford. His position was that I could go to Stanford. That would be fine, but he wouldn't pay for it. [Laughter] I could go to Dartmouth or I could go to Harvard if I got a scholarship. I did get some kind of tuition break at Dartmouth and that was the best deal, and I was perfectly happy to go to Dartmouth.

CARROLL: Did you play tennis here, then?

HART: Yes. I played on the freshman team and then played varsity tennis. Then I left Dartmouth and took a year off. I worked

for a publisher in New York. Dual, Sloan and Pearce and began writing fiction and, as a matter of fact, decided that I would not continue with college education because, with the exception of two or three professors, [Thomas] Tom Vance in English and [Eugen] Rosenstock-Huessy in philosophy and one or two others, I felt that I was not learning anything much. I recall a course on the novel where much of the time was taken up by putting up plot diagrams on the blackboard. After all, if you had read the novel, you didn't need to have the plot diagrammed. It was like putting a "Hi Marx" outline up there.

So one day I sat down and said, at the end of sophomore year, "Is it worth it?" I was perfectly happy with the environment and had decided "No." If I wanted to write, I would go back to New York and then do that. Why not learn to write by writing? So I worked for Dual, Sloan and Pearce as a sort of office boy and junior editor. A jack of all trades. Then I was persuaded...one step back...as connected with the publisher, I went to book parties and that kind of thing and met people from Columbia who said "Why aren't you in college?" And I said exactly what I have said to you. So they said "Give Columbia College a chance." I did and that worked out very well. The professors were...I suspect that Columbia had the best English Department in the country from the end of the war...probably before the war... but at least from the end of the war through about 1965, '68, in there, when people retired and then it changed. But it certainly was a very good department when I was there and when I taught there.

CARROLL: You actually ended up getting your degree from Columbia.

HART: Class of '52 and Ph.D.

CARROLL: From there, as well?

HART: Yes.

CARROLL: What I am curious is what Dartmouth was like when you arrived in '47, which is really the post-war years. Was it a different place than it had been and turned out to be?

HART: Yes. I think this was probably true of all colleges at the time. Dartmouth was very heavily veterans and one of my roommates had run a small aircraft carrier in the Pacific War...the kind of ship that was basically just slapping flight decks on tankers and sending them out. On this kind of carrier, it was pretty easy to take off, but landing on them was another question. So...Ed Kelly, his name was, had come back. He must have been in his late twenties anyway and I was seventeen. So I was surrounded by people who were much older and had a totally different kind of experience.

CARROLL: Did that influence you at all in your feel for the College or how you responded to it?

HART: Well, it did, I think. In the first place, Dartmouth, not only because of the veterans, but I felt it was extremely violent. They had an outfit called...I forget what it was called. We can fill that in...but it was an organization designed to enforce hazing rules. Wearing your beanie, carrying luggage for upper class men...multiple things that you had to do. And, if you didn't, you could be pretty seriously abused. Now I think what killed that, although it was very much alive in my freshman year, was the veterans. I mean, they were not going to be hazed. They were not going to carry anybody's luggage. They were, by the way, not going to observe parietals rules with women in the rooms, so that demolished that. It was simply unenforceable. So the College was in a certain flux then, but it was pretty, I thought, rough.

CARROLL: Had you joined a fraternity?

HART: No. I was tending to leave most of the time. [Laughter]

CARROLL: In preparation. Had you participated in the Great Issues Course or had you left before you could participate?

HART: I think it was going. It was in its sort of decadence, I think. It got off to a...I may be wrong on this. I think maybe when I came back to teach at Dartmouth, it had begun to fizzle. Back then I think they did have people like Reinhold Niebuhr, Paul Tillich or sort of luminaries like Eleanor Roosevelt or William O. Douglas, the Supreme Court Justice...people who were worth seeing. But, by the time I came back to teach at

Dartmouth, my impression was that it had lost its original inspiration. They were listening to the police chief of Concord, New Hampshire or something like that. The seniors got impatient.

CARROLL: Was [President John Sloan Dickey '29] Mr. Dickey a presence on campus?

HART: Very much.

CARROLL: What were your impressions of him when you were an undergraduate?

HART: Very favorable. He was highly visible and friendly, though dignified. He looked like a college president. You knew that this man would not lie or, you know, do anything silly. He was dignified and maintained his authority. I had no notion of his intelligence. I still don't, really. I haven't read anything that he had written. I don't know what he saw in Canada. Every time I think of Canada, I get tired. But he apparently was fascinated by Canada.

CARROLL: Did he address the student body? Did he have connections with the student body, or was he more a remote figure?

HART: Not at all remote. He shoveled snow on Main Street. He was at football practice. He watched my tennis matches. We knew each other, basically.

CARROLL: Did he know most of the names of the students?

HART: Pretty much, unless the student made a point of being reclusive or hiding. He was around all the time.

CARROLL: How would you characterize then his leadership style?

HART: You would admire him, not intellectually necessarily, but as a man of character and force, responsibility, and a consuming interest in the College.

CARROLL: When you research the history of Dartmouth, it is striking how Dickey brought so many changes to the campus. Were you aware of that, living through them?

HART: Yes. I had a guy named [Albert Herman] Hastorf for Psychology I. I have forgotten his full name, but he was known among the students who cared about such things to be a hot shot and he was one of Dickey's recruits. Dickey was improving the faculty which, to put it one way, was basically in some part a prep school faculty at that time, and making it a more...I hate to use the word "professional", but more academically distinguished, let's say.

CARROLL: Well then, What prompted your action to go on and get a graduate degree in English? I am curious, when you almost didn't get the baccalaureate degree.

HART: Well, as I said, I was very interested in writing. I published some pieces in The Jack-O-Lantern and I had a couple of good freshman English teachers who encouraged that. I like to write. I had gone to a high-powered high school in New York...Stuyvesant High School...one of the three that you have to take an entrance exam for. It was pretty literary.

As I said, I didn't feel my courses were up to what they should have been. We didn't learn anything. If I had been learning anything, I certainly would have continued. At Columbia, I did. We had Lionel Trilling and Jacques Barzun and Gilbert Highet and Moses Hadass and Quentin Anderson. Quentin Anderson and Richard Chase both were Dartmouth graduates. And all publishing all the time in Partisan Review and the New Republic, bringing out important books and what that made a student, undergraduate, feel was that it was possible to do that...to be appearing in magazines all the time. Write books and so forth. These people were doing it and so I moved in the direction of a Ph.D.

I went into the Navy on account of the Korean War, into Naval

Intelligence, in, I guess, late '52. I got out of that in '56 and came back to Columbia. I had to chose between Harvard for a Ph.D. and Columbia and chose Columbia. I remember walking around in Hamilton Hall, which in essence is the main building at Columbia College, with my cards...to get people to sign for permissions. One of the professors, Frederick Dupee stuck his head out of his office and it was as if I had never been in the Navy for four years. He said

“Hart. Do you want to teach Freshman English?” All right. That’s how that started.

CARROLL: Did you like teaching from the beginning?

HART: Yes. I didn’t feel any...basically, teaching English is just going in and talking about a book or a poem. I mean, it didn’t take much preparation since I knew the material. I was just reading the poem with the students.

CARROLL: How did you get back to Dartmouth in 1963?

HART: Can we go back to your point about Dickey? Probably, if he were alive now, he would say that one of his main missions was to upgrade the faculty and that was still going on in ‘63. The English Department had had a very bright, powerful teacher named James Cox who, I think had been at Dartmouth and had then gone to Michigan...was teaching at Michigan...and I was teaching at Columbia and I had published a great deal in my field, eighteenth-century English literature. I published a book with Alfred Knopf and another one at the University of Toronto...even before I had tenure. So Dickey and I think Arthur Jensen [’46], who was then Dean, had the idea that Cox, who was supposed to be...he was a Mark Twain scholar...he would be the American...liberal is the wrong word...American populist or liberal Mark Twain, and I would be the traditionalist Edmund Burke...and that would be an energizing thing to bring to the campus. On top of that, the man ahead of me in my field at Columbia was not old and alarmingly healthy and it was not a promising situation. So Dartmouth looked very good and I thought, in ‘63, it was very definitely on the upgrade.

CARROLL: Did you bring a family with you when you moved here?

HART: Yes. A wife and two children.

CARROLL: Was that...did that play at all a role about raising the children where you wanted to because you grew up in New York.

HART: Yeah. Morningside Heights was pretty nice except, you know, there were muggings and so on; but, if you are streetwise, there are things that you don’t do in New York. You don’t have to get mugged.

CARROLL: Was that a change that was rather hard to adapt to? To come from the city with so much happening out here to a place where there was not even an interstate at that point?

HART: I didn't feel it that way. I liked that tennis was very convenient. I loved the winter sports, skiing and so on. I thought it was pretty good.

CARROLL: Did the family adapt as well?

HART: Very well.

CARROLL: What were your...you had been here a few years ago at that point...not quite twenty. Fifteen years ago on campus and you came back. What had changed during those fifteen years?

HART: I think the Dickey program of upgrading the faculty had been a success and that Dartmouth was...Lionel Trilling, when I left, I had an offer to go to Virginia, too, and before that to go to Berkeley. A parenthesis as regards Berkeley...At that period, about 1960, I don't know why but the demography or the economics was such that universities were dying to hire people and it was just the opposite the way it is today where Ph.D.'s are driving taxis; but, after I'd published my second book, I got a call from Henry Nash Smith, who was Chairman at Berkeley. He was recruiting...I think it was around the time of the Modern Language Association thing...not necessarily, though and the Berkeley English Department had a suite in some place like the Waldorf or the Pierre, you know, and I felt like a quarterback or a movie star. They had a bar. I wouldn't have to teach for the first year. I could go to Europe or whatever I wanted to do. But that was a little bit before the era of mass air transport. Going to Berkeley sounded to me something like going to Beijing or Angola, you know. It's way off there somewhere. I had this Virginia offer and then decided to take Dartmouth. Trilling said that it was the right decision. He thought that Dartmouth had been underrated and Virginia was overrated, so he endorsed that decision.

