

Please Note

This oral history transcript has been divided into multiple parts. The first part documents the presidency of John G. Kemeny and is open to the public. The second part documents the presidency of David T. McLaughlin and will be open to the public in June 2012. The third and final part documents the presidency of James O. Freedman and will be open to the public in June 2023.

This is part one.

Edward M. Bradley
Professor of Classics, Emeritus

An interview conducted by
Mary S. Donin

February 12, and 24, 2009

Hanover, NH

Rauner Special Collections Library

Dartmouth College

Hanover, NH

INTERVIEWEE: Edward M. Bradley
INTERVIEWER: Mary S. Donin
DATE: February 12 and 24, 2009
PLACE: Hanover, NH

DONIN: All right, so today is Thursday, February 12, 2009. My name is Mary Donin and we are in Rauner Library with Edward M. Bradley—Professor Edward M. Bradley. Professor emeritus, I guess I should say. That was as of 2006 that you became emeritus?

BRADLEY: 2006. Yes.

DONIN: I guess we'd like to start out, Professor Bradley, hearing about how it is you ended up coming to Dartmouth back in—I think it was 1963?

BRADLEY: Yes.

DONIN: Did you find Dartmouth or did Dartmouth find you?

BRADLEY: Dartmouth found me. Dartmouth found me initially, I think, at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of New England in Lakeville, Connecticut. This must have been in the spring of 1962, where I met Norman [A.] Doenges and I was at that time working on my doctoral thesis and trying to find gainful employment. And they—he—Norman Doenges, I think, asked me to come up to Dartmouth and I decided that I would not come then. That it was premature and I wanted to have my thesis in hand and my degree in hand before leaving Yale—I was at Yale.

Then in the winter of 1962, Dartmouth was recruiting again for the fall of 1963, and I met Norman Doenges at the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in Baltimore, Maryland. At that point, I had completed my thesis and was going to receive my degree in June and was looking

for a position. So I took the old train up to Dartmouth and had my interview here.

I knew then two things that made the choice almost inevitable: I liked the idea of becoming a member of a young department that was expanding and where I was going to be given opportunities to teach in a variety of areas. I was currently teaching, at that time, at Yale, where I had been assigned a mission that did not necessarily correspond to my own interests or, I thought, my talents. So I liked that about Dartmouth—the opportunity to be part of an enterprise that was growing. And in addition, I knew that I wanted to establish myself in the country. That I wanted to live in a part of New England where I might even be able to afford a home in the country, which was not possible at all on an academic salary in southern Connecticut. So those are the two elements in my decision to come.

DONIN: So were you part of [John Sloan] Dickey's ['29] rebuilding the faculty?

BRADLEY: No, I came after. Dickey started to rebuild the faculty in the early '50s. And Norman Doenges, the person who was the chair of the department when I came, was a person brought here for that purpose, and he did—he really did become the architect of the department of classics as it evolved during the second half of the twentieth century and as it is today. He's still alive. When I retired there was one person I sought to honor in my own retirement and it was Norman Doenges who really made possible the life that I had at Dartmouth College.

DONIN: In what way?

BRADLEY: In that he gave me, through his own philosophy of education, opportunities to develop as a teacher and a scholar that I don't think I would have had—or cannot imagine that I would have had—elsewhere.

DONIN: Mm-hmm. Now this was in the Classics department?

BRADLEY: That's right. Classics department, yes.

DONIN: And you were teaching—the department was offering not just language—

BRADLEY: Latin and Greek, but what Norman Doenges did was to persuade the college—the appropriate college committees—to allow us to offer courses in translation that drew large enrollments. And the greater the enrollments, the more persuasive power he had to hire more faculty. And then with more faculty, we expanded our range within the more traditional area of the classics. So we offered courses in archaeology and additional courses in advanced Latin and Greek and in history, and so on. And so little by little, we developed—we moved from a faculty of three—I think I was the fourth person to join the department in 1963, so we were four with me, possibly five. And within a matter of ten years or so, we were close to ten. The department virtually doubled in size.

DONIN: And that was a reflection of the additional offerings?

BRADLEY: The additional offerings in translation courses that were so popular that we needed more staff, you see?

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: That was the way it worked. I mean, it doesn't work that way anymore, I don't think. [Laughter] But it did then. He used that as leverage for expanding his faculty. So I give him credit for that. And as I say, then I was allowed to develop our Roman foreign study program which I put together in 1971, and I look back on that as being—in some ways—one of my proudest achievements at Dartmouth College.

Our current chairman of the classics department was a student of mine in the course of one of those Roman foreign study programs, and then came back as a teaching assistant for me two years later in the fall of 1976. And then he went on to a very distinguished career as a winner of the Rome prize in Rome, and taught at Rice University and won awards there as a major scholar in his field, and is currently the chair of the classics department here. So I see him as being the proof-positive of that program.

But without the encouragement of people like Norman Doenges and others at that time, I would not have been able. I wasn't trained as a classical archaeologist. I was trained as a philologist, but they allowed me the opportunity to develop that program which came to mean an enormous amount to me in terms of my own professional, academic, artistic, aesthetic, and even spiritual growth. It was a great activity for me during the course of my career at Dartmouth.

Norman Doenges, though, was the—as I say—the architect of a lot of that. So he was chosen by John Dickey. And then as I say, John Dickey's choice was good to the degree—at least in my judgment—that Norman then knew how to establish a professionally strong and very accomplished department.

DONIN: So he was carrying out the mission of Dickey.

BRADLEY: I think so. I think so. Dickey really wanted to bring to Dartmouth, as you know, people who were a little—there were great teachers here during the Hopkins years, and some of them were still around when I came. Royal [Case] Nemiah was one of them—a wonderful, wonderful teacher revered by everyone who had known him. And he adopted me a little bit as a kind of senior mentor in a touching way. But he and his colleagues had really no interest in any activities outside of the classroom.

And what John Dickey wanted—as you know—was to bring to Dartmouth people who would make their mark in their own field of professional training and be as much scholars as teachers; to become teacher-scholars. And, as I say, in the case of Norman Doenges, I think that he chose—he and his deans—chose the right person, because obviously I speak from the point of view of one who did benefit, has benefited enormously from that philosophy of Dartmouth College when I was hired by Norman and in the course of my career here.

DONIN: Were you aware that this sort of growth was going on in other departments?

BRADLEY: Yes, I was. Yes, I was. And it meant that there were very interesting colleagues of my own age in other areas of the

college. And it meant, obviously, that there were times when we were somewhat irreverent in our regard to some of our older colleagues, who seemed to us to be a little sleepy. But, on the other hand, there was a good deal of fellowship—more fellowship, more comity, perhaps—within the faculty in those days than there is now when people are much more preoccupied with their own professional advancement. The college was socially and intellectually far more of a community than it is now.

DONIN: And why was that?

