

Robert E. Field '43, TU '47

**Vice President and Treasurer of Dartmouth 1986-90
Trustee 1981-87**

An Interview Conducted by

Jane Carroll

October 13, 1997

DOH-26

Rauner Special Collections Library

Dartmouth College

Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: Robert E. Field '43 TU '47

INTERVIEWED BY: Jane L. Carroll

PLACE: Baker Library
Hanover, NH

DATE: October 13, 1997

JANE CARROLL: Today is October 13, 1997, and I am sitting in Baker Library speaking to Robert Field, Class of '43, Tuck '47, who served many roles at Dartmouth College, not the least being as a Trustee from 1981 to 1987 and, in 1986, as an Acting Vice President and Treasurer of the College. Did I leave out any major roles?

ROBERT FIELD: In 1986, I did become Acting Vice President of the College; but that was pending a search for a successor. The search was called off. I kept that office for something like four years.

CARROLL: Good. Let me go back to your first time you saw Dartmouth and came here. Was that when you were an undergraduate?

FIELD: No. My father was Class of '14 and my brother was '39, so I had been in Hanover before I enrolled.

CARROLL: Did you ever consider any other college?

FIELD: I considered the Naval Academy. I got out of high school in 1938 at the age of sixteen and, at that time, I thought rather seriously of applying for admission for entrance at the Naval Academy; but also, Dartmouth was clearly the only other choice and, in the last analysis, was the choice I made.

CARROLL: Why did you choose Dartmouth?

FIELD: Well, until I was about twelve years old, I thought if you went to college, you went to Dartmouth. Then I heard of some place called Harvard from my father and that was spoken in very derogatory terms, so it was not a difficult decision.

CARROLL: What was it like when you got here?

FIELD: What was it like? Something less than three thousand students. All male, of course, as you well know. The facilities, of course, have changed considerably. When I matriculated, I had a room at Crosby Hall...the top floor of Crosby Hall...Room 309. It since has become administration, as we all know...part of Blunt Alumni Center. I roomed there for three years and then my senior year, I went down to Tuck. I was a 3/2 at Tuck. My senior year I lived at Chase. I was in the Navy...the V-7 Program...and most of us accelerated by going to school in the summer of 1942. So I graduated in December of '42 instead of my regular graduation in June of '43. Then I went out to the war and came back in '46. In '46-47, I got my second year at Tuck...my Master's Degree.

Then I went with Price Waterhouse in New York where I spent thirty-five years, mostly in New York; but, during the last seven or eight years, I was very heavily involved in the international firm and did a lot of travelling around the world.

In the meantime, I was quite active in Dartmouth affairs, being various class officers and so forth and involved in fundraising starting with the...oh heavens...certainly before the Third Century Fund, but definitely in the Third Century Fund, the Campaign for Dartmouth and the Will to Excel and so forth. I also was on the Board of Trustees...I did a lot of recruiting at Tuck School for Price Waterhouse and ended up on the Board of Overseers there. I was Chairman of the Board of Overseers at Tuck School when John Hennessey [John Hennessey W., Jr.] was the Dean and I headed the search committee which selected his successor. I was the vice chairman of the Campaign for Dartmouth and so forth and, you know, class activities and the rest of it. So I was very heavily involved in Dartmouth all along.

In 1981, I was elected Alumni Trustee, recommended to the Board as a choice for Alumni Trustee and the Board did elect me as a Trustee in 1981. That was a contested election. It was only the second contested election they had had for Alumni Trustees. The year before, John Steel [John Steel, Jr. '54] had been put up as an opposition candidate to the Alumni... Association of Alumni's [Dartmouth College Alumni Association's] nomination and he did win the election. So...he won the nomination, and was duly installed by the Board of

Trustees the year before I ran in 1981. My election was contested, too. I did win in 1981. Just to skip ahead a little bit, in 1986, my second five-year term was contested again and I won that time also.

CARROLL: I am going to slow you down here just a bit. You have kind of gotten me down the road and I am still in the '40's. [Laughter]

FIELD: Okay.

CARROLL: I wanted to ask you just a little bit about what the difference was between when you went away to the Navy...the Dartmouth you left behind and the Dartmouth you came back to for that last year at Tuck.

FIELD: Well, I think the difference was in the composition of the students. It was a mix of classes all the way from...especially down at Tuck School...from late '30's on through 1945 and '46, coming back to get their second degree...second year at Tuck. So the mix was different. There was a lot more maturity in the [later] group of students. That's speaking for myself as well as others. I was more mature and I got better grades the second year than I did before; although I was a *cum laude* at the College. I think that is the difference, primarily. Our attitude was more mature. Obviously...we had three or four years in the service to gain that maturity.

It was a lot of fun. Most of us were married. Some had children. We lived down at Tuck School at Wigwam Circle. Wigwam Circle, at that time, was a circle of pre-fabricated Navy housing. It is no longer there. It was where the parking lot is now, next to Thayer School. As I say, we were young. Most of us had children. We had a great time and, at the same time, studied hard.

CARROLL: I had an alum from that group tell me one time that he thought his cohort group was more open to coeducation because of having had that experience than those who were slightly before or slightly after. Did you feel that way?

FIELD: No. No. No. When the College contemplated going coed, I wondered at the time whether there wasn't a place for an all-male college. I wasn't violently opposed to going coed, but I didn't think it was necessary and so forth. In retrospect, that

was the wrong view of things. Dartmouth really had to go coed. It would have fallen behind the times had it not gone coed. So I am comfortable with that; but I didn't...I don't trace any of that comfort back to the post-war years.

CARROLL: I was just curious. I want to go back to the Third Century Campaign because you really played a major role in that to some degree when I was reading the reports.

FIELD: I have almost forgotten what it was. [Laughter] I have been in each of the campaigns, you know, and I can't remember...was Third Century Campaign...

CARROLL: Under Dickey [President John Sloan Dickey '29].

FIELD: Under Dickey. It took place in 1970, I guess. Right?

CARROLL: That's right.

FIELD: Wasn't there one before that? What was the Third Century Fund? Was that fifty-five million?

CARROLL: Yes.

FIELD: Okay. Wasn't there one before that for something like nineteen or twenty million?

CARROLL: If there was, I haven't researched that.

FIELD: Okay. Well that was the start of the really significant campaigns which came more frequently--the Third Century. I was in charge of Westchester County.

CARROLL: This was one of the beginning parts for Dartmouth of really doing the major fund drives.

FIELD: That's right.

CARROLL: How did you folks go about forming how to do it?

FIELD: Well, with a great deal of guidance from the College...from the Development Office up here. It was a case of getting a core group of alumni in the area, sitting around a table, going through the list of alumni and trying to figure out who were the better

prospects and so forth--all with guidance from the Development Office.

CARROLL: Were alumni surprised when you called them and asked for major donations?

FIELD: I don't remember.

CARROLL: You don't remember. [Laughter]

FIELD: I really don't remember. No, I don't think they were surprised. I mean, with Dartmouth (let's face it) they were certainly accustomed to giving to Dartmouth, but on a much lower scale, of course. In the Alumni Fund we were running sixty-five, seventy percent participation in those years. So, people... there is always that continuing abiding love for Dartmouth which, you know, has persisted throughout the years.

CARROLL: Why do you think that is?

FIELD: I think a lot of it has to do with the same reason I became indoctrinated with Dartmouth. My father was here. I mean, there are so many (it was a family operation) whom you now call legacies. We didn't call them legacies in those days, but they existed. For example, Tuck School was all Dartmouth at that time. We didn't have anybody from any other undergraduate schools there, so it was a closely-knit association. I think probably, once you got here, I think the geographical location had a lot to do with developing a sense of camaraderie and so forth.

Let's face it. In those days, particularly in the late '30's and '40's, most of us didn't have cars. We couldn't afford them. We couldn't go very far or very often, so this was it. This was our existence. Dartmouth was it, even as it is today; but perhaps more so in those days [Dartmouth] was Hanover. So you had fewer people. There were probably twenty-seven, twenty-eight hundred students at that time--something less than three thousand all together.

CARROLL: Then it comes time you were the Chair of the Tuck Alumni Fund.

FIELD: Overseers. Board of Overseers. Yeah.

CARROLL: I spoke with John Hennessey and he talked about the time he had to convince the College to let Tuck raise their own money.

FIELD: Right.

CARROLL: Were you a part of that?

FIELD: I headed the first campaign. We raised all of something like seventy thousand dollars. What did John say? Seventy or eighty. Less than one hundred thousand.

CARROLL: Less than one hundred thousand.

FIELD: Seventy or eighty. It was the first campaign we had.