CARROLL: This is backing up a bit, but I am just sitting here wondering, what made you decide on eighteenth-century English literature? What attracted you?

HART: Well, in Stuyvesant, I just was rattling around the library and began to read [Edward] Gibbons' Decline and Fall and, liked the prose, namely, it's assurance. It's a sense of civilization. It's a sense of earned achievement as body of the Roman Empire. And then I read [Edmund] Burke, who had the same perspective on England and felt an affinity for that prose, and went on from there. But I branched out rapidly. You have to have a base and my base has always been the eighteenth century; but a lot of courses that I have taught have been in modern. I am writing a book now called Smiling Through the Cultural Catastrophe, about education, and it begins with Genesis and goes through Dostoyevsky.

CARROLL: I had a professor...this is an aside. I had a professor once who explains that the most masterful opening sentence that one could ever read was the beginning that Gibbons uses in his series of The Decline and that has always stuck with me.

HART: Well, he could write.

CARROLL: Clearly. What were the students like when you returned in '63?

HART: It was all male, of course, and I thought they were as good as the Columbia students, but a little different in tonality. At Columbia, you were more likely to get the mad, often Jewish, neurotic but with surprising touches of genius type person; and Dartmouth did not ordinarily have that kind of person. Though I would say that, across the board, the Dartmouth students were the same as Columbia. I would assume Virginia or, you know, Cornell...all very good students. It is always on a bell curve, really. You have 5-10% excellent students and then more and then you have people who...but everyone can do the work. The people who fail do so for reasons of character or disease or something.

CARROLL: You describe very nicely the kind of quirky personality one can get at Columbia. How would you describe then the typical or the stereotypical, perhaps, student at Dartmouth in '63?

HART: Again, things were in transition. When I was a freshman, I had the feeling that all Princeton students had sort of brushed forward crewcuts and tortoise shell glasses, and that all Yale students had a sweater turned inside out and a “Y” on the chest. They all belonged to at least eight singing groups. Harvard students were sort of moles. Probably this is true, but I think the S.A.T.’s and the Merit System began to homogenize the student population. So they are pretty much the same.

CARROLL: The S.A.T.’s were instituted in ‘57, I was told.

HART: Yes. What we had was the New York State Regent’s Exams, which where...I mean, they were standardized tests and colleges put a whole lot of weight on those.

CARROLL: What were the most popular courses when you first started here?

HART: Well...Do you mean the ones the students talked about, let’s say.

CARROLL: Yes.

HART: [Eugen] Rosenstock-Huessy’s philosophy courses were very exciting. In this book that I mentioned, I have a chapter called “Four Great Professors at Work” and he is one of them. Then, at Columbia, Mark van Doren and Lionel Trilling and then Cleanth Brooks at Yale. So the book is about education...different ways of behaving in the classroom. So, Rosenstock-Huessy was talked about by the students who cared about ideas. Tom Vance had come from Yale, I believe, and taught American Poetry. That was important. He was very good at it. Herb West [‘22] was a showman, really. I went to some of his lectures. I didn’t learn a thing, but enjoyed the spectacle. A very good professor of philosophy named [Francis W.] Gramlich taught here. We had a good Shakespeare teacher. He would not go over well today. Francis Childs. He was a great reader of the speeches. Histrionic. Quite sentimental. He would cry and so on; but it was amazing. He was considered a frustrated actor.

CARROLL: Was the emphasis on entertainment or on ideas in '63?

HART: You have to, whatever your mode, persuade the students that you are interested in the material. If you are not interested, why should they be interested? I don't think that is being entertaining. I think it is putting your cards on the table. Now you can do that in many ways; by moment-to-moment brilliance or...For example, Marjorie Nicholson at Columbia, had spent her life on Milton. She was chairman of the Graduate Department and her demonstration was that she could teach "Paradise Lost" without the text in front of her. She knew it. "Turn to line on 285 in Book 3." You know, she talked about that passage. You knew that if she spent her life on it, it must matter to her. That was powerful.

CARROLL: That would be. I have read somewhere that in 1968, you worked on Ronald Reagan's run for the presidency.

HART: Yeah. That's when I became active...

CARROLL: How did that come about?

HART: A very interesting story. While I was at Columbia, I was teaching in their summer school; as a matter of fact, teaching a course in Victorian Novel. I needed the money and there was a girl in the class who knew Ernest van den Haag who was a European polymath. He was an expert in economics. He made a living as a psychoanalyst. He published a book called The Fabric of Society, which was a survey of the social sciences and actually readable. He ended his active academic career recently as a law professor at Fordham.

So he knows everything. The girl saw a copy of his book lying on my desk and she said, "Would you like to meet Ernest van den Haag?" So, yeah. So she invited me to a cocktail party at her place in the Village and there was our host. He was serving as a recruiter for [William F.] Buckley's National Review. He was writing for it himself and he asked me, you know, if I liked to write. Fine. So I started reviewing books basically for National Review, mostly of in my own sort of academic field. I got to know Bill Buckley very well. Went sailing with him and so on.

So it developed that, in 1966, Ronald Reagan ran for governor of California and won over Pat Brown by a million votes and, after all, Pat Brown had defeated [President Richard M.] Nixon in '62. So Reagan beats Pat Brown by a million votes. He obviously became a presidential candidate. So Buckley was out there having lunch, I believe, with Reagan at Pacific Palisades and said something like "Look, Ron. I know you are running for President." "Well, no. I don't know." Buckley said, "Cut it out. What you need is a [Theodore] Sorenson..." who had been [President John F. Kennedy] Kennedy's aide for speeches and what "being a Sorenson" meant was putting quotations from Heraclitus into the candidate's speeches. So Reagan finally agreed that he did need someone who would give certain academic gloss to what he was saying, and I turned out to be that.

I flew out to California and interviewed Spencer...I forget his first name [Stuart "Stu"]. It was Carter, Spencer, Roberts who would campaign...They would package a campaign and do everything; the speeches, the scheduling, the polling, everything. They were working for this man who supposedly was not running for President. So I passed the test there and came back, packed up and flew to Sacramento and worked with Reagan doing not only speeches but all kinds of material, propaganda, celebrations of his accomplishments, glossy stuff for press releases and so on.

Reagan ran into the problem that he had only been elected two years before in '68 and Californians, unlike New Yorkers, don't think that their governor is necessarily a presidential candidate. They feel very California. So he did not commit himself as a candidate. This made it hard to round up delegates. He finally...I helped write a speech we did on national TV, CBS TV, based on a couple of other speeches and then I rewrote it later for Nixon and he gave that on national TV and he began to make progress. But Nixon beat him out at Miami. I was driving back across the country, figured it was all over, staying in some dump in Death Valley or somewhere and got a phone call from Nixon Headquarters, which was 450 Park and would I care to write speeches for them. So I wrote speeches for Nixon in the campaign against [Hubert H.] Humphrey and George Wallace.

CARROLL: Those must have been incredibly exciting times.

HART: Very interesting.

CARROLL: Did you sit down and talk to their handlers...I don't mean their handlers...their advisers about what kinds of issues they wanted?

HART: Oh, yeah.

CARROLL: How much guidance, I guess I am asking, were you given?

HART: Well, basically, you know what the candidate has been saying. You read what he has been saying in his speeches. More of a problem was for me to find out what a political speech is. So I went around to the Sacramento Public Library and took out volumes of [Winston] Churchill, [President Abraham] Lincoln and it became clear that a speech is not a literary object that delivers information. In other words, it is not a lecture. It establishes communion with the audience. They don't want to hear about global warming. They want to hear that you understand their condition and you are going to sympathize with it. You may not be able to do too much about it, but at least you understand where they are. So that's what a speech is and I did that with both Reagan and Nixon.

Now Reagan's staff was much smaller, so I would get a phone call from the Governor. The secretary would say "Okay. He is on the phone." Often [William] Bill Clark, his Chief of Staff, who then became the National Security Advisor at one point. "The Governor would like to say something on education. Maybe half an hour. Can you do this?" "Sure." And, of course, we wanted vouchers for the schools and we wanted school choice and we wanted a more traditional curriculum instead of frills. You know, it was no mystery what we wanted and I would come up with that.

CARROLL: Did they take and adapt it or did he try to put in some of his own quirky sayings? In other words, still he made it more personalized?

HART: Yes. I would give him...what he would have to say, a pretty strong outline of the speech. I mean, it would be a full text. He would rewrite the whole thing on yellow pads...those legal-type pads, putting in his own thoughts and, inevitably, some Hollywood anecdotes. Then he would reduce the yellow draft to cards. He liked to have cards in his hand...pretty much just topic sentences. But, since he was used to memorizing lines, he did this and did it very successfully.

CARROLL: Did you write a different kind of speech for him than you did for Nixon?

HART: Well, I first went to 450 Park and that probably was the best speech-writing team ever assembled for a Presidential campaign. [James] Jim Kehoe had been editor of Time and then came over to the Nixon campaign. He didn't write anything. He managed the speechwriting. But it was [William] Bill Safire, [Patrick] Pat Buchanan, Ray Price. The Director of Research, Alan Greenspan...now the Federal Reserve Chairman. I came from the Reagan campaign. George Gilder came from the [Nelson] Rockefeller Campaign and Henry Kissinger was secretly, though working for Rockefeller, coaching Nixon on foreign policy.

CARROLL: It must have been an incredible experience.

HART: Yeah. You like anecdotes. I guess the first or second day I was installed at 450 Park, Nixon was up at the Pierre...that's where his office was. I went up there with Kehoe to meet the Vice-president. He looked just like Richard Nixon. [Laughter] He said, "You know, Mr. Hart. We are going to take the high road in this campaign. We are going to stick to the issues, and that's the way I would like to run it." I said, "Mr. Vice -president. You may think you are running against Hubert Humphrey, but you are running against Lyndon Johnson." He said, "Oh, I didn't think college professors thought that way." [Laughter]

**[End of Tape 1, Side A -- Beginning of Tape 1, Side B]**

HART: It was much like a pyramid with...depending on the speech...a major speech like his Law and Order speech. You see, our tactical problem was running against Humphrey, presumably on the left, and Wallace on the right. So Humphrey would be saying something like “Justice and Order”. In other words, before you can have order, you have to have justice. Wallace was saying “Law and Order”. So we ultimately ended up saying something like “Order and Justice Under Law”—trying to get between the two of them.