BRADLEY: There were instruments for making that possible. One of them was—for instance—the Ticknor Club, as a matter of fact. It seems so quaint now, when I think back to it. But the Ticknor Club was a meeting of humanities scholars that took place once a month, I think, in the faculty lounge of the Hopkins Center. And for each meeting, a younger member of the faculty was asked to present a paper. The older—the greybeards [Laughter] were there in attendance, and there would be sherry served. It was all very genial and friendly and a little old-fashioned, but very pleasant. It meant that we met one another and that we talked to one another.

And similarly, when—because we were divided into divisions, and divisions met as divisions every—they met fairly frequently. But they certainly met religiously at the beginning of every term, ordinarily in the Wren Room of—for the humanities division—in the Wren Room in Sanborn House where we talked about courses within the division; actually had to pass on and approve courses. So we heard from one another about what we were planning to do in different courses, and there was debate within a limited—a group of limited size.

At the beginning of every year, the chairs of departments stood up in turn and introduced to the members of the division the new members of their department. And there was always a little reception. So there were forums where members of the faculty met fairly frequently and had a chance to come to know one another and converse informally and formally with one another.

And it also was a time when everyone was encouraged to serve on committees of the faculty, and there were many. Service on committees was taken into consideration when people were being proposed for tenure. And of course committee service meant that people had opportunities to meet colleagues from other divisions and work with them regularly—on a regular basis in pursuit of some task. For instance, John Dickey—I don't know if it was John Dickey—but I was asked to serve as a member of the Wolfenden Committee. It was chaired by John [H.] Wolfenden, and our task was a reorganization of—God, [Laughter] if I could remember correctly—it was a fairly ambitious task; not to reorganize the faculty, but maybe some aspects of the faculty. So John Wolfenden was a wonderful, wonderful professor of chemistry. [Franklin] Frank Smallwood ['51] was a member of that committee. Leonard [M.] Rieser ['44] was on that committee. They stand out in my memory. I was the—because I was the most junior member, I was the scribe, or the secretary. But I came to know these people and—as I would know their, as it were, their temperaments, the bent of their intellects, and so on. So that helped to create a sense of community right across the faculty. And we met rather more frequently as a faculty, it seems to me, than people do now. People were far more attentive to the business of the faculty.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: Now, there were lots of great events in those years that caused the faculty to be much more involved in the governance of the place, beginning with the assassination of John Kennedy, and then the growing anti-war movement in the United States, and then, with the recruitment of African-American students, there were some moments of turbulence and [Laughter] more than turbulence, and of course, the takeover of Parkhurst in '68 and so on. So the faculty—there were some often long and ardent faculty debates and so on. People came and people were concerned. So it was a quite different life, and I have to say that that life marked me in my understanding of what an institution of higher learning should be.

DONIN: Hmm.

BRADLEY: And John Dickey was—John Dickey left a very, very strong imprint on that because, if I may speak of him right now in conjunction with those early years, John Dickey sought, every year, as no president since, in my judgment, to address the fundamental question of what is Dartmouth College and what should it be about? He labored over such questions, and so, convocation was always a very interesting and stimulating event—graduation less so because it's much more of a celebration. But John Dickey sought every year to define for the incoming class, as he rethought his understanding of Dartmouth College, what it was to be here, what the college was to be about for them, even as he reminded them—and it certainly was true in his time—that the genius of this place is very much measured by its geography and of course its history. And he knew that better, I think, than most of his predecessors. I don't think John Kemeny, for all of his genius in other areas, understood to the same degree what I'll call the genius of Dartmouth College.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: But John Dickey was steeped in it. Steeped in it because he'd been a—to be sure—he'd been an undergraduate here. Steeped in it because he loved the outdoors and knew that if one came here in those years when the interstate highways had not yet been completed, that if one came here, one had to make a friend of the environment and the climate, to the best of one's ability. And that also the history of Dartmouth College continued to reverberate when one considers what brought Eleazar Wheelock here, even if there was a tendency to forget the responsibility for Native Americans.

But the idea that this place was formed to—created to form future ministers of the faith—that is to say, men with an obligation to serve others—was translated, I thought well, by John Dickey into the understanding that Dartmouth was a place for him and remained, I think, where service to others is fundamental to the kind of conscience that the Dartmouth undergraduate should develop.

And John Dickey lent weight to what he said in his own personal behavior—by his own personal behavior—to a degree that I found just almost appalling because I once had

an occasion to sit with him at a dinner table when there was a guest here. Sir Isaiah Berlin was a guest of the Russian department and was going to speak that evening. There was a dinner for Sir Isaiah Berlin in the Drake Room of the Hopkins Center, which is now, as you know, a kind of warehouse for UPS parcels.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: But it was at that time used as a dining room for private college occasions. And I was invited to the dinner and the lecture. There were several tables set without any places assigned, but John Dickey was seated alone at a table for seven or eight. And people were sitting elsewhere as if somehow no one wanted to sit with John Dickey, and I thought, “goodness.” So I sat next to him.

I didn’t know him all that well, although he had—as I think I indicated earlier to you—impressed me very much by sending me a note, penned in his own hand in red pencil, commenting on and perhaps even complimenting me—I don’t remember that well—on a citation report I had written for a student named Cornelius Van Voorst [1968]. I still remember the boy’s name. And I can remember thinking, “My God, what kind of an institution is this where the president actually reads these citation reports and writes a note in his own hand to a lowly, first-term instructor?” I had taught at Yale for three years, and I certainly loved Yale—I’m a Yale alumnus—but Yale was really not that kind of egalitarian place at all. So I was, from that day on, rather impressed with John Dickey.

But I didn’t know him, and I didn’t really come to know him personally until—as I said—that evening when, at the dinner table in the course of conversation, he recounted an event in his own life. This had to do with Russia and Russians, since the Russian department was sponsoring the occasion, I assume that’s what prompted the conversation.

He reminded us all--or someone reminded him--that he had initiated contacts with Soviet scientists--thanks to the help of George Kennan whom he knew from his State Department years—to bring them to Dartmouth to seek ways of breaking down the barriers—cultural, political, and social—between

the Soviets and Americans by having scholarly exchanges. He had—I forget how often this had taken place—but in the course of one of these annual encounters where several Soviet scholars came to Dartmouth to meet with their American counterparts here, during which John Dickey said that he would do his best to break the ice by staying out and drinking [laughter]—sometimes late [laughs] into the night—with the head of the Soviet group. That was his contribution.

One night he came home to the president's house after having drunk...what he had to drink [Laughter] with his Soviet counterpart, and was going through the mail that was on a little table in the hall, and inadvertently opened a telegram that was addressed to the head of the Soviet group. And the contents of the telegram were quite anodyne—it was an invitation from some lady somewhere to this man to come give a—I don't know—a book signing or come and give a talk. It was not from some distinguished or important political figure.