CARROLL: Was it hard to go to these people? After all, the Tuck people were also, by and large, Dartmouth people. Did they find it odd at all to think of Tuck as a separate unit?

FIELD: I don't think they found it odd. Some of them got a little confused. "Why should we be giving to Tuck and giving to Dartmouth?" and so forth; but the proof of the pudding is in the eating of it and, from that humble beginning, you know what has happened now. Tuck has a very strong, vigorous giving campaign of its own; especially marked by the very extraordinarily high percentage of participation by the most recently graduated Tuck students.

CARROLL: Were you on the Board when they made their decision to expand and change their admissions policy at Tuck?

FIELD: As I recall, it was the beginning of it. It was a gradual, gradual change towards bringing in students from other undergraduate colleges; but not so much the emphasis on three or four years experience before enrolling at Tuck. Although, that's not true because I remember our son was one of the last...he was Dartmouth '76 and Tuck '77. He went 3/2 and I was Chairman of the Board at that time and I think, if that had not been so, they probably wouldn't have taken him then. They would have told him to go spend three or four years, which they were doing at that time, because he was about...there were only two or three 3/2's at that time when our son did it. He was the last of a dying breed.

When I went there, there were a lot of them. They did the five-year program, so he was the last of a dying breed as a 3/2 and, although they didn't put that much emphasis on spending three or four years away from the College before...getting business experience before coming back for a Masters Degree, still it was happening at that time. So, yes. I was on the Board during the beginning of that expansion.

CARROLL: Do you think that was a good policy to ask people to go have experience?

FIELD: Oh, yeah. I think so.

CARROLL: Why?

FIELD: They can contribute more from their own experience and thereby share it with others. Our son said this himself. He saw this as a 3/2...not having that outside experience, except for summer work. He would corroborate the fact that, yes, it brought a dimension to the classroom from which all students benefited.

CARROLL: How did that change the nature of Tuck?

FIELD: The nature?

CARROLL: The character of this institution. Let me put it that way.

FIELD: I don't think it really changed it. As a matter of fact, Tuck developed, if indeed, you say "developed," (I am not sure they had to develop) but they just carried over and, if anything, strengthened the feeling of camaraderie and the teamwork and loyalty to Tuck that previously, you know, there has always been at Dartmouth; so, for whatever reason, whether it was just the North Country or the air or whatever it is, I mean, you will find the Tuck alumni just as strongly loyal to Tuck as the Dartmouth alumni are to Dartmouth.

CARROLL: What do you think are the most significant events of John Hennessey's time as head of the Tuck School?

FIELD: Oh, boy. Well, I would say the change in mix, which you reminded me of...the change in mix. Boy, you are taking me a long way back.

CARROLL: I know. [Laughter]

FIELD: John was a strong dean. My silence shouldn't be taken as being denigrating to John in any way because he was an excellent dean of the school. He certainly developed the faculty. What can I say? I just can't recall anything outstanding other than the fact of general competency and leadership.

CARROLL: That's fine. Did you work a lot with John Kemeny [President John G. Kemeny] during that time?

FIELD: No. I did not.

CARROLL: Did you know him at all?

FIELD: Only briefly. When we were putting together the Campaign for Dartmouth, I was Chairman of the Board of Overseers at Tuck at that time and he asked me if I would head up the Campaign for Dartmouth...the major gift campaign, and I told him that I felt that probably there were people better known than I was to do that, so I ended up being one of the vice chairmen for the Campaign for Dartmouth.

CARROLL: Who was the head of that?

FIELD: You can look in your archives. You will find it.

CARROLL: Okay. [Laughter] Just curious. So you really came on the Board as David McLaughlin [David "Dave" McLaughlin '54] became President.

FIELD: The same year. 1981.

CARROLL: Had you known David McLaughlin?

FIELD: Yeah. I met him through some Tuck associations.

CARROLL: What was your assessment of him?

FIELD: My assessment.

CARROLL: Yes.

FIELD: Energetic. Enthusiastic. Deeply devoted to Dartmouth. Committed to it. Primarily, obviously, a businessman by background. He had chaired the Board of Trustees quite competently. I admired Dave. I was very much in Dave's camp, if we want to get down to that. So I thought he was a good choice for the presidency.

CARROLL: I want to go back just one year to John Steel's election. Had you followed that contested election to the Board of Trustees?

FIELD: I was not involved in it in any way. Certainly, I was interested in the proceedings; so, vicariously, yes, I followed it.

CARROLL: From a distance, what did you understand the issues to be surrounding his election?

FIELD: The issues were that we had a hard core of alumni with some very vocal spokespeople who felt that the Board had become too liberal; that Kemeny was too liberal; they didn't like coeducation; they didn't like getting rid of the Indian symbol and so forth and so on. These were the real dinosaurs. Unfortunately, some of them were somewhat more powerful alumni, going back into...basically to the '30's...the hard core of this group was the '30's.

So they felt primarily that the Board had become too liberal and too complacent and too willing to accept Kemeny's liberal ideas and these changes that Kemeny brought about and so forth. So they just organized themselves to put in their own candidate with the hopes that, once he got on the Board, he would bring a change. As a matter of fact, that didn't happen. John Steel was remarkably silent in the years I served with him.

CARROLL: You are the third person who has told me that.

FIELD: Oh, really.

CARROLL: Yes. Why was there so much fervor surrounding the Indian symbol?

FIELD: I can give you the platitudes on both sides.

CARROLL: That would be great.

FIELD: It was a controversial issue. Those of us who grew up with it, having the Indian symbol at Dartmouth since the early '20's...I guess Glen Cunningham [Likely that the narrator intended to refer to Elijah William "Bill" Cunningham '19,] sports editor and columnist, of the Boston Post] coined the phrase, didn't he? Or applied the moniker. It was not really an official symbol. It never was an official symbol as far as I know. It was just used and, unfortunately, a lot of it was a caricature...which we didn't see any harm in. As far as we were concerned, we were proud of the association with the Indians. I am giving you the platitudes. That's all I can do.

CARROLL: That's good.

FIELD: We considered it proud and many of us, including myself, said "Come on, guys. We are trying to honor the Indians. We are not trying to denigrate them" and so forth and so on. And I had my Indian-head cane. I got my father's Indian-head cane.

CARROLL: So he had one, even back in '14.

FIELD: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

CARROLL: Even though the official symbol was not the Indian until later.

FIELD: That is correct. That is a good point. I never correlated that. Isn't that interesting?

And there were only, as far as I know, there was one Indian in our class. I was very close friends with him. Henry Perly [Henry G. Eagle Perly '43], known as Henry Eagle. I think there may have been one other Indian in school. I am not sure; but, as we all know, up until that time, despite the professed mission of the College when it was founded in 1769, we hadn't been educating any Indians. So we didn't have a voice on campus to react to the use of the Indian symbol as being a token...the people who didn't want to be a token. And I accept their view. When we began to get more Indians on campus, largely as one of Kemeny's changes and so forth. One of his efforts was to...

CARROLL: To recruit.

FIELD: Yeah. All right. To enroll more Indians and so we began to get a group of Indians on campus and they said, "Hey. We don't

want to be anybody's token. We don't want to be anybody's symbol." I used to have debates with my classmates. I still have classmates who think it was a mistake to get rid of the Indian symbol, because they give you the same platitudes. "We were honoring them. We didn't demean them. We are proud of our Indian association."

My answer to them was, "Look," I said, "I feel the same way you do, but if you are doing something offensive to your neighbor, unless it is a matter of life or death, you don't do it. And this is offensive to a significant number on the campus." Of course, the number on campus wasn't just the Indians. They were able to rally to their cause, an awful lot of other people. Who many of the older alumni would say "Well, they are the flaming liberals on campus" and so forth, and "The College is getting too liberal and, my God, things are going to hell in a hand basket and so forth."

But that was the controversy and I wish that they had found a better solution. As I understand it, Kemeny was working on it along the lines...and I am not sure of this, but I believe it was along the lines of getting rid of the caricatures and getting a dignified Indian symbol. You might check this with Lu Martin [Lucretia "Lu" Martin]. I am sure you have talked with her. She knew Kemeny better than anybody. I think he was working on that at the time that the Alumni Association Committee to study this issue, headed by Bob Kilmarx [Robert "Bob" Kilmarx '50] at the time, came up with a recommendation that we downplay the Indian symbol.

CARROLL: Sort of a natural death.

FIELD: A natural death.

CARROLL: What I am curious about then is there was that tightening of procedures after John Steel's election about how you get on the Board of Trustees and they re-wrote the procedures. I don't know if you remember this.