So, since I had done that TV speech for Reagan that he gave on CBS, which was based on a previous speech that he gave at a big fair ground in Minneapolis, I think...I retooled it, using Winston Churchill after Dunkirk, “Have we come all this way from Agincourt only to see...” So Reagan said “Have we come all this way...” and Nixon found himself saying “Have we come all this way, just to see our campuses burning, our streets full of riots.” You know, all those things. So we had some proposals and I had to put...and it was a good thing, too...because Nixon had legal advisers and criminologists and James Q. Wilson and several judges and we would have conference calls. [Richard] Poff, Congressman from Virginia, was very good. Very helpful...an expert on law and crime. Nixon offered him a Supreme Court nomination. He turned it down for some reason.

So there would be this committee and, for example, should we say there should be a West Point of the police to bring them up to speed on criminal stuff. This ran into terrific opposition from governors and local police. They didn’t want any federal presence in their picture. Maybe rightly so. All kinds of other proposals that had to go through this process before they would become a speech, because a speech really becomes policy. If Nixon, you know, says all these things and then becomes President, then people start saying, “Well, look. You said right here. Where’s the West Point of the police?” So it was filtered through, up to Nixon and then he would, in his little handwriting, make suggestions. It would come back through Kehoe to me. Buchanan would help. He gave that, I think in Philadelphia.

It is very hard to tell where you are in a campaign because, you joined the plane, which was called "The Tricia," about a week before he actually gave the speech. He would ride up in the front in his cabin. The speech would go up and come back and go up and come back. Then we had a motorcade through Philadelphia. We didn't expect to carry Pennsylvania, but we wanted Humphrey to have to send money to fight it and he gave the speech in a big amphitheater...possibly an indoor ball park...it is hard tell. He was still making corrections and they were being xeroxed and given to the press right up until the time he gave the speech.

He ad-libbed a remarkable...speaking of communion. A speech doesn't have to make total sense. In one of my climactic passages, I called Ramsey Clark, who was Lyndon Johnson's Attorney General...also a war protestor. I said that Ramsey Clark is a conscientious objector in the War Against Crime. A good cheer line. So Nixon loved that, but he ad-libbed and brought down the house. I couldn't believe it. When he said "Ramsey Clark is a conscientious objector in the War Against Crime", the crowd is cheering. He said, "And, when I am President, we will have a new Attorney General." It makes no sense at all. Of course, he is not going to have Ramsey Clark. [Laughter] That was terrific.

CARROLL: I guess once you get cheering for one point, it is easy to cheer the next line. When you were writing, did you hear the difference cadences of the two different voices? Reagan's as opposed to Nixon's? And write for them?

HART: Reagan could be heroic, as he often was, at Normandy and speaking at Oxford, whereas Nixon would sound silly. So Nixon has to be prosier.

CARROLL: I suppose you never told him this, did you?

HART: He knew. He was very smart. The first speech I gave him, Kehoe said "Much too much like Ronald Reagan. Nixon is not Ronald Reagan." What Nixon was running on was not inspiration, but competence and respect...even grudging respect is what we wanted.

CARROLL: I am curious, now...although this is not part of what you have done...how you would rate [President William J.] Clinton as a speechifier...not content?

HART: He has improved in that he badly needed discipline. He talked too much. Too many words. You cannot...It is like inflation in currency and the money. If you have too many words, they become cheap. So you have to make the words count. I think he is doing better. His first big speech was at some...nominating [President James] Carter, I think. He spoke for two hours, you know.

CARROLL: I think it was [Governor Michael S.] Dukakis.

HART: Somebody.

CARROLL: But it went on forever.

HART: It was a disaster. Even in his first term, he was still too voluble. But now I notice that he has pared it down. He is not naturally eloquent. He does not have eloquent writers. Maybe, with his character background, he can't come on like Churchill or something. I think, within his talents which I consider meager, I think he has much improved as a candidate.

CARROLL: Did you work with Reagan at all once he was in the White House?

HART: Well, Nixon wanted me to come down after he won. I went down there and saw no reason to go there. I didn't like the atmosphere. It was too...you know, the country was at war. There was a lot of civil disorder and the big struggle at the White House was over the luncheon sitting. The second sitting had the more prestige. You know, it was just sort of... I don't know. I just didn't like it very much. After all, I had a Ph.D. in literature. What do I want to be in the White House for?

CARROLL: Yeah. I was just curious.

HART: I saw a lot of Reagan after he was President, but not as a...

CARROLL: Not as a speechwriter.

HART: Right.

CARROLL: Were you a part at all of his campaign organization here in New Hampshire when he ran?

HART: No. There are a lot of funny things there. You know, he lost in 1980 in New Hampshire because Jeffrey Bell, who had been a student of mine at Columbia, had written a speech for him. Bell was an assistant to Alan Greenspan in the '68 Nixon campaign. Then he beat some famous Republican...a woman...and then ran against Bill Bradley for the Senate and lost to Bradley. Then he became a political consultant working for Reagan. But, what he did that lost Reagan New Hampshire was that, in a speech Bell wrote, he came out for I think it was a \$68 billion cut in the federal budget...or whatever...a big cut to be paid for, if the states wanted it...with taxes. In other words, they would support more welfare and take it away from the federal government. So, the only problem was that New Hampshire doesn't like state taxes. So there went New Hampshire to [President Gerald Ford] Ford. So Reagan finally pulled himself together in North Carolina. He went to Kansas City and narrowly lost to Ford.

CARROLL: It makes you think how one idea can fell a campaign.

HART: Well, there is the virtue of this Nixon organization. I mean, if there had been things like that...Bell just wrote the speech and Reagan said "Sounds good." [Laughter]

CARROLL: Were you here on campus...we were talking about the protests and how the '60's were a time of protest. Were you here on campus when William Shockley gave his speech?

HART: Yeah, but I didn't see it. There are...for example, I have some respect for the...what do you call the I.Q. guy. That's not the right word...Arthur Jensen at Berkeley. He is an expert in his field. He can talk forever about I.Q. and it's roots, its causes, what it means. He calls it general intelligence...whatever. Shockley got a Nobel Prize in electronics or something.

CARROLL: Transistors.

HART: That's it. And it is always suspect that some guy tried to pull his status in one field in something very different. But also he was going into genetics, paying Blacks to be sterilized and so on. It was getting pretty far out. So, you know, I wasn't interested much in it. There were protests and so on. [President John] Kemeny, I thought, took the wrong...I just followed The Dartmouth really...Kemeny was saying, "Let him speak. Let him speak. I am going to refute him after he is finished", which is not the way academic freedom should be. Whether you are going to refute him or not, he should be allowed to speak. It is not up to Kemeny to be refuting him, anyway.

CARROLL: Ideas are ideas.

HART: Yeah. Take them for what they are. But I guess the Blacks were standing up or chanting or whatever.

CARROLL: Clapping, rhythmic clapping.

HART: Did he get the speech off at all?

CARROLL: Never. Never. He finally retreated. It was a remarkably effective protest because it succeeded; but did not deal with the issue of freedom of speech at all.

HART: I was speaking of George Gilder, who was a speechwriter and this very issue that you are talking about. There is some stuff there. I saw Gilder a month ago. I was debating in Stockbridge, where he lives, against some people from The Nation magazine about the Arts Endowment. Anyway, I had dinner at George's house and he began as a Rockefeller Republican. Nixon gave him a job in some agency where he saw how the money is spent in Washington. He became rapidly more conservative. Then he wrote some good books against feminism; one called On the Rocks. It was about how men don't live as long if they are single and, you know, have all kinds of problems. Then he became a visionary of capitalism. He wrote a best seller called Wealth and Poverty...I think it was called. A very good book. The thesis is capitalism isn't immoral because you have to imagine the needs of the consumer and so on. It is sort of an anti-dismal science.

What he now is, to my amazement...I have heard reverberations about this...he is a computer guru. He had written a book. He thinks computers are close to God. It is going to change, you know..."Let there be light" and the computer is "light". He is getting \$25,000 a lecture in Silicon Valley and is giving one lecture a week.

CARROLL: That's all you have to do if you get that much.

HART: He has written a book called Microcosm, which is the bible of this whole thing. He knows...he is philosopher of computers.

CARROLL: Well, I guess we all knew there would have to be one eventually, didn't we? I will look that up.

HART: It is in paperback, I think. He told me. I haven't got to it yet.

CARROLL: I am going to roll this back a bit.

HART: Gilder and free speech. We had him up here at one point to...he was in transition between this anti-feminism and his capitalism. So we said, "Do it. Give twenty minutes to each." So it became known...I think Marysa Navarro[-Aranguren] was the spark plug...that the feminists or their allies were going to prevent George from speaking. So we told him that we would videotape the thing and bring charges both in the College and civil charges if you interrupt the thing...fine you in court. And that squashed the protest.

CARROLL: So there are ways to handle it.

HART: Yeah, and Dartmouth would have to act on a video tape of someone doing that.

CARROLL: You must have been on campus also when Parkhurst was taken over in '69, I believe that was. Do you remember the issues that surrounded that?

HART: I think it was ROTC [Reserve Officer Training Corps]. Dickey handled that well. He had a deal with Walter Peterson, who was Governor, and they arrested these guys and they spent time in jail during their summer vacation, I

think, and emerged in the fall without suntans. So I thought he handled that expeditiously.

CARROLL: Someone said to me once that they thought all of these protests eventually wore Dickey down at the end.

HART: I am not surprised.

CARROLL: Did you have that impression, as well?