But John Dickey found himself in a quandary there: what do I do? And I think most of us—as he told the story—thought to ourselves, well you call the lady and say, “Send another telegram.” He struggled. He agonized over that. And he decided—and this is the most important part of the story—that he would tell the Soviet that he had inadvertently opened the telegram, knowing that in the climate of suspicion which was so great that--John Dickey added--a couple of days before when they had gone out to visit a farm in Vermont, the B&G man--who was the driver of the car--happened to be wearing a trench coat, and the Soviets were convinced that he was a spy from the CIA. He said, “That was the climate which we were in.” And it took some persuasion to identify the fellow as just some man who happened to be assigned to drive the car.

John told the head of the Soviet delegation what had happened and gave him the telegram, and he said there was a period of freezing in the atmosphere that persisted for several days. Then he said that on the evening of the last day, prior to the departure of the Soviets, when there was a banquet of some sort, John Dickey used that event and told them all what had happened—and used it in an attempt to

persuade people to be much more sensible about what had been going on.

And as he told that story, I can remember thinking to myself, “Who is this improbable man?” Who carries honesty to such a pitch? Whereas the rest of us, without being dishonest, would have circumvented the crisis and acted otherwise.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: So I developed thereafter—I have to say—a kind of awesome regard for that man. And I always felt—and my friend [James M.] Jim Cox, who was a professor of English here, became and is still a very, very close friend—I can remember talking with Jim Cox about John Dickey, and Jim saying, “He’s a man in whose presence you would never want to be reprimanded, because you would know that you had done something wrong.” A reprimand from John Dickey, coming from a person of such integrity and probity, would be crushing.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: So, I like to tell that about John Dickey because he—as I think I’ve suggested or implied—he had an enormous mark on me—left a mark on me, to the degree that in his retirement, Jim Cox and I sought him out and we would have luncheon with him at Landers Restaurant at least twice a year. Landers was the place on the road to Lebanon, on Route 120, which was a local roadhouse where they had a bar. They had an Austrian barman named Heinrich, who was married to someone who was a technician in the biology department here. And we would—it seems improbable to say—but we would go to Landers with John Dickey, and each of us would have at least two martinis, served by Heinrich...and hamburgers, I think, which were very good. They made a very good hamburger sandwich.

And we just used the occasion to talk to John and get him to tell us about his life and experience. We just used it to grill him and to learn from him as much as we could about his own past and his recollections of Dartmouth. He was a wonderful, wonderful friend to have. He became, with us, something of a *habitué* of Landers, so that the waitress—and

this all seems so improbable [Laughter] these days. I don't think anyone drinks martinis anymore, and certainly people don't have martinis for lunch.

DONIN: Right.

BRADLEY: But the waitress who regularly took care of us was a woman named Norma. And Norma had been around [Laughter]. Norma had known at least a couple of lives before. But she would come and greet us, "Hi John. Hi Jim. Hi Edward," and give us all a kiss. "What are you boys having today?" [Laughter] I'll tell you, this was not the John Dickey that I think—I don't know. I don't know. But that was also John Dickey. So John Dickey, in his retirement, became a dear, senior friend to Jim and me. That was—those were occasions in which we cemented that friendship.

DONIN: Did the young faculty generally find him approachable?

BRADLEY: I don't think—I have to say, I think I was rather... I don't think there were a lot of people who saw him as I did. I think that a lot of people saw him as someone who wasn't a great scholar, may have been a little snooty. I don't want to be unfair there, but... There weren't many occasions for seeing him outside of faculty meetings. He had—he tended to be somewhat self-effacing at faculty meetings, and his humor was wry. He may have—maybe some wanted him to be more decisive, or more eloquent. He had a style of speaking which was somewhat halting, because it was clear he wanted to... He reflected on what he said. He didn't have a fluent delivery, and it may be that some of the younger—some people my own age just didn't think he was all that smart. You know? Just because he didn't have the fluency and the assurance of a Kemeny.

But as I said, having heard him tell that story about himself, I just happened to have the privilege of knowing a different man. And I liked what I saw. I...I come, myself, from a puritanical heritage...background. And...[Laughter]...a stern... People with a stern outlook on things, and so on. I liked John Dickey's discretion and his simplicity. And I certainly admired his probity. So he corresponded to my way of thinking, an example of a real leader.

DONIN: How did he deal with all the unrest and turmoil?

BRADLEY: He was troubled by it. He was troubled by it. I think he found it difficult to understand fully. Who didn't? He was a little impatient of it. Let me see if I can give you some examples. There are some things one tends—well, I have forgotten. I have sharp memories of some things and some other things that were important.

There was a time when the Afro-American Society made very important demands on the administration that seemed to many of us to be foolish, including—for instance, I think—that they wanted the college to employ a—I hope I remember this correctly—an astrologer, perhaps.

I may be distorting something here, but I remember a late night—you know, late night meetings of the executive committee of the faculty—which I was a member of at that time—trying to deal with these demands. Professor Errol [G.] Hill, who was kind of a liaison between the Afro-American Society and the executive committee, was going back and forth. It was hard for people to be patient in the face of some of these demands.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I suspect that John Dickey may have felt—he never expressed this to me personally—may have felt, as a lot of people did—and I may have as well—how now, here the college is going out of its way to try to provide serious educational opportunities for these young men—it was young men at that time—and what are they doing? Do you understand? [Laughter]

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: Aren't we being nice? [Laughter] There may have been more of that than there should have—just confusion and misunderstanding, and maybe some residue of old-fashioned quasi-colonialist attitudes. I'm not suggesting that we were blameless or perfect there, but I think John had trouble understanding that. He certainly had trouble understanding the people who wanted to take over Parkhurst.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I think he never—he was always very discreet in his comments on events or persons. [Changing audiocassette] Do you want me to stop?

DONIN: It's all right. I'll turn this over. Okay.

BRADLEY: As I said, he was always very discreet in whatever—in commenting on matters for which he had clearly developed his own judgments. So he never let go, certainly not with Jim Cox and me. And you have to remember, Jim Cox is some 10 or 11 years older than I am, so he was a lot closer in age to John than I was.

So I tended to be quiet for most of the—more quiet, quieter—than Jim Cox was with John. But John, when we asked him questions about his relations with some people and so on, he would intimate with an ironic or a wry smile that he had some serious reservations about this, that, and the other thing. But he—where one knew that he was damned angry. [Laughter] And he certainly was angry, I think, in the wake of the takeover of Parkhurst, and his having been lifted out of his office on his chair.

So, I think that it was hard for him to face the events of the late '60s. Yes, yes. He didn't have—I think it was hard for him to understand how to measure them. Well...

DONIN: And at that point—

BRADLEY: At that point, he was facing retirement as well, you see.

DONIN: Yes, I mean he'd been on the job, by then—

BRADLEY: For 25 years. Yes.

DONIN: Right.

BRADLEY: Yes, yes.

DONIN: Right.