FIELD: I sure don't.

CARROLL: Okay. Don't worry about it. Then you come up and you are pitted against a conservative kind of candidate named T. Coleman Andrews [T. Coleman Andrews, III '76].

- FIELD: The third.
- CARROLL: The third? Oh, I didn't realize there was "the third" there.
- FIELD: T. Coleman Andrews, III. That's two strikes against him. Anybody that styles himself by his first initial and his middle name and anybody who has a Roman numeral three after his name. He was a classmate of my son. My son was Class of '76. Yes. T. Coleman Andrews.
- CARROLL: How did it come out that you two contested...how does a contested election evolve?
- FIELD: Well, you must remember there were two. Schram [Ronald Schram '64] ran at the same time and he was contested.
- CARROLL: That's right and he was contested by Malcolm Beard, Jr. [Malcom V. Beard, Jr. '67?].
- FIELD: That's right. These opposition candidates were put up by a very strong group around New York. Ave Raube [Stephen Avery Raube '30] was the spokesman for it. He was Class of what? '31? '32? George Champion ['26] put the money behind it, rather than putting his money into Dartmouth, by the way. They had various people in other parts of the country, but primarily in the East here who formed a strong group, ultimately financing Dartmouth Review and founding the Hopkins Institute. The same bunch.
- So, when I was asked by the Search Committee to be the Trustee candidate, I was called almost the day after by Ave Raube who wanted to know whether I would...he wanted me to commit myself on such things as bringing back the Indian symbol.
- CARROLL: You want to hear the platform?
- FIELD: Yeah, I would.
- CARROLL: Against the lower standards for students and faculty. They complained that there was no consistent investment policy. They were against what they called frivolous courses being offered on campus; specifically, Women Studies and Native

American Studies. They were against the fact that there was a homosexual group on campus that got College money, that there was uneven student disciplinary action. They wished to dissolve the Tucker Foundation. They wished to reinstate the Indian symbol and to have faculty performance given more weight at tenure. Does that ring a bell?

FIELD: Most of it. Most of it does and Ave Raube wanted me to commit myself. I said, "I am not going to commit myself, Ave." I said, "If I am elected to the Board, I will apply, hopefully, judgment and thought to each issue and come up with what I think is best for the College and not for any particular group and I am not going to commit myself in advance." So that's when they decided to run someone against me. If I had agreed with what Ave Raube wanted me to do, with that platform basically, I am sure they wouldn't have run an opposition candidate.

CARROLL: There must have been some issues there though that you could have stood behind.

FIELD: [Laughter] Do you want to run over those again.

CARROLL: Do you want to go through them.

FIELD: Go through them again. Just go one by one.

CARROLL: The first one is that they are complaining about the lowered standards for students and faculty, which they connect to the increasing diversity.

FIELD: So the complaint really...they were saying that a thirst for diversity is bringing about a lowering of the standards. Right? I never believed that. I am going to tell you the same thing I told Ave Raube. If I get on the Board (I am putting it in the past) if I am on the Board, I will look at all the facts on each of these issues and I will come up with what I think is the best answer for the College. Now, as far as diversity causing a lowering of standards, I don't know that that was the case. I would have to find out whether that was the case or not, rather than somebody's imagination. I don't think they had anything other than a conjecture with which to support that contention that the diversity was bringing about a lowering of standards.

I do think...here I got into hot water. Can I jump way ahead?

CARROLL: Go ahead.

FIELD: I got into hot water with Jim Freedman [President James O. Freedman] after I was no longer vice president and so forth. I was concerned because I felt that the College was downplaying the legacy, that they were thirsting for minority enrollment by which...you know, bringing about diversity, but through minority enrollment at the expense of the legacies. As far as I am concerned, the *esprit de corps* of Dartmouth depended to a large extent upon the stream of legacies coming into the institution. Okay.

So I voiced that opinion to Jim Freedman and I got back a letter which, I am sorry to say, was not very [satisfactory]. All it said was...It was then that I found out how they were defining legacy was that one of your parents had to be Dartmouth. Grandparents didn't count. Uncles didn't count. Brothers didn't count. Just the parent. When I found that out, I wrote to Jim and said that I thought this was wrong. This was inspired because a classmate of mine had a granddaughter who did not have a Dartmouth parent, but a granddaughter who, he thought, was eminently qualified to enter here and she got rejected. She did not get legacy treatment. So that is when I found out how Dartmouth was applying the legacy thing and I thought that was too narrow.

First of all, Jim said, "Well, when you were on the Board, you could see the number of legacies declining." Okay. I attributed that to the fact that we were showing preference for minorities and leaving less room for legacies. Then I found out, after I left the Board and the administration, I found out that...Jim said, "Well, they are just not applying." Well, then I found out that they were defining legacy in a much more narrow way than I defined it. So I said, "Why is that? Why should we not...it seems to me that at least a grandchild ought to be a legacy." The answer I got from Jim, written answer, was that "All the other Ivies were interpreting this the same way."

Well, that got my back hair up because I think we are different from the other Ivies and one of the reasons we are different is because we have had a more cohesive school spirit here--much more so than Harvard, Yale or any of the others. Dartmouth is unique in its *esprit de corps* for the institution and a large part of

that is because there is a continuing stream of legacies coming into this place. I don't want to lower the standards to admit legacies. At the same time, I want them to be given a fair shot, and the problem I had was with a perception...I had a perception that Jim...(I am getting way ahead of McLaughlin. Anyway, I will keep that.) I feared that there was a thirst for increasing the enrollment of minorities.

[End Tape 1, Side A; Begin Tape 1, Side B]

FIELD: My attitude was that this place should be open to minorities, regardless of color, ethnicity, whatever. It should be open to minorities, but they ought to be qualified, and I did not want an unbridled quest for a specified percentage of minorities...you know, setting a goal like 27%. I didn't want that to override and to therefore admit students who really weren't qualified to come here in relation to others. Now that sounds pretty glib, I know.

But, I have got to tell you...I think that [Karl] Furstenberg or any Director of Admissions here, has a tougher job than anybody on campus, including the President because you have got nine, ten thousand students applying. Ten percent of them never should have applied and you throw them into the wastebasket. A good percentage of the top are shoe-ins.

In the middle, you have a huge, a huge number of students, any one of whom could survive here, could thrive here, could contribute here. How you make that selection among those students, I don't know. The problem is, having made that selection, having made that cut, you are going to get these calls and letters from parents, and they say "My God, why didn't my student get accepted?" And there is no real answer. You can't give them an answer, for most of these cases. You have to say, "Look. I am sorry. John or Jane would have made it, but it is just..." You know, so I don't know. I think Karl has got the toughest job. This is way beyond our subject matter, but anyway. So that was just the first one on that?

CARROLL: That was just the first one.

FIELD: We had not better go...

CARROLL: Oh, no. No, no. I think this is great.

FIELD: All right.

CARROLL: The other thing they said was that there was no consistency in the investment policy. I think you are the perfect person to answer this because you served on so many of those committees.

FIELD: I don't know what they meant by that. I really don't. The investment policy was very, very conservative. They had one advisor, State Street Trust. John Meck [John Foster Meck, Jr. '33] had been the treasurer for donkey years and it was a very conservative investment policy. It was consistently conservative, as far as I know. So consistency was not the problem. They could say it was too conservative and that is correct. It had too much in fixed income. Paganucci [Paul Paganucci '53] changed all of that when he came in.

CARROLL: I was just going to ask how radical was the change when Paganucci took over?

FIELD: Oh, very much so. Oh, yeah. We expanded the outside advisors and managers and so forth. That was all Pag's doing.

CARROLL: You also began, at that point, as I understand it, to invest in start-up capital.

FIELD: Yes. With venture capital.

CARROLL: Venture capital. Thank you.

FIELD: That was part of his diversification.

CARROLL: How important was that?

FIELD: Extremely important.

CARROLL: When you sat on that committee--on the Investment Committee--the endowment tripled. Was it just that?

FIELD: No. Don't forget we had some capital campaigns in there, which brought new money into it and the market. Hell, the market...Back in 1982, the Dow was at twelve hundred. It is now at eight thousand. It has had some ups and downs in there; but, by and large, it has been on the up-take ever since.

CARROLL: I suppose if you can't make money during that period, you had better look at yourself. [Laughter]

FIELD: If you had left it in fixed income, you wouldn't have made money; but Paganucci brought about the start of diversification and changed the mix between equities and fixed income and, throwing in for good measure, some of the wild cards like venture capital and so forth which enabled the endowment to benefit from the increased interest in the stock market.