HART: Well, it was a different world. These people were not the sort of gentlemanly students. I mean...When Dickey was, when I was a freshman, if a student had to see him, even a student who had the worst hangover, he would have a coat and tie and he would call Dickey "Sir" and so on. Dickey didn't expect funny-looking people to invade Parkhurst. That was out of the question; but he resigned soon after that and reputedly, the faculty didn't like the jail sentence. [Thaddeus] Thad Seymour ['49] got in trouble with the faculty and then went to, I think, Wabash [College] and then Rollins [College] as President.

CARROLL: Were you surprised when Dickey announced his retirement?

HART: Yes. He looked fine to me. I didn't see why; but there is a feeling, which I can understand, that someone said that you shouldn't be President for more than ten years under these conditions...these conditions being fund-raising and all the things that the...say the [Ernest Martin] Hopkins-type President didn't have to do. He could be President for twenty years and be a role model of a sage, friend, very pleasant. But I think things are a little bit different now.

CARROLL: When you came in '47, was Hopkins still the President?

HART: No. Dickey.

CARROLL: Dickey had just come?

HART: A couple of years before.

CARROLL: When Dickey left the College in 1970, what do you think were his strengths and weaknesses? Where did it stand?

HART: Well, we have gone over that in terms of improving the faculty. He was peculiarly a Dartmouth President. He wore a plaid shirt. He liked to go up to Mount Moosilauke to meet the students up there. He shoveled snow. He had a big dog. He had great dignity. He signed all the freshman [matriculation cards] incoming forms. He was outgoing and friendly. I assume the alumni thought he was God.

CARROLL: That's true. What were his negatives?

HART: Intellectual contribution. I mentioned Canada sort of off-handedly, but that, you know, I don't feel the presence of a superior mind. He was a lawyer. A State Department man. Undoubtedly, he could talk about foreign policy and things like that. For example, he is not George Kennan.

CARROLL: Were there rumors abuzz during the election or the nomination procedure for who was going to succeed Dickey? Do you remember?

HART: Yes, and I forget who was mentioned, though Kemeny was mentioned because...maybe because Kemeny was sort of a genius. You know, he was not Dickey in both senses. He didn't wear a plaid shirt. He didn't shovel snow, but he invented BASIC. So, if that, in a logical sense, would be a continuation of Dickey's project of improving the intellectual character of the institution.

CARROLL: What did you think of John Kemeny?

HART: I got along with him fine. They said when Henry Kissinger was National Security Advisor that everybody loved Kissinger until they talked with the person he had lunch with last, where he contradicted everything he had told you. [Laughter]

CARROLL: I like that.

HART: So Kemeny was always very civil and always saying things that he thought I would like to hear. I could sort of tell that, emphasizing his desire for a more traditional-type of education. "I am for the great books and real substance," he would say, "but the faculty won't do this and the faculty won't do that," which may have been true.

He also told me on the Indian symbol thing that he was surprised when the thing was brought up and passed. I don't believe that. I don't care about the Indian symbol. Never used it on my stationery. But I didn't like the claim that it was racist or prejudicial to that particular group. It was not. I thought it was a triviality.

CARROLL: Were you surprised when Kemeny was picked to succeed Dickey?

HART: No. There had been a lot of talk about him.

CARROLL: There must have been a pretty abrupt change of style then when John Kemeny arrives.

HART: Very. Yeah.

CARROLL: What was his style, Kemeny's style, as a President?

HART: He was surprisingly affable as a person. Nice to talk to, but his identity was math and mind, and I don't think he would be able to identify a poem by Yeats, you know. If you asked him who wrote Ulysses, he wouldn't know. I assume that the areas of his ignorance were colossal, except that he knew a tremendous amount of the emerging field of computers. So, we have Kiewit [Computation Center]. It is a very good thing and ultimately we have Kiewit. From my point of view, the Dante Project that Bob Hollander put in... Bob did it here because Kiewit was so superior to anything Princeton had.

CARROLL: I am going to ask you what I have asked other people. I read about Kemeny and he seemed to be the antithesis of the stereotypical Dartmouth person. He is foreign born. He is Jewish. He is highly intellectual. He has no athletic ability that one can seem to ascertain. Why do you think (a) he was so attached to this institution and (b) he was able to be swallowed by the alumni when he was presented to them?

HART: That's a good question and I haven't really thought about it except that I, myself, liked him so that is one vote. You know, if I do, why shouldn't someone else? He never lied directly or openly. He never did anything nasty that I could see. He seemed to want good things.

Now you have to...I am thinking out loud. You have to see the way college changes. Now, Hopkins was the first non-minister to become president. Before that, everyone had been a Protestant. [William Jewett] Tucker and so on, all the way back. So it must have been a bit of a jolt to bring in someone who was not in the clergy. But, after all, in the 20's, America was...business was very important and Hopkins could talk to business and that kind of thing. Hopkins was no fool, either. He was well read. I read his Chapel speeches. They are excellent. So it was a good choice, but different. Dickey had those assets that we have gone over. I suspect that the alumni don't need a stereotypical person if they trust him and feel that he has got the best interests of the institution at heart.

CARROLL: What do you think was Kemeny's impact on the campus during his Presidency?

HART: Nothing like Dickey's physical presence. [James O.] Freedman has been more reclusive than Kemeny. I think people respected the math. I am not sure I want to know who chose that math building [Gerry Hall]. It looks like the same firm that did the tollbooth that is on the Connecticut Turnpike. [Laughter]

CARROLL: I hear it is coming down really soon.

HART: That's a great thing. It's a giant shower.

CARROLL: Just awful. Do you remember the first major decision Kemeny made upon stepping into the Presidency?

HART: He reached a solution to the coeducational thing through the Dartmouth Plan, which is awkward in many ways, but you can't have everything. I mean, (a) if you want women and (b) if you don't want to drastically cut the number of men, you have got to use more of the plant and so you get the summer session and the European times away and so forth. So he sat down with his computer and figured out how to do that. Now, there are all kinds of complaints about it, which I sympathize with. But, you know, if you say (a), you have to say (b), which he did very well, I think.

CARROLL: Was coeducation a surprise when it was voted by the Trustees in '71?

HART: No. It had been talked about for so long and the country sort of was moving that way with the change...more women going to graduate school, more women going to business school, medical school, law school. So, in a certain way, I now think it was a good move. The men dress better. They don't smell. You don't see people with torn t-shirts.

CARROLL: A civilizing influence.

HART: Yeah. It has been good. At the time it was going on, I was sort of nolo contendere. There is a maxim in tennis. You don't change a winning game. If you are winning by running to the net, you keep running to the net. I felt we were doing all right. Why change? But, you know, I felt that, maybe, if you stayed all male, it might have strange effects on the student body, if the country is going coed in a certain way. In other words, you might just get retired colonels' sons or, you know, sort of peculiar types. [Laughter]

CARROLL: What is the selection process you are working into? [Laughter] So you were willing to sort of go with the decision.

HART: Yes. No problem.

CARROLL: Most of the alumni seemed to have felt that way, but there were a few very vocal alumni who spoke out against it. What do you think their effect was on the coeducational process?

HART: Probably not much. They conceivably would have an effect on not reducing the number of males that much. You couldn't possibly reduce the number of males from 4,000 to 2,000. So the complaints might have...I think that might have happened anyway. The Dartmouth Plan. So, who knows? People always like to remember the way it was when they were there. On the other hand, if a business always stays the same, it is not going to succeed. It has to adapt.

CARROLL: What was the effect of the women on the classrooms and the classroom atmosphere once they arrived?

HART: I find that they are much more passive. They are afraid to take risks in the sense of...suppose you are dealing with a difficult poem. They are not as willing to hazard a guess on what this might mean; whereas, a male, you know...generalizing... might say "Well, maybe it is this way." The women aren't. They are much more agreeable...the women. You will very often in a class get a couple of males who are real sons of bitches and they will fight you all the way. You know, and just...usually sit in the back of the room and you know there is going to be trouble. They often have a baseball hat on backwards. [Laughter]

CARROLL: Did you change your teaching at all when the women arrived on campus?

HART: No. I got into, as Red Barber used to say for the Dodgers, a bit of a rhubarb when I was teaching a big course in the Literature of the 1920's. I had to teach The Sun Also Rises and we have Jake Barnes' problem, the trouble with Brit and all the sexual problems in the book. So I had to, you know, talk about them. One female student wrote a letter to the Chairman saying that Professor Hart is talking about sex all the time. Fortunately, two students were recording these lectures and another student in shorthand, so I could prove that, you know, I wasn't talking about sex all the time. I was just teaching this book.

CARROLL: And [Ernest] Hemingway does a lot of talking about sex.

HART: Yeah. What else? [Laughter]

CARROLL: It's interesting. Do you think there were growing pains during coeducation or did it go rather smoothly?

HART: For me, it did. I can understand being...you know, the first group or groups of women might have felt excluded, maybe abused. I don't know; but I do not frequent fraternities or dormitories. I remember when I first came in '63, I was invited to a cocktail party. I think at SAE and I found out that their idea of a cocktail party was beer in paper cups at 8 p.m., plastic cups at 8 p.m. It just didn't cut the...[Laughter]

CARROLL: That doesn't do it. There was also, I have read about it, in The D after the Cambodian Invasion, a large protest on campus. Kemeny is just in office and he calls off all classes and has a teach-in. Do you remember that event?

HART: Yeah. I held my classes anyway.

CARROLL: What was the atmosphere on campus like at that time?

HART: Near hysteria. I suppose...well, the hysteria had been increasing since 1968 when we had the terrible events in Chicago at the Democratic Convention. I was tear-gassed at the Republican Convention in Miami. The Vietnam Veterans Against the War rushed the auditorium and the State Police came out of the ground with riot costumes. They had tubes that looked like mortars and were popping off these grenades. I said, "Wait a minute. I'm for Nixon."

CARROLL: And you got through.

HART: You know, I thought, "It's a war. Why get excited." There was a great deal of what I thought was irrational, probably mixed up with the drug culture of the times, too. I refused to cancel. Most students came to my Eighteenth Century course. I said that, except for the Vietnamese, themselves, Dr. Johnson is more important than Vietnam. And I think so.