BRADLEY: So he may have felt, also, "I'm leaving at the right time." But he never—there was never a—it's important, I think, to know about the man, there was never any trace of bitterness or recrimination in his retirement. He was just wonderfully fun to talk with. He did mention, and this does relate to his successor I think, with a little sadness and disappointment, that whereas when he—John Dickey—was made president, he made a point of honoring Ernest Martin Hopkins—of consulting him, even if he didn't follow advice given by Ernest Martin Hopkins. But that John Kemeny never came to him once. That was hard for him to swallow. He didn't complain about it, but it was clear that was a bitter pill. He may have regarded it as just being a breach of elementary courtesy.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I think he would have liked to have been considered someone to consult on occasion by John Kemeny. But John Kemeny never did do that.

DONIN: How much of a hand did he have in the selection of—?

BRADLEY: I don't know. I have no idea. He was—I have no idea. He was delighted with the selection of David McLaughlin.

DONIN: Mm-hmm. The faculty at the time that John Kemeny was selected, what was the reaction?

BRADLEY: I think the faculty was very, very pleased.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: Very pleased. I really didn't have much of an opinion. I didn't know John Kemeny very well, other than he was active in faculty meetings and was an intelligent and articulate spokesman for what he—for the causes which he represented when he spoke. But I don't—I, myself, didn't really know him much and had no reason not to think he was a good choice. And I think, in fact, it was a good choice.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: But I think the faculty was generally was very favorable to the selection of John Kemeny, and the idea of having one of our own, an academic person who knew the institution and who'd shown himself to be a person of remarkable intelligence and intellectual pedigree. All these--I think--were factors that left the faculty extremely pleased with his selection as president.

DONIN: Did John Dickey feel that was any sort of a reflection on the fact that he was not of the faculty?

BRADLEY: No, I don't think so. And as I said, John Dickey never—you know, he never complained. He never—for instance, when we asked him that question—we asked him about his relations—we would ask him at our luncheons at Landers Restaurant. We would ask him about his past: his relations with Dean Acheson, with George Kennan—whom he admired enormously—George Marshall. So through him, we would seek to have a better understanding of that remarkable world of the late '40s.

And above all, when the UN was taking—coming into being. And then, of course, we asked him about Ernest Martin Hopkins, because John clearly did depart from the Dartmouth that Ernest Martin Hopkins had left him in wanting to bring Dartmouth right into the twentieth century—the second half of the twentieth century. Whereas I think he felt—and I believe, correctly so—that the Dartmouth of 1945 was still, in some ways, very much the Dartmouth of 1930. Even I felt that, to a certain degree, when I came here from Yale in 1963. There were aspects of Dartmouth then that I felt were much those of a great, big, private prep school—of a prep school.

DONIN: Mm-hmm. Such as?

BRADLEY: Oh, some of the hazing, the beanies that the freshmen wore. I thought, Good grief, this is.... [laughs] As a boy, I'd read—a little boy, when I was 10 or 11—I'd read books written in the '20s and '30s about...John Brown Goes to College or something. [Laughter]

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: Or to State U, where everyone wore a red sweater with a big letter on it. [Laughter] And I thought--when I saw the students building bonfires the first few weeks I was here, and wearing beanies—I thought, “This is so childish.” [Laughter]

DONIN: So when you—

BRADLEY: Now, I’d come up from sophisticated New Haven, so I—but I was—so John Dickey must have felt that very smartly having come from San Francisco to Hanover in 1945. [Laughter]

DONIN: Hmm.

BRADLEY: So he did what he did, and he did it well. And as you know, the Great Issues course was a prominent feature of his attempt to reform and enliven the intellectual life of Dartmouth undergraduates.

DONIN: That was winding down when you were there.

BRADLEY: Yes, they no longer had it. They no longer had it. Yes. It had already wound down. But I don’t think John ever intimated to us that he sensed that John Kemeny disapproved of anything that John Dickey had done. On the contrary, John Dickey brought John Kemeny to Dartmouth. John Dickey, to that extent, made John Kemeny possible.

DONIN: Sure.

BRADLEY: No, I think it’s a question of temperament. John Kemeny was a very proud man, and I had myself an incident with him in which he demonstrated to me that it was very hard, if not impossible, for him to acknowledge error.

DONIN: His own error?

BRADLEY: Yes. Yes. If I may, I’ll tell you the story.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: Because it does provide an interesting—in my own thinking—an interesting contrast. During the early years of John Kemeny’s tenure, the war in Vietnam was still going on, as you know, and there were a lot of protests here

concerning the restoration of the ROTC programs and then the presence of military recruiters on campus. A petition made its way to John Kemeny that protested the presence of Marine recruiters on campus. I received a call—let’s see—no, I received a letter from John Kemeny singling me out as the senior-most member of the faculty among the signatories of that petition, drawing my attention to the fact that it was the practice of Dartmouth College to allow military recruiters to come to campus, and chiding me—maybe more than that. Here I forget a little bit. But, reprimanding me, perhaps, for my role in the petition. Copies—what was equally important—copies of the letter were sent to all of the senior administrators of the college: Donald [L.] Kreider, who was at that time vice president for—I think—student affairs—I forget—the provost, Leonard Rieser, and so on. So it became a matter of my permanent record.

DONIN: This was a faculty petition...?

BRADLEY: It was a faculty petition.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I had never seen the petition in my life. So I called the president’s office and I said, “May I see a copy of this document?” So I received a copy of the document, and it was a petition, and there were the names of members of the faculty appended to it. They were all typed. There was no signature there. Someone had typed my name! Someone had typed my name to a petition I had never seen or signed!

DONIN: Hmm. That’s disturbing.

BRADLEY: It was. All right, hold on. [Laughter] And in addition, two other persons whose names were on that were John [W.] Lamperti, in the math department, who was in fact by age and by seniority, senior to me! A member of Kemeny’s own department.

So I asked to see the president about this. And he did receive me in his office, and I drew to his attention the fact: one, that I had never signed it, and in fact there was no signature, and that a petition without a signature is not a petition. It’s a document that may or may not be true. He

never said, in any form, anything that suggested responsibility. He never said, for instance, this is a ghastly mistake. He didn't need to be personal about it. Somebody goofed. Nothing.

So, as I left his office, I said, "John, I would appreciate your sending a letter clearing my name, and clearing the files on this." But I had to ask that of him. I always felt that was—now that's a small event, in a way—but I felt that that was a measure of the difference between him and John Dickey. I knew that John Dickey would have said, I made a mistake here. Or someone, in my name, made a mistake. But, since it is in my name, the mistake is mine.

On the other hand, I should say, in exoneration of—but I felt that was always a characteristic of John Kemeny that he could not, would not, acknowledge—at least not publicly, mistakes made, if mistakes were made, just as he never really wanted to ask the faculty to share in any sacrifice that had to be made. There were times—it seems difficult to remember them precisely now—but there were times when, for financial or other reasons, the college had to cut back. I remember talking with friends about this—that John Kemeny was making a mistake and not inviting the faculty to share with him in something that had to be done. And he always said, "I'll take care of this." And he liked—I think—posing as the champion who didn't need help from anyone, and more often than not he was able to do what he needed to do. But he was a person who did not solicit the active support of others. He liked being the person who solved the problems by himself.