CARROLL: I think what this comment may well have been about was the South African investments and the fact that there were student protests about the investments in South Africa at that point and that divestiture was the rallying cry.

FIELD: Well, that was a big issue when Dave [President David McLaughlin] came on campus and I was very much involved in that, both as a Trustee and as a Vice President-Treasurer. If that was it, that doesn't express it very well.

CARROLL: We will get back to that.

FIELD: We should because that was one of the highlights of the McLaughlin era.

CARROLL: They say that they were against frivolous courses.

FIELD: I could probably pick out some courses I consider frivolous, but they respond to a demand, and I don't believe any student here has suffered from what somebody might consider by his or her own standards a frivolous course. Yeah. If I went through the curriculum, I could pick out some that I wonder why the heck we're having them; but that is going to happen in any institution.

CARROLL: They were complaining that a homosexual group at the College got college money.

FIELD: As I recall it, if we had refused to give them money because they were homosexuals, we would have been in violation of Equal Opportunity and jeopardized any federal grants we had. So we didn't have any choice in the matter. As a *bona fide* student group, they didn't get any more support than any others. It was a very modest amount for publications and so forth.

CARROLL: This is something maybe...I don't know the truth about, but they said there was uneven student disciplinary action. I don't know if this is referring to a specific event.

FIELD: Yeah. They felt that the protestors (this really gets back to, basically, South Africa)...By that time, there were two very vocal constituent student groups on campus. One, ultra-conservative; one, ultra-liberal. Not large. The bulk of the student body did not participate in this, but there were these two groups who were very strong and very vocal.

The ultra-conservatives carried on under the banner of The Dartmouth Review, and the very liberal carried on under their own auspices and were supported by some of the professors. Of course, The Review was supported by some of the professors, not many, but some.

But they were both intransigent. They were no different, really, in their approach. They were both intransigent, intolerant of any other...closed minds, intolerant. As a matter of fact, they were so far left and so far right in their attitudes that they came together. You know, you could switch the platforms and you wouldn't see any difference. I mean, they just approached the damn thing, the issues, the same way--with complete intolerance and closed-mindedness. So they (and I forget what the incidents were involved) felt that the College was coming down harder on the conservatives when they did something outrageous, than they were when the liberal students did something which they considered to be outrageous. I don't recall the specifics. Anyway, that was their perception.

CARROLL: And they wished to dissolve the Tucker Foundation.

FIELD: Why, I don't know except I think they felt that it was a do-good thing, you know, a social do-good thing, going out, you know, a touchy-feely sort of thing. Going out and helping the poor people in the area. Why they objected to it, I don't know, except they felt, I guess, that it wasn't the College's business to be touchy-feely.

CARROLL: They thought that faculty performance should be given more weight at tenure.

FIELD: I don't know what they meant by that.

CARROLL: I assume they must mean teaching.

FIELD: It always has been given weight. As far as I recall, I certainly don't perceive that it has not been a factor. That's what distinguishes Dartmouth from the other Ivies, both teaching and research. It always has been and always will be, as far as I know.

CARROLL: And they wanted, of course, to reinstate the Indian symbol, which we have spoken about.

FIELD: Right.

CARROLL: That sums up the platform that you were up against; but, both times you were challenged, in '81 and '86, it was not even close.

FIELD: No. If you go back and look at the demographics of the voting...if you look at the votes by class, the dividing line was really in the early '50's.

CARROLL: How did that work?

FIELD: Well, before the '50's, you will find the mix. Some classes voted for the opposition candidate. But, starting with the early '50's, there was solidly a majority, class by class, in favor of me and Ron Schram. So it wasn't that every class, if you go by class, not every class voted for me and Ron Schram. If you go back in the '30's and the '20's, you will find several classes that went the other way. Let's face it, the numbers are, if you get them all together, obviously, the greater number of alumni are in the later classes than in the earlier classes.

CARROLL: You know, at your election...I have a good friend who is Class of '74, and your election in '81, he told me was the first time he had ever actually taken the time out to vote because he was so incensed by the conservative candidate. I wonder how many more stories like that there are.

FIELD: Oh, I think there were a lot. I think there were a lot. I don't think there was much point in voting before that.

CARROLL: That may be the case.

FIELD: In fact, there wasn't a vote available until there was an opposition candidate. As I recall it, the process was the nominating committee of the Alumni Association picked an alumnus and that was it. They put that person forward for the Alumni Association to, in effect, ratify their selection, and then that person was put forward to the Board of Trustees for election. Of course, the Board of Trustees could turn them down; but there would have been wigs all over the Green if they had done that.

CARROLL: How did you get chosen the first time?

FIELD: I don't know. I really don't. All I know is that I had been very active in Dartmouth affairs and most recently, most prominently, I guess as the campaign...When was the Campaign for Dartmouth? That was before I was elected, wasn't it?

CARROLL: That's right. That's under Kemeny.

FIELD: I gained some visibility there and also as Chairman of the Tuck School Board of Overseers. I got the call from David Taylor ['50], who was chairman of the Nominating Committee. I got the call at my office and he said, I was their choice. The trusteeship was so far from my thoughts that I thought he was telling me that they were going to nominate me for an appointment to the Alumni Council. I had never been on the Alumni Council. Finally, it dawned on me what he was talking about, so I picked my jaw up off the floor and said, "Yes. Sure. Right." [Laughter]

I think Ad Winship [Addison L. "Ad" Winship '42] had a lot to do with it. I never talked with Ad about it; but Ad Winship was Vice President for Development.

CARROLL: And you worked with him on...

FIELD: He succeeded George Colton ['35]. I worked very closely with Ad on a lot of things and I just have a hunch that Ad encouraged them to put my name in there because I called Ad right after this telephone conversation. I said, "Hey, do these guys know what they are doing?" Ad said, "Yeah. Sure they know what they are doing." So I think he was aware of it and I think Ad had a lot to do with it.

CARROLL: You never had any second thoughts about whether you wanted to do this?

FIELD: Of course not. Come on. [Laughter]

CARROLL: Just checking. It's a lot of work, though.

FIELD: No. It is written in stone that it is the greatest honor that you can bestow upon a Dartmouth alum.

CARROLL: It is. Did you start out at a meeting or did you start out at one of the Minary Center retreats?

FIELD: I really started at the Aspen Institute, along with Dave McLaughlin. The Sloan Foundation. I think it was Sloan who was financing a first-time seminar of new presidents and new trustees of colleges and universities. It wasn't just Dartmouth. Dartmouth headed it up. The director was a Dartmouth alumnus. Who the heck was it? I have forgotten the director of the project. He raised the money for it, but we had representatives from, I don't know, maybe a dozen various institutions. New presidents and new trustees. We spent several days out there. So that is really my first introduction to it.

CARROLL: Out in Colorado. What kind of things did they talk to you about?

FIELD: Oh, the usual panoply of what were then problems facing campuses and so forth. You know, diversity, minority treatment on campus, campus divisions resulting from this sort of thing, the economics of it. A pretty wide range.

CARROLL: As a Board of Trustee [member], when you speak, every time you speak, you suddenly speak with the authority of decision-making behind you. Did you change the way you then are able to speak to others, other alumni you meet?

FIELD: Well, you have to be careful. You can speak your mind within the confines of the trustees. Okay. You can oppose things. You can support things. You can argue; but, once you have made a decision, you have got to speak for the Board. You can no longer take a contrary opinion and say, "Well, I wanted to do this, but the Board overruled me" and so forth. It can't be done. Not with proper governance. So you have got to be careful how

you express your views. You may not agree with everything the Board comes out with, but you have got to support the Board in its final decision. So you can't go out and denigrate the Board or try to take a critical or contrary view of what has transpired.

CARROLL: You can't stir the waters.

FIELD: No.

CARROLL: Was that ever a problem?

FIELD: I don't recall it was.

CARROLL: You walked on to a Board that really had changed a lot in the last ten years. There was a Black trustee. There was a woman trustee and there was a significantly younger trustee. There was Reginald Harcourt Dodds ['58]. There was Priscilla ["Sally"] Frechette [Maynard] and there was David Weber. [David "Dave" Weber '65] Did they really represent their constituencies, or did the Board think of them as individuals?

FIELD: The Board thought of them as individuals. John Steel was the only one who represented a constituency. He was there as a representative of a constituency, but he never really carried the banner for them.

CARROLL: You started out...in the first year, you worked with Richard Hill [Richard "Dick" Hill '41] as Chairman?

FIELD: Yes.

CARROLL: Who succeeded him? I should have looked that up. Was it Sandy?

FIELD: Sandy McCulloch [Norman E. "Sandy" McCulloch '50] succeeded Dick.