CARROLL: I am kind of curious. When you talk about coeducation, I want to talk about diversity and the increasing diversity of the student body and the faculty in just a second; but, to set that into perspective, I was wondering what you think the role of tradition is at Dartmouth? It is the rallying cry of so many of the alumni.

HART: Well, tradition is what you say...a vehicle of identity. Each school has traditions of various kinds. Some bad. But Princeton is a different institution from Dartmouth. It has a different history. It is more southern in important ways than Dartmouth is. And Yale has its own culture. So tradition is a shorthand, I suppose, for these various aspects that are felt things and do give meaning to any institution. The traditions of the Marine Corps are different from the traditions...

**[End of Tape 1, Side B -- Beginning of Tape 2, Side A]**

CARROLL: We were talking about the role of traditions at Dartmouth and I was curious, what do you think are the traditions that define Dartmouth?

HART: Outdoors. Environment. I mean, inextricably, it is going to be different from Columbia or Harvard. Therefore, you will have people who, for example, might like to play football but also like to ski. That type of person is going to want to use the environment. Or hike or go to Moosilauke or so on. Also, New Hampshire has it's own feeling, well expressed in the whole ambiance of Robert Frost, which is a kind of tough minded and skeptical attitude toward existence. Very different from Walt Whitman or someone, you know, who is just not going to give that much. You have to find it in the poem and New Hampshire is a conservative state in that sense; although, I think Libertarian adds its impulses, too. Highly individualistic. So Dartmouth is in New Hampshire which does have consequences.

There are funny things about Dartmouth...a lot of funny things. Superficially, one funny thing is the absence of beds of flowers. That might have to do with the climate. It would look much better if you had...I spoke recently down at Washington and Lee...

CARROLL: I never thought of that.

HART: Yeah. And that place even...it is south...but in May the place is full of roses and petunias. It is sort of a happy kind of a thing. Dartmouth is very austere.

CARROLL: Very puritan.

HART: Yeah. A lot of pine trees. [Laughter]

CARROLL: That's true. I will have to look around again. So many times when alumni protest something, it is with the reasoning of tradition behind them, and I think it is wonderful to sort of put

it in perceptive what traditions counted and what don't. Whose role is that to do?

HART: I think you can't invent a tradition, you know. The Dean comes out one day and says "Men. We've got a new tradition. We are going to sit on that fence over there." It either happens or it doesn't; but you should not...responsible people should not, without great consideration, attack customary usages, let alone frivolously.

Singing is a tremendous tradition at Yale. The Wiffenpoof are sort of at the top of the pyramid, but there are hundreds of these groups, apparently. I stay at the Yale Club often. I have my shirt there. Once a year, they have a tradition called Singing through the Club and all these groups come down to New Haven and they are singing all over in banquet halls and in rooms, and they pass through the main lounge and the thing finally ends up with the Wiffenpoofs, and all the groups come together and they all sing together. It is great power. If I were a secondary high school student and interested in voice, I would certainly be drawn to Yale. So why should they fool around with that?

CARROLL: Well, Kemeny really came into office and took on a lot of what were the sacred traditions or at least images of those traditions. He brought in coeducation and then he issued a comment where he said that Dartmouth were going to make an attempt to attract increasing numbers of Blacks, Native Americans and disadvantaged New England youth. I was wondering, what was the effect of that declaration on the campus?

HART: It is not an innocent declaration because, as I say, he who says (a), has to say (b). And what you get are these outgroups coming in with something like 200 points lower in their S.A.T. scores. There is no reason for Dartmouth to have someone with that deficient qualification.

It doesn't mean that that person can't go to college. They could go to [University of New Hampshire] UNH or they could go Saint Anselm's or go to Colgate or go to Syracuse. There is no reason for the first line colleges to have this, except perhaps on artistic grounds, like a painter says "We

need a little green here, a little black” or something, you know. No.

A college is primarily an institution...it’s primary mission is knowledge and intellect...not exclusively. It’s a community, but it also has to sustain itself. No. I think we have gone scandalously far in the direction of social work.

CARROLL: How easy was it or is it to integrate those groups into the student body?

HART: Apparently not good. They seemed to be resentful and the students are resentful of them. They know they aren’t as good in class. From my point of view, say there would be two aspects...Say I have a lecture course or something largely lecture...thirty-five students up to whatever...three hundred students. It doesn’t matter, really, how good the students are in that course. They write their papers and get their grades.

In a seminar, it can be embarrassing if there is this guy there that doesn’t belong there and we’re dealing with something complicated. It really...everybody is embarrassed, including the student. So it is no favor. Tom Sowell talks about fit and his point is that you don’t have to stuff somebody into Berkeley. He can just as well go to Irvine or UCSC [University of California at Santa Cruz] or somewhere and be happy.

CARROLL: Did Dartmouth have to create certain support groups for these people or support systems, I guess, for tutoring, whatever?

HART: Yeah. They had the Bridge Program. Black students, I think entirely, would come up and spend the summer getting some tutoring...that kind of thing. I’m absolutely not opposed to that.

I am opposed to courses which aren’t courses in Black Studies which are advocacy groups, support groups. The history of those things...Women’s Studies, Black Studies, Indian Studies...is that they were sold to the institution ostensibly as looking for new material that would then be incorporated into the History Department, the Psychology

Department, the Anthropology Department, whatever. But, no. They become established and they apparently are here forever and what they are now is sort of annex colleges that aren't really...they aren't producing anything. Most of the people who teach them aren't notable in the quarterlies, except they now have their own little magazines which they publish.

CARROLL: Although as a follow-through, the man they just got to head the Native Americans Studies Program, Colin Calloway is quite a power house.

HART: That's good.

CARROLL: Yeah. I have been impressed reading some of his things. When they established those departments, what I am wondering about is how do you establish a department where there is no tradition of scholarship. What do you use to teach; what are the tools?

HART: Obviously, it has been a problem and the tools have been created; sometimes honestly, sometimes dishonestly. I had a friend teaching at San Francisco State. I think he was on the curriculum committee and they tried to do a decent Black Studies Program. It was taken over by the Black Panthers, actually, but they tried to get it going. They were mimeographing up stuff...slave diaries...you know, that hadn't been published. They had to re-create the text for the course; but it is a problem.

CARROLL: Was that ever discussed when those departments were initially put together?

HART: I don't remember it being discussed. No.

CARROLL: I didn't find any discussion of it in the campus newspaper or in the minutes of the faculty meetings; but I thought, perhaps, informally among one and other, the faculty might have...

HART: Maybe it is the kind of question you don't usually raise. You know, where is the material? You know, big silence. [Laughter]

CARROLL: But every department, every course, has to pass through a committee, does it not?

HART: Yeah, but the committees are increasingly porous. In fact, that's become useful around the country. Course like Columbia's Humanities went to Homer through Dostoyevsky in a year, are not being put in as electives around the country. You know, if you can teach the Nicaraguan Lesbian poets for college credit, why not Homer? And there is no answer.

CARROLL: When did the impact of women and minorities on the faculty make itself felt?

HART: Well, the College bringing in women had to bring in women faculty and made a big effort to do so with mixed success, I think. We have some very good women in the English Department. We have some who are entirely unacceptable. In one case, the department voted against tenure and Kemeny promoted her anyway. But, you know, you can live with it. In many cases, it is not a happy experience.

CARROLL: Was the English Department the one with the first tenured female?  
Was it Blanche Gelfant?

HART: It may be. I am not sure that Navarro might not have been...

CARROLL: Slipped in over there.

HART: Something. Yeah. I don't know what it was.

CARROLL: Did that change the offerings or the courses that were being taught in any way?

HART: Yeah. I am sure that...I don't think Blanche would have taught the usual classical authors, Mark Twain, Henry James, whatever; but I think now not...with some justice, I think you might find Sarah Orne Jewett or The Awakening or, you know, something that...You know, I don't see any reason not to read Uncle Tom's Cabin. You know, it is atrociously written and cartoon characters. Nonetheless, it has reverberations you can consider. You can usefully say, "Why isn't it great literature?"

CARROLL: I am curious...this is something that is not quite directly at Dartmouth. I am curious in general how one decides when contemporary literature should be put into the curriculum. I am thinking of someone like Toni Morrison who often times shows up in the course syllabi.

HART: I think with great caution. Now, there are different ways of looking at it. Lionel Trilling...have you read much of him or any of him?

CARROLL: A little, but not anywhere near "the opus".

HART: He didn't think modern literature should be taught at all.

CARROLL: I knew that.

HART: But that derived at least in part from his own perspective of what he wanted to do with literature because he saw literature as embedded in culture and so he was not drawn to a recent book which would not have been commented enough on. You know, he wanted Wordsworth where "so and so says. So and so says. So and so rejects and accepts and praises or attacks him."...and then sort of look at the whole thing and bring it forward.

He did give a famous course in twentieth-century literature at Columbia; but, by the time he gave it, say in 1960, '61, after all The Waste Land had been around for twenty-five, thirty, forty years...22 to 62, let's say...and talk about commentary. There is plenty of commentary.

CARROLL: A lot longer than the poem itself by a long shot. So when does one decide, how does one decide to place contemporary literature into the books?

HART: Well, how about one course called Contemporary American Literature? You can read, you know, poems that are being written this afternoon, if you want to. It would be interesting. You know, without any commentary, how good is this? Why is it good?

CARROLL: I think it would be kind of scary, I think, to some of the students who are accustomed to falling back and looking at critics and what they have said about x, y or z.

HART: Well, I. A. Richards gave a famous course at Cambridge which resulted in his book called Practical Criticism where he assigned poems from all periods, but without any authors or dates. So you had to, you know, say what you thought.

CARROLL: That would be fun, I think. Great fun.

You are quoted as saying in 1980 that the curriculum at that time was fragmented and it lacked what you called narrative content... That the parts were greater than the whole. I was wondering if you could explain that a bit.