DONIN: And he was also protecting the faculty, wasn't he?

BRADLEY: Well, I just tried to convey to you that yes, no doubt that was—protect, perhaps spare. But he misunderstood—I'm suggesting to you—the temper of the faculty which wanted to participate in the consequences of whatever decision was made. Wanted to be involved.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I actually do remember discussions with colleagues of mine in which we'd say, "Doesn't he understand that if he really

wants this to work, people have to be involved with him in it?" That it's not enough to ask someone to do something because then people have the sense that they are not being respected for their own ability to make decisions that may be cooperatively helpful.

DONIN: Hmm.

BRADLEY: There was—it wasn't a question of contempt for the faculty—although I think there were times when one might have felt there was a kind of benign contempt for the faculty.

I should say, on the other hand, I had one very positive experience with John Kemeny, at a time when I was the chair of the agenda subcommittee of the executive committee of the faculty. The college was designing a charter—a new charter that redefined the relations between the college of arts and sciences and the associated schools: Tuck, Thayer, and medical. I, in that capacity, organized meetings with the deans of medicine, Tuck, and Thayer. I remember at that point establishing a very, very good relationship with John Hennessey whom I came to like enormously and respect as much as I liked him. I think that [James C.] Jim Strickler was dean of the medical school then, and I forget—I don't think it was Carl [F.] Long—I don't remember who. It may have been Carl Long who was the...

But anyway, we met and we had a series of meetings. We were able to hammer out a new charter. I felt a little bit as if I were a diplomat. [Donin laughs] No, no. It was kind of exciting. So we hammered out a charter that passed muster with the other faculties, and then it was voted on by the faculty of arts and sciences. After that meeting... So I was still the chair of the agenda subcommittee of the executive committee of the faculty, which was a position of some minor prominence. I sat up next to the president at the faculty meetings.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: John Kemeny asked me if I would give him a lift home after the meeting. Now, you know his home is on Webster Avenue, it's not very far away. I had at that time [Laughter]—my wife and I just moved to an old farmhouse in Vermont

and we were struggling financially. We lived on the top of a hill at the end of a dirt road and it was wintertime. I had an old—when I say old, maybe 20 years old—half-ton Jeep pickup truck—[Donin laughs]—that I had bought from my younger brother. But it had four-wheel drive. But it was extremely temperamental. In order to start it on cold days, I had to remove the air filter, and with a pencil depress one of the flutters—you know, one of those little wings in the carburetor? [Laughter] So someone had to do that, and someone had to try to start it. [Donin laughs] I said, “Fine, I’ll take you home, but John, you’re going to have to—here take my pencil—and you stand—“ [Laughter] So there was John Kemeny who had probably never held a screwdriver or hammer or wrench in his life—I don’t know whether it was a screwdriver I kept in the glove compartment or a pencil from my pocket. Anyway, there was John—I think there was a light, wet snow falling. [Donin laughs] He was there pushing down the flutter valve and so on [makes engine revving noises] and we finally got the damn thing started. I got out and put the air filter back on. He got into the truck, and I drove him 200 yards to his home. But I think in retrospect that was his way of saying thank you. He never did say thank you. But that was his way of saying thank you.

DONIN: Right.

BRADLEY: Will you take me home? [Laughter] So I think he was just extremely awkward—I say that, tell that story, in the wake of the story I just mentioned about his inabilities: I made a mistake and I’m sorry about this, I should have thought of it. He clearly—whatever the motives or the motions may have been, he was a man who, for all of his eloquence in talking surely about mathematics and the sciences that he knew and his role as a member of the Three Mile Island Commission, in direct social intercourse with others—really unable to articulate easily, either an apology or an expression of gratitude. But at least I do think—I do see—and I say, that story of the drive home—his desire to be closer to me than his words allowed him to say.

DONIN: Mm-hmm. People often note that socially he was extremely awkward.

- BRADLEY: Yes. Well, that's what I'm saying to you. Yes. But you can see that. From my point of view, I can acknowledge his remarkable accomplishments as the leader of Dartmouth College. But as a colleague, I never felt that I liked him very much. I didn't dislike him. But he became, because of his own behavior, rather more a matter of indifference to me. Whereas, I do tend, of course, to idolize John Dickey a little bit like a schoolboy. But I just—I am predisposed temperamentally, philosophically, morally to like a person like John Dickey who thinks as rigorously as he did about what he's trying to do and is not ever afraid of acknowledging his own mistakes.
- DONIN: Uh huh.
- BRADLEY: I think that's...and Dave McLaughlin had that quality, too. Dave McLaughlin, who was in so many ways a bad choice for Dartmouth—but Dave McLaughlin had that saving grace, in my judgment. And on another occasion, I will tell you about an encounter with him that allowed me to see that.
- DONIN: So he was more of the John Dickey school?
- BRADLEY: Oh yes.
- DONIN: Right.
- BRADLEY: And he loved John Dickey.
- DONIN: Yes.
- BRADLEY: And he showed that love, I think, more than people ever give him credit for. But I think he deserves credit, too, beyond his dying day for the way in which he cared for John Dickey. I see that as being a very important measure of that man.
- DONIN: Mm-hmm.
- BRADLEY: The best, even though he was really just not cut out for this position at all, as president of Dartmouth College.
- DONIN: Mm-hmm. Not a good fit?
- BRADLEY: No, no.

DONIN: Was John Kemeny the right man to take the college, take Dartmouth into coeducation?

BRADLEY: Yes, indeed. Now that's an extraordinary accomplishment.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: It's a—I think —I think that it is perhaps the most important accomplishment in the history of Dartmouth College in the 20th century.

DONIN: Did you assume that the trustees saw that coeducation was coming and they--?

BRADLEY: Perhaps. Perhaps. But, you know, when one thinks about how adamantly so many of them resisted the abandonment of the so-called college mascot—of how viciously some of them contested the college's reaction to the burning of the shanties on the Green, and were so ardent in their support of some of the—really the most—in my judgment—the most vicious activities of the *Dartmouth Review* and of its supporters, I don't know that it was all that evident. I don't know. I mean, obviously some of them saw that it was likely to come and should come.

But the important thing is that John was at the helm and guided that through and saw the way to make it possible in a manner that was palatable to the trustees because it didn't involve massive expenditure of capital. And as someone who had been here for nearly 10 years prior to coeducation—and I speak as one who--I'm one of five sons. And I went to a private, all-boys school, and I went to a private all-male institution. So, you know, I had some inherited sympathies for an all-male world.

But it is true that the life of this institution... It was hard for the intellectual life of this institution to really take hold and blaze up with all men here, in an isolated spot where it is all too easy to continue to foster—not so much an anti-intellectual environment, but an environment in which it was rather more camp Dartmouth than Dartmouth College or Dartmouth University.