CARROLL: I am curious as to how much the personality of the Chairman affects the *esprit* of the Board.

FIELD: It is like any governing body. A good Chairman is going to get a Board, whether it is trustees or directors or whatever it is, going to get them working together hopefully in harness and arrive at a conclusion which he or she has already arrived at. Okay?

[Laughter] But he does it in a way that involves all the members of the governing body so that they feel they have got their input. In the end, hopefully, he ends up with a coherent conclusion that is the consensus of the Board.

CARROLL: So a good chairman builds consensus.

FIELD: Yes.

CARROLL: Who was the best chairman you worked under?

FIELD: Well, I only worked under two: Dick Hill and Sandy McCulloch.

CARROLL: That's right.

FIELD: As vice president and treasurer, I observed George Munroe ['43] and Mike Heyman [Michael "Mike" Heyman '51]. I would say, of all those, George was the best.

CARROLL: What made him the best?

FIELD: He had a quiet manner. Of course, he had been Chairman of Phelps Dodge, so he had a lot of experience in governing bodies. But they were all good. Mike Heyman, of course, was Chancellor of the University of California, so he was well experienced in governance. Dick Hill was CEO of the Bank of Boston. These are top-notch people. They were all good. I would say Sandy was a little blunter than the others. He was a little more inclined to express his opinion, rather than solicit the Board's opinion, again along the lines that he wanted it to be. Sandy would come out and say it like he wanted it, you know. [Laughter] Dick and George and Mike would kind of lay back in the weeds.

CARROLL: Sounds like a duck hunter's analogy. [Laughter] What were the issues that were facing the Board of Trustees as you stepped on? Do you remember?

FIELD: Well, the investment policy in regard to South Africa, turmoil on campus. We had these two divisions...not divisions. They were not divisions. The bulk of the student body was the same old student body, but we had these two vocal groups that were stirring things up.

That spilled over into the faculty, of course. We had the Jeff Hart [Jeffrey Hart '51] on one side. Not many of those. And we had Hoyt Alverson and Leo Spitzer and Ivy Schweitzer and so forth on the other side.

You know, The Review, at that time, was the mouthpiece for this. I shouldn't say that because The Review, regardless of how I viewed their actions and their maliciousness, they are very bright. They are self-starters and very bright kids. But I believe, in their younger days, they probably pulled wings off flies. They didn't care. They found joy in being malicious and hurting people. That's how they got their kicks, by hurting people. That's what I couldn't stand. They didn't just address the issues directly. They tried to destroy people, which they did with Bill Cole [Professor of Music William Cole]. But, anyway, that created a lot of dissension on campus. So that was a problem.

CARROLL: Do you want to talk about that a little bit? The question of divestiture and the shanties?

FIELD: Yeah. Yeah.

CARROLL: That seems to have built slowly. There were the Sullivan Principles and then there was the question of whether Dartmouth was really adhering to them.

FIELD: Oh, no. There never was a question of that. We adhered to them. It was a question of whether they were adequate or not.

CARROLL: Okay. That's right. Do you think they were?

FIELD: I don't think it mattered a damn whether we invested in companies doing business in South Africa or not, as far as apartheid goes. I don't think it had any effect whatsoever of what went on in South Africa.

CARROLL: Do you think that the outcome that we have seen would have happened no matter what?

FIELD: Yes. I don't think that the investment policy or the United States had anything to do with it. So I was very much opposed to putting any sort of a limitation on the investment choices available to the College for social good.

The purpose of the endowment is to provide a stream of income to support the College. It is not to do good. It is not to put money for good causes, Greenpeace or anything else, or not to put money in South Africa because we didn't like their policies or Northern Ireland because we didn't like their policies there. That is not the purpose of the endowment. The purpose of the endowment is to provide income to support the institution.

If we want to get on the stump and talk about apartheid and Northern Ireland and China or whatever, that is fine, and that is well in the prerogative of a college or a college president, and they should be doing that if they feel that way. But let's not hamper the primary objective of the endowment by introducing what I consider to be extraneous constraints.

CARROLL: When I read the literature that came out at that time though, it seems to me that Dartmouth was not really invested very much in South Africa.

FIELD: Very little. We didn't invest in any South African companies. We had a policy. We invested in some companies who did business in South Africa. We didn't invest in any South African companies.

CARROLL: So it is really once removed.

FIELD: Once removed, but that, too, was...those who were violently opposed to apartheid felt that we shouldn't invest in that. But it wasn't--It was a very small part of the investment.

So, you know, we could have sold those investments. Okay. It probably wouldn't have affected our performance at that time, but I view it as one of cutting off--as limiting the investment opportunities. Maybe by only a little bit at that time, but it opens the door to something else and something else, and, before you know it, you have got a Calvert Fund or something like that which invests only in socially-responsible companies, which unfortunately ...well...

CARROLL: Which has not done as well as other things. [Laughter]

FIELD: In most cases, because you have limited your opportunities.

CARROLL: How did the shanties come about?

FIELD: Well, they were put up by the students who were opposed to our investing in companies doing business in South Africa and they were, in effect, in their own view, replicating the living conditions of the Blacks in South Africa. They were attributing those conditions to the fact that we were investing in companies doing business in South Africa, which was quite a quantum leap.

CARROLL: That caused a huge stir, not just here on campus, but...

FIELD: In the whole town. Well, and nationwide.

CARROLL: Nationwide.

FIELD: Yeah. So they got the publicity they wanted.

CARROLL: That also caused a lot of trouble for David McLaughlin.

FIELD: Oh, yes.

CARROLL: Who came in for a lot of criticism as to how he handled that situation.

FIELD: That's right.

CARROLL: What is your opinion on the matter?

FIELD: Well, I didn't like to see them there. I didn't think they ought to be there. I sympathized with Dave and the difficulty of doing something about it, because it wasn't just a small group of students involved who put up the shanties. A significant number of the faculty were supporting those students and, to remove those shanties by force would have caused a very great deal of dissension on campus. You have to remember, when Dave came in, he had two strikes against him with the faculty. At least two strikes. Maybe two and a half.

CARROLL: Which was?

FIELD: He was a businessman. He wasn't an educator.

CARROLL: Yes.

- FIELD: He was a businessman and they didn't want a businessman. That was it. That's two strikes.
- CARROLL: Two strikes. Okay.
- FIELD: Two strikes. Okay. All I am saying is that he was viewed at best with sort of a "wait and see" attitude, with suspicion and so forth. He was a businessman. They didn't want a businessman. They wanted another Kemeny. They forgot that, before Kemeny, I don't think any President of the College was not a businessman or a lawyer. Dickey [President John Sloan Dickey '29] was a lawyer. He wasn't an educator. He was a lawyer. He practiced law.
- CARROLL: Hopkins [President Ernest Martin Hopkins '01] was a...
- FIELD: Hopkins was a businessman. Before that you had ministers.
- CARROLL: That's right.
- FIELD: But, anyway. The deck was stacked against Dave when he came in.
- CARROLL: Do you think that held and tied his hands somewhat in dealing with the shanties?
- FIELD: Sure. Oh, yeah. Sure. Look. A college president has an almost impossible job. It is not as hard as director of admissions, but an almost impossible job. You have got to satisfy four constituencies. You have got to satisfy the faculty, the alumni, the student body...who else? Three constituencies. Oh. The administration. Four. And the trick is, you are not going to keep them all happy at the same time. The trick is not to get them all mad at you at the same time and Dave got them all mad at him at the same time.
- CARROLL: He did. Yeah.
- FIELD: Unfortunately, that's what happened. The alumni...he lost a lot of alumni support because they felt he didn't get rid of the shanties. He was too easy on the liberals. He should have clamped down, not just the shanties, but basically, he should have been harder with the liberals.

He lost the faculty because they didn't like him in the first place. They mistrusted him as being a businessman and they thought he should have been stronger and more forceful with The Dartmouth Review, and hitting them on the head.

The students...well, all that kind of filtered to the students so, you know, they sensed something wrong with the leadership and so forth. It wasn't all that happy a campus as they felt it ought to be, and, obviously, in that case, you look to the leadership.

The administration...Dave made a couple of mistakes with the administration and that hurt him badly. He got rid of...

CARROLL: Rod Morgan [Rodney "Rod" Morgan '44]?

FIELD: Well, he got rid of several. I didn't know Rod, but Rod was out. But the big one was Mike McGean [J. Michael "Mike" McGean '49] and that was a bad mistake on Dave's part. He pushed Mike out.

CARROLL: Why was he...

FIELD: Oh, Mike was absolutely adored by the alumni.

CARROLL: Why do you think he did it?