HART: Well, it is almost a commonplace in cultural history that close to the center of the Western mind is what is called Athens and Jerusalem, Socrates and Jesus. Athens, being both a city and a symbol and the symbol meaning a tradition of cognition; Jerusalem both city and tradition, a tradition of holiness. And you can see these, Athens and Jerusalem, emerge first in Homer, where you have the nobility of the warrior, but which presumes a kind of nobility of soul, too. The warrior is in the foreground. What Socrates does is internalize the heroism of Homer, or Achilles, Odysseus. The hero becomes the philosopher, what he knows. On the other side, you have Moses, who was an epic hero in many ways like Achilles...warrior, leader, nation builder; but you get the beginnings of a holy tradition with his teaching of the Ten Commandments as expanded in the rest of the Homeric mosaic epic. And he dies like an epic hero, looking at the Promise Land from Mount Pisgah.

So, as Socrates internalizes the Homeric heroic, Jesus internalized the Mosaic heroic where Moses looks out to behavior. "Thou shalt not commit adultery." Jesus says "Thou shalt not look upon a woman with lustful thought." Or Moses says "Thou shalt not commit murder"..."kill". He means murder. It is in the context of the law. Jesus says "You shall not look upon someone with anger." So the whole thing becomes an internal heroism which people call "holiness". Now, everybody has been talking about this paradigm, Werner Jaeger...what is his name...[Sextus Empiricus?] Empiricus, [Claude] Lévi-Strauss, [Friedrich] Nietzsche.

Nietzsche's superman is the man who can combine Athens and Jerusalem. Caesar "with the heart of soul of Christ", he says which is, of course, a myth. So you have these paradigms and they come together in first century Near East. Principally, in the figure of Paul, but backed up by the Evangelists, all of whom wrote in Greek. Greece came to the Near East through the conquests of Alexander the Great. You can start with Alexandria and eighty other cities. You get the synthesis of Athens and Jerusalem in Paul's uneasy synthesis. But Paul was a Roman citizen...wrote in Greek. He is a rabbi and John, at the beginning of his gospel says in the beginning was the "word" which is the Greek, logos. It comes out of Greek philosophy. So you get this dialectic, which is there in the beginning, and rattles right through history, through all of the great literature of the West and I think makes the West different from China.

The Chinese symbols are the Wall and the Forbidden City and the millennia of silence. There are no contradictions in China. There is no Athens in Jerusalem...no polarities of that kind, so they don't have much to say.

The West moves from St. Augustine to Voltaire through the Enlightenment, which moved far in the direction of Athens and philosophy. But Dostoyevsky says no to that and Raskolnikov kisses the crossroads and we are in St. Petersburg. So you get the great cathedral of Chartres and you get the Golden Gate Bridge in the West.

And that is what I would mean by a paradigm for a curriculum or one course. I am going to teach a version of that next spring at a small college in Massachusetts...Nichols College...and see if I can do it by teaching The Iliad, The Inferno and, say, Hamlet and The Tempest for four weeks.

CARROLL: That's a lot to put into four weeks.

HART: Yeah. Have a quiz every morning.

CARROLL: So when you were talking about needing to have a kind of cohesion in the curriculum, you would like to have seen themes that would be understood throughout the different courses.

HART: Well, Columbia does it in one course...their Humanities 1, 2...all freshmen take it and I wouldn't want to go and...you know, there are lots of things to take...art, music, math, science and so on. So by no means monopolize the curriculum. Rosenstock-Huessy importantly said in class in 1947 that the purpose of education is to ...is the citizen. What is the product of education supposed to look like? And he said "The citizen;" by which he meant, he said, the person who, if necessary, can refound his civilization. In other words, who knows the constituent aspects of Western civilization...as I have just outlined and that would be one definition of what the citizen ought to know.

CARROLL: When you were going through and there were so many curricular changes that were coming about during the '60's and '70's, what was the system for vetting those courses and setting standards?

HART: In the English Department, you would propose a course...you would give a course description and a reading list and so on. You would go to the departmental committee...Committee on the Curriculum. Then it would go from there up through the division...the Humanities Division...to a divisional committee, I suppose. And then, at a faculty meeting...a general faculty meeting...the recommendation positive...there would be no recommendations that would be negative...would come forward for general approval.

CARROLL: You were a main advocate for retaining the Canon through all of this.

HART: The Canon did not exist when I came here.

CARROLL: That's interesting. When did it come about?

HART: Well, it didn't exist when I was a freshman, either, but the structure of the English major was more sequential. There was more structure to the whole curriculum; but I certainly would have wanted to change the direction. I don't think a person ought to graduate without reading the important books. Not exclusively. [President James O.] Freedman said a remarkable thing. Someone said "Do you think every student should read a play by Shakespeare?" and his

answer was “Well. No. They might miss something wonderful like Toni Morrison”, which reminded me of Lyndon Johnson saying that [President Gerald] Gerry Ford couldn’t walk and chew gum at the same time. [Laughter]

CARROLL: Well, how did the Canon come about? How did that image of the Canon come about?

HART: Usually consensus over a long period of time.

CARROLL: How would you sort of define this Canon?

HART: Dr. [Samuel] Johnson said in his preface to Shakespeare that a classic is a book that continues to be widely read and talked about after one hundred years. And he named that length of time because it would mean that it did not just have topical appeal...address some issue that was here for a time and then disappeared. In a sense, that is why we don’t read Uncle Tom’s Cabin as literature. But it was wildly successful when it came out.

So, if you go back, Homer was written down in about 800 B.C. It probably had been oral literature for several hundred years before that; but there has never been a century in which Homer was thought to be irrelevant to the life of the mind. The same is true of Dante, for example. Dante has been more commented on than any other...The Divine Comedy has been more commented on than any other work except the Bible. It has been translated into Japanese and Thai and so there begins to emerge books of that character. I think, myself...and this is probably...when this book comes out, I conclude with Dostoyevsky but also with Gatsby, which seems much less...but I don’t think so. It came out in ‘25. This is now ‘97. It is approaching Johnson’s 100 years. And I think it has a richness of texture that we can say now that it isn’t just about the Jazz Age. It is not about bootlegging and so forth. It makes a permanent statement.

CARROLL: I want to sort of switch gears a little bit here. In 1980 also, there was a challenge to trustee elections that Dr. John Steel from the Class of ‘54 challenged the slate of candidates. Could you talk about that a little bit? What happened and what the issues were?

HART: Yeah. I was close to that. Steel had several children go to Dartmouth. I have forgotten the sequence; but around that time, one of them, John Steel, Jr., I think, was a varsity tennis player, first on the team. Steel had other children coming along and owned a house down here on Route 10, south of the College. So he spent a lot of time here. He took great interest in the things going on. For example, he would go around and talk to professors and get to know them, attend their lectures and things. So he had a very active interest, unlike most trustees who come for the weekend. Now, he was strong on the Indian symbol. What else he was running on, I am not so sure at this point.

CARROLL: I believe that it was clear during this election, when Kemeny had already tendered his resignation and that he would be part of the search by the Trustees voting on the next President. I believe that's true.

HART: Yeah. I think in a general way without...I think when the Trustee ballot goes out, it has printed on it a brief statement of what these people want and I don't want to read later time back into it, but he may well have wanted to protect the undergraduate identity of the College as against more graduate study. Yeah. In general, a consolidation of what he thought Dartmouth was, and felt that there were threats to that.

CARROLL: Why do you think there was so much opposition to his taking what was actually a legal challenge to this election process?

HART: Well, it raised all kinds of hell and had a lot to do with The Dartmouth Review being founded. He represented an opinion that there had been too much change or change of the wrong kind, I think. So, without being able to specify it, I think he was a protest candidate and Dartmouth doesn't like protests, except certain protests.

So he won that election and there were many scandals attached to the process. His election...his vote was first challenged by the administration on the grounds that he had...among his list of supporters, it included Ron Campion ['55], who owned Campion's. Campion indicated that he had been pressured to take his name off the list. Whoever it was that had added him to the list hadn't got a signature from

him...not having been in the Nixon Campaign. [Laughter] So Campion claimed that they had used him illegitimately. Dartmouth owned his store, so it wouldn't take much pressure for him to... And then there was fakery, I think, a recounting of the ballots. [J. Michael] Mike McGean's ['49] office was counting them. You could see through the envelopes and begin to get an impression. It amounted to a poll on the way the election was going. So, at that point, Steel, as I recall, knowing that there was monkey business going on, came here. He hired a lawyer and made sure that the process was intact. Then he won. Things were counted and, in fact, he won.

CARROLL: Quite largely.

HART: Yes. Then they held up seating him while all kinds of, I think, bogus issues were raised. They finally seated him, I think, at the August meeting of the Trustees up at whatever it is called.

CARROLL: Minary Center.

HART: Right. So...

CARROLL: What were they scared of?

HART: They thought he would be a right-wing fanatic. I mean, liberals tend to think that everyone outside of the liberal ambiance is probably a militia man or something...goes drilling over in Beaver Meadow...not in the club.

As a matter of fact, he turned out to be an extremely conscientious and civil individual who made no trouble at all. And, after he finished his first term, as I remember, the Trustees re-voted him for a second term. So there was a lot of sound and fury without much going on.

I mentioned The Dartmouth Review. There was something going on. It was a criticism of Kemeny in some way, or his policy. Anyway, Fossedal, [Gregory] Greg Fossedal ['81] was a remarkable character who became the first editor of The Dartmouth Review, did so because he had been forced out as editor for The Daily Dartmouth. What he did as editor was write a signed column under his own name, not a

corporate editorial, supporting Steel. Then the staff was rebellious, but he was editor...had been elected. There is some kind of committee that runs The Dartmouth and they got Fossedal to resign. I am not sure how; but he was then at liberty to start a new newspaper, which he immediately did.

CARROLL: Let me stop you right there.

**END OF INTERVIEW**

INTERVIEW: Jeffery Hart '51

INTERVIEWED BY: Jane Carroll

PLACE: Baker Library  
Hanover, New Hampshire

DATE: July 18, 1997

CARROLL: This is the 18th of July, 1997, and I am speaking with Jeffrey Hart for the second time. You had mentioned the desire to enlarge upon some of the things that we had touched upon last time, and you mentioned to me something called the Vigilance Committees in 1947. What were they and how did they work?