The presence of women changed... It seems so evident now that it's scarcely worthwhile rehearsing it, but the presence of women changed inalterably and immeasurably for the better the environment of learning. It was literally a transformation. It took us out of the night into the day. And it's taken some time, but my own sense is—and certainly was during the last many years of my tenure on the faculty—that this is a place where women have made their place, have created their space and their experience, and that this is their home as much as it was and is for men. It is truly a mature community of men and women. It means that then it is possible for people to engage in serious learning in the circumstances that we most honor.

So, yes, that is the great accomplishment. Even as I admire very much what Jim Freedman did in finally, I think, altering the cultural ethos of this place. But it wouldn't have been possible—you know; he built on the achievements of John Kemeny's coeducation.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: Just as I think John Kemeny's acknowledgement—long overdue—of the college's commitment to Native Americans. It's not been easy, and I don't think anyone would crow triumphantly about it today, but at least it is in place and the college does work at it as hard as possible with good people in making a place for Native Americans. But those... What Jim Freedman did really did depend absolutely on the—not so much the climate, although in part the climate—but on the materials brought to campus in the form of a coeducational community of men and women. So, his achievements were enormous in that regard.

But as I said, as a president, I never felt that he gave to Dartmouth the same kind of soul-searching, reexamination that John Dickey did every year. Presidents since Dickey have contented themselves with saying good things—rather repetitively, sometimes platitudinously—nothing bad, but no one has explored in the same wonderfully honest way the meaning of the place as John Dickey did. I don't mean to say that what John Dickey discovered every year was some great epiphany for the world, but people who failed to see

him as a scholar, were people who failed to see that that was his scholarship in a way.

He was a... He researched and searched again into the meaning of the place. So he provided an educational philosophy that his successors have inherited and have just taken for granted and have, in their own annual remarks at convocation or graduation, echoed. I think Jim Wright is the most—David McLaughlin wanted to be, but couldn't—Jim Wright, I think, is the closest in his understanding of the Dickey legacy, and in his own way, seeks to embody it, in his public pronouncements.

DONIN: Right. Well—and John Dickey has to be the most oft-quoted president.

BRADLEY: Yes! Well!

DONIN: Whenever there is an occasion.

BRADLEY: Well, he had interesting things to say. Yes, yes, I know. Yes.

DONIN: By far.

BRADLEY: Yes. No, no, no, I know. What a dear man he was. What a great man. It's nice to have a hero, and he was a hero. Yes, he was a hero. And as I say—or have implied by what I have said—he made my career at Dartmouth a source of just enormous gratitude on my part, for having been here.

DONIN: Well, speaking of your career, let's back up just a little bit.

BRADLEY: Yes.

DONIN: How are you doing time-wise?

BRADLEY: Fine. It's fine. Yes.

DONIN: How was the tenure process here for you, then?

BRADLEY: It wasn't all that bad. [Laughter] I certainly couldn't survive it today! No, it was not bad. It was, in fact, good. A number of factors which are no longer material were considered then, and one of them was committee service, scholarship to be

sure, teaching, and so on. But there was more of a balance, certainly, between teaching and scholarship than I think there is now. Committee service does not—is not a factor in any way, and members of the faculty—at least so far as I know—have been for the last many years, and still are, counseled not to waste time on committees unless they want to. It's just a waste of their time. They'd be better served by publishing that second book.

But tenure in my day was a lot easier to achieve. It was necessary to have a presentable body of scholarship, but it didn't have to be in the form of two books. Nowadays it is two books. That's my sense.

DONIN: Was it still in the hands of a Committee Advisory to the President?

BRADLEY: Yes, it was. Yes, yes, the same thing. And it went through the deans and so on. Yes. It was a lot easier. It was a lot easier.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: That's all I can say.

DONIN: Was it the same time frame? Seven years, or...?

BRADLEY: Yes. Yes, yes. Six years, I think. In my case it was six years.

DONIN: But it changed as a result—

BRADLEY: Probably in the '70s. Probably in the middle to later '70s. Mm-hmm. And I don't know quite what precipitated the change other than the fact that in the '60s, when I was here, there were jobs everywhere.

DONIN: Ah...

BRADLEY: There were jobs everywhere. I happened to enter the academic world at a perfect time, when there were just all kinds of opportunities all over the nation. Then things tightened up a good deal. So I think, in part, it was a question of supply and demand. That meant that the scrutiny for promotion with tenure was much—became much more

rigorous. The process set in motion by John Dickey grew apace. So John Dickey brought scholars here, who brought scholars here, who brought scholars here. And with each successive generation, there was an intensification, perhaps, of scholarly expectation and scholarly production. So little by little, the older generation of scholars—or teachers—was being eliminated through retirement, departures, and so on. Death. And then new people, fresh from the graduate schools of America were coming here.

DONIN: Oops. [Changing audiocassette] Okay.

BRADLEY: Coming here and finding that their colleagues in place were already established scholars setting standards for them to meet and exceed. And because what happens is inevitably that the people in place expect the people coming to exceed what's been done. So I think—but that certainly was set in motion in the '70s, and the place is still acting that out, so far as I see. And so it does mean that the quality of the faculty, by and large, is—in terms of its commitment to serious scholarship—is first-rate.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I do think that this institution continues to prize teaching, but when—under Jim Freedman—the four course load was institutionalized, it did tend to signal, subtly, but it did tend to signal to the faculty that teaching was less important, and scholarship more important.

I don't know that statistically it led to any increase in superior scholarly production. I don't know that. I don't think anyone has ever studied that. But as I say, it did tend to suggest to the faculty, do less teaching because you should be doing more scholarship. Inevitably in such circumstances, there is a kind of mental readjustment in which, I believe, undergraduates tend—it's slight and it's subtle—to matter less. We do, as you know... We have for these past many years tended to have recourse increasingly to adjunct members of the faculty or part-time people in areas where, when I first came here, regular members of the faculty taught. I think of the basic English courses. You see, now members of the English department, people in the writing department do that. They have people who are not English

PhDs. In our department we tended—right through to the end of my career—to have the senior members of the faculty teach beginning Latin and beginning Greek.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I think that we felt that that was in our interest as well. I don't mean to say that we were virtuous, more than others.

So, that is a change that has taken place that is, I think, of some significance. I think students are still very well served here, and that the faculty is deeply committed to working closely with undergraduates, but they may not be quite as well served as they were.

DONIN: Does it have anything to do also with the increase in graduate programs here over the years?

BRADLEY: Graduate students are always going to be rather more interesting to senior professors than undergraduates.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: In the humanities, though, that's not a problem. And indeed, it's for that reason, I think, that many in the humanities resisted the implementation of graduate programs. Also, we all knew, or a lot of us knew, that it didn't make sense at a place like Dartmouth to do not very well what was being done very well only a hundred or 150 miles from here south. [Laughter] You know, why try to compete with Yale and Harvard and Brown and, gosh, I don't know?