FIELD: I don't know. It was before my time. I don't know. Well, it wasn't before my time. I was on the Board at that time, but I wasn't vice president. He just felt...I don't know. I can't answer for him. You might talk with Dave.

CARROLL: I am. I haven't gotten there yet.

FIELD: It will be interesting.

CARROLL: I have been talking with him...we haven't really gotten to his presidency yet. We have talked about his time as Chairman of the Board. But he is such a charming and kind man, how did he not translate that to the faculty? Why do you think they did not give him a fair shake?

FIELD: Because he was a businessman.

CARROLL: Is that enough?

FIELD: Yes. Certainly. Certainly. I mean, the faculty...I love the faculty. I respect the faculty, but they can be so childish. Have you ever been to a faculty meeting? You know what I am saying, don't you?

CARROLL: Yes.

FIELD: I cannot believe the faculty in the way they act toward each other and as a body. Again, I think we have a wonderful faculty. Individually, they are wonderful people. I admire them. I respect them. I am glad they are here. I wish I had as good faculty members when I was here; but, damn it all, they can be so absolutely petty and childish. It is unbelievable.

You go to a faculty meeting and it is all procedures, all process. It is all process, not substance. You have got "Robert's Rules of Order" and these motions put forth and then you have got an amendment to the motion and then you have got to vote on the amendment to the motion...

[End Tape 1, Side B -- Begin Tape 2, Side A]

FIELD: My successor, Lyn Hutton, said that trying to control faculty is like trying to herd chickens. She is right. [Laughter]

CARROLL: I love that.

FIELD: Again, getting back to the faculty. They will get up at faculty meetings with all their fellow professors assembled there and they will excoriate each other. If somebody gives a committee report, some else may contest it..."That is the dumbest report I ever..." You know, you wouldn't act that way. No responsible, reasonable person other than outside of faculty would, you know, publicly criticize each other the way that they do. It is just unbelievable and they take it in stride. And, perhaps, because they are demigods. They are king in the classroom. Anyway, where were we?

Why Dave had a tough time with them? I am sorry. I can't give you any better answer than that. Look. Whatever I have said here, whatever I am going to say...I am a strong supporter of David McLaughlin. I didn't want to see him step down from the

presidency. But, he lost the faculty and, once you lose the faculty, you can forget it.

CARROLL: It's a tough road.

FIELD: Forget it.

CARROLL: Mr. Paganucci said that he thought David McLaughlin liked to get things done.

FIELD: Oh, yeah. Sure.

CARROLL: And that he was completely frustrated by the slow process.

FIELD: Of course. Of course. It is all by committee. It is unbelievable how long it takes to get anything done or a decision made, and I attribute it to the fact that...(What was it? Stanford, several years ago, organized a group to form a committee to study their expenditures and so forth. They were trying to bring the budget under control and the chairman of that committee said that "What we have to learn is that..." How did he express this? "In a committee decision, one vote..." Forget that.)

What I am trying to get at is I think that the faculty committees, when they are considering a problem, probably because of their research-orientation and so forth, keep digging and digging and digging for more fact, more facts, trying to find more facts. I think they have a feeling that, if they turn over enough stones, there will be a divine revelation that will say "This is the answer." And it has to be unanimous and that is what this guy at Stanford was saying. You have to learn that one opposing vote doesn't quash the consensus.

In business and what Dave was used to and what any businessperson is used to is you get as many facts as you can. When you think you have enough facts to make the decision, you make the decision and go on to the next problem. Now, you may not have every bitty, nitty, gritty piece of information that you might have gotten and maybe you make a mistake because you didn't do that, but you get on with the business of the institution or the organization--and that's what you can't do here or at any academic institution that I know of, because it is just an infinite, tortuous process of digging and digging and digging and debating. And you've got to have an absolute consensus. You

have got to have it unanimous. It has got to be unanimous or you just keep working on it until it is.

I have been through this. I have been through this as vice president and treasurer. I was trying to change the emphasis between the faculty income and administrative, but basically the faculty income while active, and the faculty income after retirement. We had an extremely generous contribution, TIA [TIAA/CREF] credit, for retirement funds. You are aware of it. You are probably a participant of that. To such an extent that we had faculty people and administrators retiring at a greater income than they had when they were active, which to me was absolutely absurd.

If I view the continuum of compensation to a faculty member or administrator over the course of an entire lifetime from employment to death, they need more of that money up front than they do when they are retired. I was working with a committee to change that and we finally did bring it back down, as you recall. As I remember, it was 15% and we brought it back to 10% or something like that. Was that 10% or 7%? I don't know, but anyway, we finally managed to get them to change the mix a little bit so that you got more when you were active and less when you were retired, but I'll tell you, it was just an interminable process to get that done.

CARROLL: Years in the making, I imagine. How did you feel as a businessman coming into an academic setting? Did it frustrate you as well?

FIELD: Yeah, but I think I was more relaxed than Dave about it. I mean I just accepted it as being something that I wasn't going to change so I had to learn to work with it. I don't think Dave accepted that, and that is probably because Dave was a CEO and I wasn't a CEO. [Laughter] A really good CEO, who is going to move an organization, can't just go with the flow. He has to change things, whether people like it or not.

CARROLL: Did David McLaughlin have a kitchen cabinet to whom he could turn for advice in this transition time between his business and academic life?

FIELD: Not that I am aware of. Certainly not a cabinet, but he leaned heavily on Paganucci. They were a strong team.

CARROLL: I am just wondering, did he ever ask Kemeny for advice, I wonder? I asked Jean Kemeny about it and she didn't know.

FIELD: Oh, I would be surprised if he didn't, because he maintained a relationship with both Dickey and Kemeny. Dave was a very interesting person. He maintained a relationship with Kemeny and Dickey. As a matter of fact, in Dickey's unfortunately long, long travail of practically a vegetable state, Dave would visit him frequently and it was Dave who arranged for him to get the care at Dick's House and so forth.

But Dave would also...just a little vignette on his attitude towards things. He would, on the birth date of those presidents who were buried in the cemetery out here [Dartmouth Cemetery], he would get a little group together, he, the chaplain, myself, and a couple of others, and we would go out there and have a little memorial service for them every year, every birthday. There are several presidents buried out there.

CARROLL: How wonderful. Do you remember which ones they are?

FIELD: No. I remember there are a couple of them right? At least one right behind Lord Street or Gile, in that part of the cemetery. I remember going there. You know Dave was a thoughtful person, but I think you put your finger on it. He was a person who was used to getting things done and he wanted to get things done and the system was just this adherence to process as against substance, and it just frustrated Dave.

CARROLL: What do you think were his best qualities as President?

FIELD: I think leadership and his sense of knowing what he wanted to do, and trying to get there. He was hampered in that, but that doesn't destroy the quality. I also think that his organizational ability was very good.

Probably the biggest single achievement...I think history is going to treat Dave's tenure much better than it does currently. He did a lot towards improving the infrastructure of this institution. Most importantly, perhaps the biggest highlight of Dave's career, was the Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center. It would not be here if Dave had not envisioned it, had not worked it out. I should give Paganucci credit, too. It took Paganucci's ingenuity, financially,

to make viable what Dave was trying to do. We wouldn't have that medical center now if Dave hadn't done it.

CARROLL: And yet he lost some ground with the Arts and Sciences faculty by pushing through that move.

FIELD: That's right.

CARROLL: What were they so against?

FIELD: They felt that it was dividing the institution, that they were splitting it up. If the undergraduate medical courses were moved out there with their faculty, there would be a division of the faculty here and so forth. And perhaps they felt there would be too much money going into that, at the expense of the Arts and Sciences, forgetting that Arts and Sciences are an integral part of the Medical School here [and have been for many years.]

CARROLL: But it gave them that whole possibility of a northern extension on the campus that they never had before.

FIELD: Well, that was the reason the trustees voted for it, primarily because, although there was no intention to expand the student body, still in the 200 years we have been here, we have known there has been expansion. Fifty years from now, for whatever reason, if they expand it is not going to be to the south. It is not going to be to the east. It is not going to be to the west. The only possible thing was to the north, so it made sense to acquire that property out there.

But it wasn't done to acquire the property. I want to make that clear. It was done because Dave McLaughlin envisioned the importance and significance of strengthening the Medical School and, at the same time the Hospital, by preserving a Medical Center, a teaching hospital--the only one between Boston and Montreal. That was his vision. In order to do that, they needed to put together a financial package which would make that feasible: Two hundred and twenty million bucks.

First of all, the components were faced...The Medical School was faced with a need for expanding its research facilities. They were getting a lot of research grants. They had expanded. The Hospital was in danger of being unaccredited because of its

facilities being antiquated and so forth. You have got to remember that was built in 1896, 1898.