HART: Well, they were very prominent during what is now called Freshman Week. I think it was still called Freshman Week. They were upper classmen, very likely seniors, who wore white trousers and sweaters and black hats and their job was to enforce the hazing regulations against freshmen such as carrying luggage, furniture...anything...for upper classmen, wearing your beanie. Sometimes, for nothing, they would act up and be nasty. So those were, you know, not exactly a welcoming thing. Most people took it in good spirit, but I didn't think it was a good idea.

CARROLL: Did it last for a week? This vigilance?

HART: Yes, but you were supposed to wear your beanie until Dartmouth won it's homecoming football game.

CARROLL: And if they didn't win?

HART: You kept it for the whole semester. [Laughter]

CARROLL: It made you root really hard. Do you know what the tradition was for the Vigilance Committees? How long it had been going?

HART: I just don't know.

CARROLL: I will have to look that up. Then you had also mentioned the Ray Cirrotta story.

HART: Oh, yes. By that time, I had left Dartmouth and I was working in New York, so I followed it first in the newspapers. It was a big story. Before that, I lived on the fourth floor of Wheeler Hall and I had two roommates or rather a single room on the same hall, fourth floor. He was universally considered to be a real crumb. He had gone out for football...not made it.

He was a quarterback...hopelessly inadequate for that post. Nonetheless, what got him into serious trouble after I left Dartmouth was that he bought a football...varsity D football sweater from one of the players. I guess the player needed money. And he was wearing this thing around, which enraged the other players. By that time, he was living in Massachusetts Hall...I think North Mass. and they went up into his room to...expecting him not to be there...to turn his desk drawers upside down and what not, to tie the sheets in knots...but he came in. There was a scuffle, and he hit the floor or hit something and died. The autopsy...it turned out that he had an eggshell thing in his skull, so even the smallest...if hit just right, I suppose, the smallest thing would be fatal. He easily could have died on Memorial Field, I suppose, if he had actually been out there. The people who assaulted him...I think correctly...got kicked out. They all finished up somewhere else.

CARROLL: As you said, at one point, you thought about writing a story or a novel around this.

HART: Yeah. I wrote...I would say half of a novel and, by that time I had got me a job at Simon and Schuster as a junior editor, first reader, basically. They gave me that job instead of an advance and I took the job because I had a tennis club bill to pay. [Laughter]

CARROLL: What was it about the story that grabbed your imagination?

HART: It was basically a college novel and it struck me that it would be a good thing to have that story at the center of it. It wouldn't just be an autobiographical account. It would have an objective development in it. It was coming along, but then I went into the Navy and, by the time I returned to the thing, I was a different person, really, than the author of that.

CARROLL: I can well understand. We had ended up last in talking about the John Steel campaign to become a trustee and you had said that you wanted to talk a bit more about the issues that were involved in that.

HART: Well, it is difficult for me to remember exactly what the issues were when he ran. It was clear that he was a protest candidate in a traditional direction. I remember that he did stress the Indian symbol. Now, in retrospect, I see the Indian symbol controversy, if it were that...abolishing the Indian symbol, let's say...as the advent of minorityism. In other words, no sensible person thinks that an image put on the currency...the nickel, the dime and so on...as a racist thing; but old Dartmouth had to abolish it because some Indians objected...particularly Indian ideologues like Michael Dorris, who may not have been an Indian. Anyway, Dinesh D'Sousa ['83], I think he was the second editor of The Dartmouth Review, conducted a poll of some 300, I think, Indian Chiefs around the country. All of them, except one or two, were for the Indian symbol. However, ideologically, it had to be abolished. So, in retrospect, Steel either saw something there or was in love with the Indian symbol for its own sake, but I think there Steel had his finger on the pulse of a negative direction at Dartmouth. I suppose, in a larger sense, he was talking about the identity of the College.

Now I just skimmed an article celebrating Freedman's tenth anniversary in which he, himself, says that, among his achievements, are putting in these studies programs...Women's Studies and so forth...which, I think, is a dilution of the curriculum and really bogus on...it is a politicization of the curriculum. They are never going to get rid of these things. They are not going to meld them into the Psychology or the History Department. They are their own type of thing and they are outside the ordinary structure, so I

consider those to be negative things. In addition to trivia...and not all trivia is really trivia...things like censoring the Bible and Drum sign outside of the Tavern Room at the Inn...now called the Ivy Grill. It used to be called the Bible and Drum. So they didn't want any references to Eleazar Wheelock in there, let alone bibles and drums and all kinds of things like that. Changing college songs; which, after all, were written by people like Richard Hovey and so forth.

I think, you know, saying, I think, that the chances of Harvard changing it's song "Ten Thousand Men of Harvard" is zero. They would think you were nuts even to suggest it. But Dartmouth has to scurry with the trends that way. Freedman even thinks he did a good job in that respect.

CARROLL: You made a comment that I liked very much where you said that Dartmouth has a very weak institutional ego. I like that. Could you explain and enlarge upon that a bit?

HART: It's a complicated thing. Harvard knows what it is...a great research university. Yale is a little bit Avis-y in relation to Harvard's Hertz. They still feel they are pretty good and they do something very well that Harvard doesn't do. Nonetheless, they know who they are.

Columbia certainly does, rather hard-fistedly. Trilling once told me that Columbia is not alma mater. It is dura mater and Barazin once remarked to me...he was "This place is run like U. S. Steel." [Laughter] So Columbia wants to be first rate. No sentiment. More like the University of Chicago than like Dartmouth or Princeton. The schools have different identities.

Dartmouth does not like it's reputation of being a party school, being an outdoor school and so forth, so it wants to be more intellectual. Not more intelligent. More intellectual. I don't think of myself as an intellectual because I don't like the word. I think it is a social category rather than a functional category in that an intellectual, sociologically, is a member of the middle class and in rebellion against the middle class. Mostly this comes from the left, but can very much come from, say, a fascist direction. I have known fascists who use the word "bourgeoisie" with as much contempt as any communist. So I don't feel that rebellion

against the middle class. I just try to be as intelligent as I can and do not consider myself, in that way, an intellectual. I think of them about the same way Burke thought of the Philosophes in France.

CARROLL: You said that maybe what Dartmouth should be or should design itself to be is the best undergraduate liberal arts education around, and I was wondering what would make it that? What is it we need to do?

HART: Well, they should have...Dartmouth...any undergraduate school, sharply distinguished from graduate work, should have in mind what it wants to produce in terms of an educated person and I have defined it, quoting Rosenstock-Huessy as a person who can, if necessary refound his civilization. This does not mean going off onto all highways and byways of eccentric subjects. You already commit yourself to some centrality in that respect. If you want to put in Caribbean studies, that's a waste of time. It is fine for graduate work; but it is not germane to this. Nor is Confucius, for that matter...most of the American political tradition comes from England and the language comes from England. The literature that we all read comes mostly from England and thus the linguistic skills.

So, when you say recreate a civilization, you are looking at a curriculum that more or less shapes itself. If Dartmouth did that, Freedman would be on the front cover of Newsweek...if he got rid of all the junk. But he would be terrified to do that. It would be unfashionable. But you would immediately see an upgrading, further upgrading, of the student body. The student body is good enough, but it could be a lot better. I certainly don't advocate going the St. John's Annapolis route.

CARROLL: Great books.

HART: Totally great books. I don't think that you have to study the Works of Ptolomy to understand Ptolomaic astronomy. Dartmouth defuses its effort and wastes it's resources on things that aren't central.

CARROLL: When you were teaching, you really had to teach through the very rebellious and protesting years...the '60's and '70's.

HART: Yes.

CARROLL: At one point, in the notes that you handed me, you said you thought a lot of it had to do with the drug culture that sprang up then.

HART: Yes.

CARROLL: To what extent do you think that was part of what happened? Which is the chicken and which is the egg?

HART: Take one step back from that. I have said that in March of '68, I went out to California to work for Reagan and worked for him through July, and protest in California in '68 made anything that happened at Dartmouth look like ping-pong. People getting killed out there and, you know, you might have an angry Black group here, but the Black Panthers were right over there in Oakland, California, and people were getting shot.

I mean, Reagan could say things there that people would be shocked by back here in the East publicly about... Some Black Panthers and radicals at Berkeley were threatening a blood bath and Reagan said at his press conference, "If they want a blood bath, they will have a blood bath." That was about the way it was and he meant it. So after that, even the occupation of Parkhurst seemed to me to be pretty tame.

However, the same principle was involved. Does anyone, for any reason, have a right to interfere with the ordinary operations of a college and prevent perhaps the majority from going to the classes when they want to go to them? My position was... and if I had had any power to enforce it, would have been...to throw out the people who were causing trouble. If I had to throw out 500, fine. If I had to throw out 1,000, fine. We can go back to the waiting list and call other people.

CARROLL: How much do you think the drug culture contributed to the spirit of rebellion?

HART: It was part of it. Whether...I think synergistically, they fed each other. But there was one year where I wondered what I

was doing here. I would go to class. I think I was teaching the broad... It didn't bother me so much in advanced seminars or serious lectures, but we had a survey course, introduction to the major, then sort of to introduce people to the range of from Chaucer through more modern stuff and the students were so drugged up that I couldn't get any response. They were so glassy-eyed. The thing was pretty bad. Ian Alsop was Stewart Alsop's son and he disappeared. Last I heard, he was in Tibet somewhere in search of the Maharishi or something, and Governor Gilligan, I think his name was, from Michigan had a son in that class, too, who was totally disengaged from anything going on in the classroom.

I remember...this actually applied to my eighteenth century course. I just sort of exempted that. At the end of one term, I gave a blue book final exam in 105 Dartmouth. And at the end of the thing, I said, "Time is up. Bring in the blue books." They all brought in the blue books and one guy handed in his blue book and said, "This is the best essay I have ever written." I said, "Well, I will put it on the top of the pile. Can't wait to read it." I went back to Sanborn and opened the thing. There was one solid line across the top of the page. That's all. He had apparently written over and over and over or something in that one line. There was just nothing. So I failed him. It didn't matter because he was on his way out anyway, I guess.