DONIN: That's an ongoing issue, it seems.

BRADLEY: I don't think it is now because no one wants to put money into graduate education. There's no money for these things. But I know that was very strongly felt in our area. There are great graduate faculties in the classics in New England, so why would someone want to come to Dartmouth and be a graduate student when all of the resources—the museums and all of that, let's say in classical archaeology—are in Cambridge or New York? Even Yale has an excellent collection of archaeological artifacts. Dartmouth has two little Roman busts. You see, we were just not...

DONIN: But in some ways, it's acting like a university. In some ways, it's acting like a college. I mean, in the sciences there are lots of—

BRADLEY: There are. There are. And I'm not in a position to say. My sense is that... John [N.] Kidder of the physics department, who died several years ago, was a good friend of mine and his view was that we just can't quite match the quality. We don't have the resources. We just don't have the resources. Maybe a single professor with a lab can bring the best in the world to his work, but it's very hard to replicate across a department. It is a question of infrastructure and money.

DONIN: Uh huh.

BRADLEY: And if you have a place like Harvard that has an endowment—or did—of whatever it was. Twenty billion dollars. And just all of them, MIT and that whole collection of institutions. That's what you just have to think of if you're going to bring graduate students here. So, his view was that in physics, they have good graduate students, but they simply weren't of the top echelon.

DONIN: Will this debate continue to go on?

BRADLEY: I don't think so. I don't.... You asked me. I don't think right now. I don't think anyone is thinking in terms.... Positions are being frozen at all the major universities in America.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: And I think resources for graduate study... You know, if you bring someone into one of the graduate disciplines in the sciences, that person has to come with an assurance of an awful lot of baggage. Labs, lab assistants, equipment, and so on. No one has that kind of money. No one. You know, right now even the rich institutions don't have that.

So I think that that kind of discussion is going to be put in abeyance for some time to come. And it certainly is not going to manifest itself in the humanities here. No, no.

DONIN: So with the arrival of women back in '72—

BRADLEY: Yes.

DONIN: —how did that change teaching for you?

BRADLEY: No, that's a good question. That's a good question. And of course, my response is going to be subjective. Women tend to be—and I think the generalization is good, generalization though it be, that is to say, I think it is secure. Women tend to be, in the strict sense of the word, more docile. By docile, I mean teachable. And young men—17 or 18 to 22—are just biologically inclined to be resistant to, just resistant. All right? There's a lot of, much more competitiveness, masculine competitiveness that enters biologically into any environment where we have allowed young men and you may have an older man.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: Women, by their body language—their faces, the movement of their hands—indicate that they are alert to learning to a degree that a lot of men aren't. I had—and I swear by this—I had my last class at Dartmouth, when I was, in the wintertime of 2006. It was a course in Virgil's *Aeneid* in Latin. So, for advanced Latin students. It was a very large class. I actually had it divided into two sections. But I'm going to say that 80% of the students were women and they were terrific. It was probably the best course I've ever taught in my life because they were... I could see from the way they reacted to what I said that they were understanding. And the way that they reacted helped me to be better. You understand? To go further in what I was saying. So, from my point of view, it was a wonderfully creative environment.

I had also some good men there, but men don't *give*. [Laughter] They don't *give* to the same degree. So one could then focus the class on the critical mass provided by intelligent and motivated women. And then they're a little bit like lighting a fire in the classroom. And they then, in turn, would tend to spark the men. The men would see, this is the way it works here. I can't sit back there with—as it were—my cap over my head.

I forbade the wearing of caps in my classroom for that reason, because they are a form of sullen resistance. The cap, worn in class, is a measure of sullen resistance, I'm sorry. That's what it is. [laughs] So I said, "No caps in this class." I said, "I know what caps are for. I know what caps are for. They're for avoiding direct eye contact, sleeping maybe. No. No caps."

But women provided that challenge to the men even as they provided an invitation to the instructor to teach, to be on target, to say things that were pertinent. It was just... I found their presence immensely stimulating, in this particular class. I don't mean to say that women are all—but by and large though, they bring a seriousness to the class that is slightly superior to that of men. They are—there's a motivation there, I think, that I encountered. So the atmosphere in the class changed significantly with the presence of women.

DONIN: Did your numbers increase?

BRADLEY: Well, we happened to benefit in the classics department from a coeducational body in that classical archaeology involves a great deal of art and art history, and a lot of women are very interested in art history. You may know, in art history, in fact, I think there's just an overwhelming majority of majors that are women.

So we have a lot of women who come in to archaeology. I think in terms of Latin and Greek, the mix is about the same. I don't think there's any—there's no statistical trend that I could—that I noticed. But in archaeology, yes. And that meant that there were a lot of them on our foreign study programs.

Some just wonderful, remarkable women, one of whom I just wrote to today. She's a professor of Italian at Fairfield right now, and her daughter is a freshman here. She's a person who was wooed away from economics by going on the Roman foreign study program, and the rest is history, as it were. She went to Yale and did work in Italian, and now she teaches Italian at Fairfield. Just a splendid, splendid person. She was one of those people who just came alive in Italy, and is representative of the attractiveness of our discipline to women because—just the nature of the discipline, which is

an area studies, a discipline that involves an entire culture, not just literature and history, but also art and archaeology. As I say, women do tend to be, for whatever the reasons may be, tend to be much more interested in studying art and art history than most men are.

BRADLEY: But I'm speaking now of Latin literature when I speak of that Virgil class—you know, literature in translation. I've had just—if I think of the citations I gave out in the last many years, most of them tended to be to really sharp women.

Yes, yes. Really, there are just very bright women here. I don't mean to say that there aren't very bright men, there are, too. But I've been lucky. I was lucky to have just remarkably bright women taking courses. And as I say, that was evident from the beginning that there was all of a sudden, as I suggested earlier. It's as if someone had turned.... It changed the lighting from 40 watts to 100 in the classroom. You understand? It became rather more incandescent.

DONIN: How about the change in the faculty? The makeup of the faculty?

BRADLEY: I think that's been more problematic. By that I mean I think it's still been hard. I think that the adjustment has not been made as easily in faculties where there are lots of women. I tend to—I'm not—[Laughter] I tend to think, myself, that women are a little less cooperative with one another and with men in the same environment. That's been my own experience.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I think men tend to be, to use the cliché, easier team players. I think women are a little less—at least this has been my perception of life in the classics department, where there are very able women. But it's clear. I actually had coffee with one of them this morning, one of the senior women. They just don't quite get along as well together as the men are willing to do, even if they don't care all that much for one another. Men are prepared to be a little easier with one another, I think. That's my subjective experience.

So, it means that there's not as much frank talk at faculty meetings. Men are a little likelier to say, What you just said is, in so many words, nonsense. That can't be said. Do you understand? They are just—there's reticence there where there might—could, should, perhaps—be more frankness. That's my own sense of things.

DONIN: Hmm.