CARROLL: I had an operation in there. I know what that place was like.

FIELD: The Clinic, at the same time, was expanding. So all three of those components were faced with expensive investments in expansion where they were. There was a question whether the Town would permit expansion on that location. Okay? Now we probably could have fought that through and won, I guess, but in Hanover you don't want a schism between the Town and the College. They have always worked well together and we didn't want to split this asunder.

So Dave was the one who said, "Look. Why don't we just move the whole thing. It won't cost that much more and we will have a brand new facility, a comprehensive medical center and all we need to do is find 220 million dollars to do it." That was the essence of it. So Paganucci got in the act then and part of that was fundraising, as you know. Part was some reserves the Hospital had. The rest was loans...float some bonds...but the key to it was 25 million dollars which the College paid the Hospital to buy the property out there. That put the finishing touch on the total package of \$220 million.

The justification for the College paying 25 million bucks for what I don't know how many...seven, eight acres...was, as you have stated, as you see, that, if the College ever wanted to expand physically, that is the only direction they could go. So it made a lot of sense and that is why the trustees voted for it...buying the property from the Hospital and, from there on, everything fell into place. None of that would have happened if it hadn't been for Dave. I don't know what we would have here.

CARROLL: I am not sure we would have still an accredited hospital.....

FIELD: We probably wouldn't have a Medical School. The Medical School almost went out during Kemeny's regime.

CARROLL: Almost then and almost in the '50's.

FIELD: Bill Morton [William "Bill" Morton '32] saved it. He was a trustee at the time.

CARROLL: Really.

FIELD: That was during Kemeny's regime. Or maybe it was during McLaughlin's. It might be McLaughlin's. Talk with Lu Martin about that. Bring up Bill Morton.

As I recall...I wasn't a part of this, but the question was "Shall we close the Medical School?" At that time, it was a two-year institution. Yeah. It was a two-year then. Then Bill Morton said, "No way." He got up. He was a very vocal trustee, a powerful man. Important. He said, "No way. I will raise the money for it." So he went out and raised the money. He saved the Medical School. Then I think they went to the three years. They tried that a while. That didn't work, so they have gone, as you know, to a four-year medical school.

CARROLL: And very successful.

FIELD: Oh, yes.

CARROLL: There was also a lot of campus building under McLaughlin.

FIELD; Yeah. That's what I meant by the infrastructure. He improved the plant tremendously. He also increased faculty compensation. That's what gets me. That faculty didn't seem to appreciate that.

CARROLL: I was reading that there was an across the board raise. I can't remember what the percentage was...

FIELD: He was the faculty's best friend.

CARROLL: They seem ungrateful to me as I read what they did.

FIELD: They were ungrateful. There again, they were not disposed to accept Dave McLaughlin. I don't think he could have...

CARROLL: There was not much that he could have done.

FIELD: I don't think that he could have. The cards were stacked against him.

CARROLL: And yet he doesn't seem particularly bitter about it.

FIELD: No. I don't think he is.

CARROLL: I find that remarkable.

FIELD: Dave is not the kind of person who would get embittered.

CARROLL: He sort of had many moments, I guess I would say, that caused some controversy. One of those was the firing of Dennis Dinan ['61] at the Dartmouth Alumni Magazine. That was early on. Do you remember that situation?

FIELD: Yeah. Vaguely. Now why was that? I know why there was the controversy. I am trying to think where he came at odds with Dave. I don't want to run Dave down. I think David made some mistakes, personnel wise. I mentioned a couple of them. I think Dennis Dinan was one of them. I think Mike McGean was certainly one of them. He brought in a couple of people that didn't work out. He made some mistakes in appointments...administrative appointments.

Dennis Dinan. There again, I think he felt that...What was his...The problem, I guess, with the alumni magazine under Dennis Dinan was that it was (I hate to use this phrase), but I guess "too independent of the College". Well, free speech should be independent of a college. Somehow he felt it was inimical to the College, and I don't know what. But anyway, that was one reason. But, in so doing, he transgressed a lot of people who were not supporting Dennis Dinan or the Dartmouth Alumni Magazine's policies at that time. Nevertheless, they were supporting free speech and the freedom of the press so he kind of stubbed his toe on that one.

CARROLL: Also, The Dartmouth Review under McLaughlin had its biggest impact. It was a very conservative time in the country. I think we have to say that as well. It really parallels what was happening in the country.

FIELD: They were at the peak of their powers.

CARROLL: That's right.

FIELD: Some very smart people on that including Laura Ingraham ['85] and....

CARROLL: Dinesh D'Souza ['83].

FIELD: Dinesh D'Souza and several others. Again, very bright kids. They found their pleasure in flaying and pillorying people. That was the height of their powers.

The interesting thing about them is that they were one of the first, if not the first, student conservative publication in the country. It was copied by many other places but most of the others died with one generation of students. The Dartmouth Review didn't, because they maintained a network of the previous editors, supported by people like George Champion and Ave Raube with money and so forth. And this network worked with the current student editors and so forth, so they kept this thing boiling. Then they did themselves in, basically. As I say, they just wore their act thin. People got sick and tired of it.

CARROLL: What do you think their role was or their impact was on the campus back in the '80's?

FIELD: Not much on the campus. I don't think many people on the campus read The Review.

CARROLL: Who did?

FIELD: Their impact was publicly outside. Jeff Hart was, you know, at the National Review. He publicized it. They would feed a lot of absolutely erroneous information out to the alumni through the Hopkins Institute and through The Review. A lot of the alumni subscribed to The Review, and they believed everything they read in it. It is interesting. If it was in The Review, they would believe it. If the College said it or published it, they viewed it with skepticism.

CARROLL: That must have been difficult.

FIELD: It was very difficult.

CARROLL: Were you surprised at David McLaughlin's decision to resign after six or seven years?

FIELD: No. I wasn't surprised because I had talked with David about it. I certainly would have supported his continuing. I was not one

who felt that he should resign, but Dave asked me about it. I said, "Look. You have got to decide for yourself. You have lost the faculty. You have got to decide whether you want to continue as President with the faculty from which you are estranged." So I wasn't surprised that he quit.

I was very disappointed that he did lose the faculty. I felt that they had treated him unfairly and they were ungrateful and so forth; but, having said that, the fact is that in the end, having lost the faculty, I don't think he had much choice. It would have been hell...he would have been tortured by another three years. In any event, the tenure of a college presidency in those days was maybe six, seven years.

CARROLL: How hard do you think it was on him? How difficult was the presidency?

FIELD: I think it took a lot out of him emotionally. David is a sensitive person and I think it hurt his wife, Judy, especially. It hurt Judy very much that he was not accepted better than he was. Dave did a lot. He was a person who did a lot for which he received too little credit.

CARROLL: I have always wanted to know...I don't know Judy McLaughlin at all, but I would imagine, when I try to imagine what it is like for her, that it was very hard to come into town as the wife of the president with no support. Did she ever find a group who could support her and help her?

FIELD: I don't know.

CARROLL: Because I have spoken with Jean Kemeny and, of course, she came up as a faculty wife and she had a very large support group. But you don't have many peers when you come in at that level and I have always sort of worried about her in retrospect.

FIELD: I wouldn't worry about Judy. She is a very strong individual.

CARROLL: Okay. What do you think were McLaughlin's greatest successes as President?

FIELD: The Medical Center stands out, I think. The improvement of the infrastructure on the campus. Starting building the endowment. Fundraising. He was a very good fundraiser. Improving the

faculty. Whether they realized it or not, improving the faculty's economic situation.

CARROLL: When he announced his resignation, do you know what the Board decided they were going to look for in his successor?

FIELD: Oh, that is pretty clear. Yeah. We agreed, and it has been in the papers. The Board agreed that they wanted a successor who could bring to Dartmouth the recognition that it deserved as an intellectual organization.

Primarily, we felt that Dartmouth was...well, for some very good reasons, it was considered to be a beer-drinking place. The rowdyism. More party than scholarship. We knew that wasn't the case with most of the students, although there was enough of it to be of concern to us. But we wanted Dartmouth to gain the respect in the public eye that it deserved, for what it was. And Freedman [President James O. Freedman] did that.

CARROLL: Did the fraternities...were they ever a concern for the Board of Trustees?

FIELD: Oh, yes. Constantly.

CARROLL: Why do you think it is that the fraternities had and have become such a center for the rowdyism?