CARROLL: How did you teach in the midst of this stupor?

HART: It was very depressing. I thought of taking leave, investigating maybe three years of leave and, you know, going back to New York and working in journalism; but, plugged along.

What killed the drugs in my view was L.S.D. It really was dangerous stuff because you could not tell what effect it was going to have. More than most, I think, amphetamines and so on. People were walking out of third story windows and falling off fire escapes and that type of thing.

Humorously, several years later, I met Tim Leary in New York. By that time, he had reverted to his Catholic altar boy persona and he consented to a glass of wine, which he didn't

drink. He was on his way down to Princeton to address a psychiatric convention, taking a position against permissiveness. [Laughter] I felt like the dangerous character and he was very...[Laughter]

CARROLL: Oh, that is lovely. This is a little bit later because I want to really switch down now to The Dartmouth Review...the impact of the founding of it, etc. I want to get that on paper. Now you started to tell the story last time. I am going to ask you to back up and tell it again about Greg Fossedal and his contretemps with The Dartmouth...The Daily Dartmouth.

HART: Okay. We are talking about the year 1980 and Reagan was running for President. Had been for a year. John Steel...I have forgotten for how long...had been getting up a campaign for trustee. In the midst of this, Fossedal became editor of The Daily Dartmouth in the normal changing-over process. And I am not sure how their editorial process on The Dartmouth works, but no one apparently was angry or bothered by the editorials themselves which are unsigned and apparently represent a consensus position on the newspaper.

But, Fossedal supported John Steel in a signed...what amounted to a column, not a news thing, but why he supports John Steel. This led to trouble on the staff and then I urged Fossedal to fight. In fact, humorously, I told him that he ought to announce that he is a communist and a homosexual, in which case he would be absolutely invulnerable. [Laughter] He didn't think that was funny. Somehow, he was pushed off that board, so he wanted to...he had in mind another newspaper.

At that same time, a quite different group at Aquinas House, the Catholic Student Center, was thinking of starting what sounded to me like it would be a newsletter or a...sort of a modest thing. The Aquinas House, at the time, had a liberal Jesuit priest named Joe Devlin. A very nice guy, but tauntingly unorthodox. For example, he would wear the wrong color vestments at a particular celebratory day. You were supposed to wear green, he wore blue. This kind of thing and his interpretations were very suspect. I think he was pretty gay besides...not actively on campus, any way. He had a statue on his desk of two men kissing and this

drove Monsignor Nolan up the wall, but couldn't do much about it. So, parish politics. By the way, I became a Catholic in 1968 after being a long time Episcopalian.

Anyway, this group of say traditionalists, conservatives at the Aquinas House wanted to start this traditionalist organ...newsletter. Whatever. And they knew Fossedal and Fossedal pulled them into his project of starting a newspaper, which would not be religious, but would be political. Campus, and generally political. I think the religious content simply dropped out.

CARROLL: Typically.

HART: Yeah. Yeah. Though Fossedal did, himself, become a Catholic. I think the only time he went to church was his First Communion. [Laughter] Anyway, the paper emerged and Fossedal was the force behind it. From his experience on The Dartmouth, he knew how to put out a paper, do layout, get it to the printer...that sort of thing. So he was the person without whom the paper could not have, in my view, emerged.

Now everyone thinks that I founded it. I had absolutely nothing to do with founding the thing, though it did take shape partly in my living room. I had separated and finally divorced my first wife and moved into a house I had bought for my father, who had died in '72. So Benjamin [Hart '81] at some point found that the Beta House was much too noisy to study in so he moved into my house in Lyme. That's how I got involved at all, let's say in proximity, with The Review, because Ben, Fossedal, Kenney Jones '84, Dinesh D'Souza and people were there in my living room cooking up the paper. People say that I am an advisor to the paper. As far as I know, every bit of advice that I have ever given has been rejected. [Laughter] I felt that the title Dartmouth Review was impossibly bland and it should be more on the order of the magazines from the 1920's like Broom and Blast, you know. Maybe Smoke Signals or Tomahawk or some more, you know, less pastel thing. That got no where. It didn't make any difference because The Dartmouth Review then became less pastel.

CARROLL: Was the name taken consciously to echo The National Review?

HART: Yes. Fossedal adored Buckley and the National Review and the layout of the magazine then and now imitates the National Review and it's got the editorials in the front. First the correspondence and then the editorials. Then the week. We called it "The Week in Review" at the National Review. Then articles of different kinds and culture in the back...book reviews, and so forth. Movie reviews in the National Review. Sports in The Dartmouth Review. But Fossedal also thought the National Review was kind of stodgy, so he combined the National Review with The National Lampoon or something like that for his sensibility and that's how that emerged.

CARROLL: How did he find [Stephen] Steve Kelley ['81] whose graphics in the beginning I think were just wonderful?

HART: Well, Kelley was sympathetic to The Review and The Review would publish stuff that The Dartmouth hesitated to publish. He didn't totally leave The Dartmouth because it gave him a daily outlet, but he has continued to be a conservative cartoonist on the order of McNelly. McNelly is his model.

CARROLL: Really. I will have to look for him then.

HART: He is in Newsweek all the time, you know, on that page...

CARROLL: Sure. The opening page where they have...

HART: The New York Times, sometimes. His base is the San Diego Union.

CARROLL: I will have to look because I thought that the opening graphic, the first page of the first issue of The Dartmouth Review was a lovely skewering of graduates as they are sitting there and he is typing his footnotes in his robe and cap and gown. It was lovely. Were you drawn in as a consultant from the first or did this happen gradually?

HART: No formal...the only formal thing I have ever had was to be on the Board of Directors, which is mostly concerned with finances. They would be very concerned if they came out

and praised [Massachusetts U. S. Senator Edward] Ted Kennedy or something, but that is not likely.

CARROLL: You end up being on what's called the Advisory Board.

HART: No. Not on that at all and never have been. That's people like Russell Kirk and Tom Sowell and Sidney Zion. It is sort of window dressing.

CARROLL: Pat Buchanan, Norris Cotton, Gordon Humphrey, Jack Kemp...all of those.

HART: Yeah. Some of those have dropped...or, you know, died or left.

CARROLL: Those people...to get on that board, must they have some sort of connection or is this just their imprimatur...that this is something they can support?

HART: The position was, in choosing such people...Martin Anderson, for example, too, comes to mind...Quite a few people not on your list there, but some well known people. They would be glad to get advice from them, but they have no duties.

CARROLL: So they are held in reserve in case one needs advice?

HART: Yes. Or possibly, in a crisis, they would have media access to lend a hand.

CARROLL: I am curious...The Dartmouth Review comes out...in one issue...right before graduation in '81 and then it comes out again...it really begins publishing in earnest in '82 in the fall.

HART: No. It came out the same calendar year.

CARROLL: Excuse me. The fall of '81. I am sorry. You are right.

HART: They took the summer off.

CARROLL: Exactly. And somehow over the summer, what started out as a very small group of people, has blossomed and the masthead now...or the list of people who are involved as either writers or graphic artists or sports columnists has

grown by leaps and bounds. So I am curious, did people just...were they attracted to this or had they gone out and recruited?

HART: You mean from the first issue to, let's say, the present time, it has grown a lot.

CARROLL: I mean from the first issue to the second issue.

HART: Well, I don't know. I think that I would speculate that people liked the first issue and then came back in the fall and looked in and wanted to sign up. But there is another factor in its growth. It has also become a kind of club. They do things together. They have pizzas, I think, on Wednesday nights from E.B.A 's [Everything But Anchovies] and they have an annual banquet for the changeover to the next editor. It is a social organization as well as a newspaper. People like to do these things.

CARROLL: And then it says at the bottom of the second issue, "A special thanks to William F. Buckley, Jr. and George Plimpton." What had they done to earn the special thanks?

HART: The example of Buckley and the example of the National Review. Buckley could not...I don't suppose would have...joined officially an advisory board. He could not because of his contract with the National Review. He can't be on any other such advisory board. He can't raise money for anything except the National Review. So Fossedal came up with that formulation and Buckley, (b), would not want to because he can't control it and, you know, who knows what...and then who, indeed, knew? What sometimes might not jump out of the newspaper?

CARROLL: And George Plimpton because...

HART: He writes these books where he plays football with the New York Giants and he puts out The Paris Review. So I don't know why he is in there. [Laughter]

CARROLL: Okay. Just thought I would ask. Where did the funding come from for The Dartmouth Review?

HART: Do you mean start up?

- CARROLL: Start up and then their abilities to deliver it free of cost.
- HART: It costs a lot more now than it did then and Fossedal actually put up some of his own cash, like living, year tuition, or whatever expenses. He had a thousand or something that he put up and that was the first issue. Now there must have been a fund...sort of a drive over the summer. Send subscriptions or...I think the subscriptions, called a donation, were twenty-five to start. I think it has gone up to thirty-five now. But a lot of people, if they write a check, are going to write one hundred and that's where the money comes from.
- CARROLL: There is a series of very contentious incidents that are connected to The Review; but, before we start on this, I wanted to ask you...do you know who came up with the motto, which I think is just wonderful? "No one provokes me with impunity."
- HART: It must be Fossedal.
- CARROLL: I always knew that in connection with the Scottish Crown, which was their motto; but I hadn't seen it before and it sort of popped right out at me.
- HART: I don't know who came up with the Teddy Roosevelt quote, either; but it is also one of Nixon's favorite quotations. I mean, he likes that because the man in the arena, however scarred or whatever, is superior to the men of just thought or, you know...
- CARROLL: The first I want to talk with you about is what you call and referred to as "The Baldwin Case". Can you talk about that a little bit?
- HART: Most people know that as the Bill Cole Case. The...

**[End of Tape 3, Side A -- Beginning of Tape 3, Side B]**

**End of Part One**