BRADLEY: So the coeducation of the faculty was indispensable. It was an indispensable concomitant to the coeducation of the undergraduate body, but I don't think that—I can't speak for other departments, although I was aware in the course of time of little incidents. I just think it's been more problematic. Maybe because women are very sensitive to entering what has been a masculine—you know, a bastion of masculine control—and that's not yet been fully worked out. That's part of it, perhaps. I do think that—as I say, I think often the cooperation between men and women in working out departmental activities, responsibilities, has not been as easy as it was when we were all men because we could be amiably rough with one another. You know?

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: You know, men sometimes use locker-room language with one another and say, You're full of something that you shouldn't really be bringing to the table, and the person would laugh and would not go home and think, I'm hated and I have no place. I'm not saying that should be true, I'm simply saying that there's no idiom that has replaced it that provides, I think, the same level of necessary candor that often one needs when something has come up where one has to be able to say, Look, the rules are pretty clear here, sorry. You know? Sorry. As opposed to spending two hours hand wringing and saying, Gosh, what can we do? You see?

So, I do think that the give and take is inhibited as it did not used to be, and a new rhetoric, to use the contemporary jargon, has not been found to replace it. I don't know if that's true across the board, but it's certainly true, I think, in the classics department, as I perceive it.

And as I say, I spoke with a senior woman today who was unhappy about it. I can see the sources of her unhappiness, and I knew and still know a lot of people in the English department, and there have been incidents there where some of the women literally would not speak to one another. I mean not even say hello to one another. Men don't do that. You know? They do other things that are bad, but they don't do that. They don't make life impossible. And a senior member of the English department—she's now left, retired. It came to the point where some of her female colleagues literally would not speak to her. And that goes on in the Italian department today, among the women.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I don't think this should be a matter of public record. I think this part you may want to expunge. But I'm simply saying that in our discussion of coeducation, the classroom... The solution in the classroom was radical, and it hasn't been as well digested or assimilated in my experience as it has been in the classroom. But the most important thing, I think, is the classroom. That's where... We're concerned with what the undergraduates do, and members of the faculty can learn, or will have to learn to live with one another and manage as they can. But we do want to provide an environment that's conducive to serious learning, and learning that encourages and affirms. That I think is true here, and that is the great, great legacy of John Kemeny. John G. Kemeny.

DONIN: Now, when you chaired the department, did you have trouble hiring? Finding women to hire?

BRADLEY: No. No. Oh no. Women are in the majority, in fact, right now in the field of classics. There was, as you may know, or you may recall, there was, in the wake of our becoming a coeducational institution for undergraduates, a lot of... There were many incentives and a lot of pressure on us to hire women per force.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: So that's not been a problem. That's not been a problem. No, no, no. There are lots of very able women available and in the case of the classics department right now, let's see,

there are currently three senior women, and one, two, three senior men. So the balance you see at the senior level is 50:50. And then there are younger people, and there are two junior ones—three junior—well, three women who are either visitors or one who is an assistant professor, and there's one young male assistant professor. Then there's someone who's half in linguistics and half in classics and half in the dean's office, so he's—but it's essentially parity.

DONIN: So what did John Kemeny's year-round operation plan do to your...?

BRADLEY: From our point of view, I think it introduced just a great deal of discontinuity. That was the price that everyone's paid for coeducation. It was I think, probably a necessary sacrifice, but it has been very hard on small departments, above all.

In our case, classics, where an apprenticeship in Latin and Greek is not easy, not immediately rewarding, one can't go abroad on an LSA and speak ancient Greek or speak Latin and go to a café and have some fun going to the movies. So we need continuity.

It's been hard on those areas of the classics department and I assume this may be true in Russian as well. Some of the more difficult languages where students typically begin the sophomore year, then they have to take a term off and they give it up and then they lose a lot, and some of them just don't have the motivation to come back to it.

So year-round operations has been a significant source of discontinuity in undergraduate learning. I know that undergraduates like it because of the freedoms it gives them, but I have to say that I think it really is, along with the Dartmouth term calendar, more like fast-food eating than going to a fine restaurant.

DONIN: I've never heard that analogy.

BRADLEY: Our terms are short to begin with. They are too short, really, for... The scientists like them a lot. I think people in the humanities, where time to do research and write a lengthy term paper is really important, and we don't have it.

DONIN: Hmm.

BRADLEY: We just don't have it. We just don't have it. I've just come from a session with Jay Satterfield and my students are going to be asked—this is a first-year seminar—are going to be asked to do some research, a research essay. I'm trying desperately to find ways to give them time to continue with their class work and the reading involved in that, then also literally do research on an essay and have it all in to me by the end of the term, as opposed to having a week or two weeks free, you see, for the examination period.

So the calendar is a real source of weakness in our area. It turns out that increasingly, undergraduates at Dartmouth interested in pursuing graduate work in the classics have to do a PG year.

DONIN: Ah!

BRADLEY: Yes. We just can't... They just can't get enough here. And the great graduate schools in classics let us know, and they're right, a Dartmouth term is not a semester. Ten weeks, or nine weeks, is not 13 weeks.

DONIN: No. So they make it up with an extra year?

BRADLEY: So they have to do an extra year. Yes, yes. They go to Penn. Penn has a PG program. Georgetown has a PG program for people like that who just read, just spend a year reading Latin and Greek. Just doing more and more reading of Latin and Greek. Yes.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: So that's a real—that's a high cost that is paid. But as I say, it does mean, on the other hand, that students are—can accommodate more easily a foreign study term into their academic calendar, even if they are pre-med or are committed to a very serious, unrelenting science major. Of course, it does give them opportunities for internships and so on that basis they value their freedom, and I understand that. But, as I say, year-round operations did constitute a high price to pay. But I think necessary.

DONIN: Mm-hmm.

BRADLEY: I feel that if that's what was required, it was well-paid. But it doesn't mean, you know... It's a little like buying a beautiful home out in the country and in wintry weather you say, Gosh, why do I live so far out in the country? Do you understand? [Laughter] So, that's a little bit of the reaction I have to the year-round operations. My God!

DONIN: And it caused you to, I assume, to have to alter your teaching as well.

BRADLEY: I don't know. I don't know that it did. Yes, we had to sort of redesign sequences. And sometimes have double sequences in order to catch people in the net when they were here.

It hasn't worked out all that well. But we do—we... My wife reminds me that I'm no longer a member of the classics department. I'm merely hired help at this point.

DONIN: Mm-hmm. [Laughter]

BRADLEY: But that's what people in the classics department, my former colleagues in the classics department, are doing. [Laughter]

DONIN: Okay. I think we should stop for the day.

BRADLEY: All right. Good, good. All right.

DONIN: I don't want to wear you out.

BRADLEY: I may have exhausted you.

DONIN: Not at all.

BRADLEY: Babbling on endlessly and so on.

DONIN: Okay.

BRADLEY: But I think so. Yes. I think. Yes.

[End Part One, Begin Part Two]