FIELD: I have to go way back on that one. When I was in college, freshman were not allowed to set foot in a fraternity. If they did, Pudge Neidlinger [Lloyd Kellock Neidlinger '23], the Dean, would have you on a bus going home the next day. You just didn't go into a fraternity house as a freshman. You rushed and pledged your sophomore year. Fraternities were limited in number. The student body was close to three thousand. Probably less than a thousand belonged to fraternities and they were very closed. They were not open to non-fraternity members.

CARROLL: I see.

FIELD: Okay. I didn't pledge my sophomore year. I pledged my junior year, but I would not have dreamt of going into a fraternity house as a non-member. It just wasn't done. I mean, this was a closed group and what they did...they weren't rowdy.

I think what happened is that, basically I believe, if you could identify the times that were changing, when it went coed, the fraternity houses in effect had an "open door" policy. Now anybody on Saturday night or Friday night, anybody could wander into a fraternity house and find a party going on. So you don't have the control of a disciplined group of brothers. At the most I recall we had twenty fraternities and they were limited to no more than fifty or fifty-five members, which is where I got my thousand. So it was not a center of rowdyism. But I think when they threw open the doors, the partying started to get out of hand. Randoms would come in. They had no real concern for the chapter, for the fraternity or for the fraternity house and so forth.

CARROLL: Or for their reputation either. What kind of solutions did the Board of Trustees ever put forward to try to curb some of this?

FIELD: What did they consider?

CARROLL: Yes.

FIELD: Closing the fraternities.

CARROLL: Did they really?

FIELD: Oh, sure. Hell, yes. That was always a question. "Shall we close the fraternities." Then they had alcohol policies and so forth and so on, various rules of conduct. They tried various things.

CARROLL: Nothing seems to work.

FIELD: No. It worked for the Betas.

CARROLL: Yes. Well, throwing them off campus is the only way, I guess.

FIELD: Eventually, I think fraternities are going to have to go. That's what I think. They won't clean up their act.

CARROLL: I want to ask you then this last thing. You, in the very beginning of your second term on the Board of Trustees, stepped down. Was that because you became Vice President and Treasurer?

FIELD: Yeah. Yeah. In January of '86, Dave asked me if I would sit in. I was retired from the firm then. He asked if I would sit in as acting vice president, taking Paganucci's place. Paganucci got hired away by W. R. Grace. Dave asked me if I would sit in until they completed a search for a replacement for Paganucci. So the search was going on at that time. So I didn't hurry the search along at all. [Laughter]

So along about 1987, the Board said "Hey, Field. You have got to be either a trustee or vice president and treasurer." I said, "Hey, I like it the way it is." I said, "Corporations have inside directors..." They said, "Field, you have got to be either a trustee or vice president and treasurer." Well, I'll tell you. It grieved me to give up the trusteeship, but I was being paid as vice president and treasurer. I wasn't being paid as a trustee [laughter] and I would still be involved in Dartmouth, which is part of the fun of living in Hanover. So I resigned as a trustee.

CARROLL: How long did you stay on?

FIELD: Then I became permanent. Officially Vice President and Treasurer at that point.

CARROLL: Until...

FIELD: Four years, I guess. Wasn't it?

CARROLL: Yes. '91.

FIELD: '91. June of '91 [September '90].

CARROLL: So you were really able to see the transition into the Freedman administration?

FIELD: Yes. That's right.

CARROLL: What are the differences now at Dartmouth from what they were when you first came on the Board of Trustees under McLaughlin?

FIELD: Well, it is pretty obvious. Much more serene now than it was then. Jim Freedman had the benefit of...first of all, he was the unanimous choice of the search committee of the trustees, which was very unusual. The first ballot was unanimous. So he

already had one foot forward with the Board. So he came in with strong support from the Board.

[End Tape 2, Side A -- Begin Tape 2, Side B]

FIELD: ...the shanties were gone, but there was still the controversy about investments in South Africa, companies doing business in South Africa. The Review was still here, as you well know. Jim Freedman gained more brownie points with the faculty by recommending to the Board that we divest from companies doing business in South Africa, which I opposed as Dartmouth's Vice President and Treasurer. I opposed it to no avail. The Board accepted his recommendations, so we did divest of holdings in companies doing business in South Africa. That gained him a lot of brownie points with the faculty. Basically, the faculty was behind the divestment move. Not violently like some of the fringe, but basically the whole faculty. Oh, I forgot. Let's go back a bit.

CARROLL: Okay.

FIELD: I think one of the major events that caused the faculty to increase their disillusionment with Dave was the ROTC [Reserve Officer Training Corps] issue.

CARROLL: Oh, I forgot about that. Thank you.

FIELD: You forgot about that. You shouldn't have, because it was very important. Dave made a mistake in that. He came to us and said, "The Navy has asked if we would reinstate an ROTC program because the Navy feels that they are getting--they would like to leaven the ranks of the flag officers by bringing in officers from the better liberal arts colleges, so that they have a liberal arts background. We feel that that would be a leavening influence and healthy for the country" and so forth. So Dave came to the Board with that.

Incidentally, there was some talk about, "Well, they also pay for it and they won't have to have scholarship money" and so forth. To me, that was insignificant.

I felt, and I think the majority of the Board felt, that we were being asked to do something for our country, and are we so high and mighty that we sit here in an ivory tower and spurn

something which ultimately was in the best interests of society, in order to get a broader viewpoint into the top military? Okay. So that is why we went out and pumped for the ROTC program. We went out and talked with the faculty and so forth, and we tried to tell Dave, "Don't you do it. Lay this on the Board of Trustees. Let the Trustees carry the spears in this thing." Dave said he wanted to do it, so he carried the spears and he got them turned right around on him. I'll tell you. I was on one of the groups that went around and talked with the faculty members and they were just these creatures of the sixties. The faculty members had visions of jackboots on campus. I'll tell you. You mentioned the word "military" and they were against it. It was a storm and Dave was right out in the front of it and took the brunt of it and that is where he lost whatever support he still had with the faculty.

CARROLL: And that was very early in his time.

FIELD: Yes it was. I forget when it was.

CARROLL: The second year, I think. The end of the second year.

FIELD: Was it?

CARROLL: Yes. It was very early.

FIELD: That hurt him. Anyway. Where were we?

CARROLL: We were talking about what Freedman did immediately; things like cutting out all investment in companies doing business in South Africa. Did that really hurt or change dramatically the endowment or the funds coming to Dartmouth?

FIELD: No.

CARROLL: By that time, there weren't many companies doing it, were there?

FIELD: That's right and George Munroe ['43 TU '44], chairman then, turned to me as Vice President and Treasurer, and said, "If we do this, will this damage our return?" I said, "Not significantly, George; but, once again, my problem is that it imposes an artificial restraint upon your abilities to invest the funds. So you are mixing two objectives here." But the President wanted it and

so that went through. So he gained support from the faculty on that.

Then, of course, he came down heavily on The Review after a while, and he was helped enormously by that stupid act of putting...

CARROLL: Mein Kampf.

FIELD: The Mein Kampf thing in The Review. They never recovered from that. As far as I know, they are a non-presence on campus now as far as I can see. I don't think they have any credibility at all.

CARROLL: The students don't even know about them anymore that much.

FIELD: No. I don't think they do.

CARROLL: Was it fun being treasurer?

FIELD: Yeah. I enjoyed it.

CARROLL: What is good about that job?

FIELD: Intellectual challenge of working with other people and so forth. I spent 35 years at Price Waterhouse during which I met a lot of people...clients and so forth. I came up through the audit staff, and the last ten years or so I was on what in effect was the board of directors, the policy committee for the U.S. firms. Later on, deputy chairman of the international firm. So I was moving around the country and around the world meeting different people, different situations, solving different problems and so forth, all of which was an intellectual challenge. Price Waterhouse had a mandatory age 60 retirement for partners. They have had since the early '40's, so I had to retire in '83, having reached that grand old age of 60.

CARROLL: It must be hard.

FIELD: It was for me. I am ashamed to tell you how many of my partners went off to Florida to live year 'round, to play golf and tennis and swim and drink and whatever. I don't know what they do down there year around, but that wasn't for me, so I had to do something. So I was consulting for a while and I became

chairman of the board of a privately owned glove manufacturer and distributor over in Johnstown, New York for three or four years until Dave asked me to come here. So, I enjoyed the intellectual challenge of it. Working with people. Getting things done.

CARROLL: Why did you decide to retire up here in a community which is pretty far removed from New York City where you had been for so many years?

FIELD: You have to go back to my antecedents on that. Dartmouth has been in my blood, you know. As I said, I have a green belly button. [Laughter] So does my son. Incidentally, we have one granddaughter who was '93 and we have a granddaughter who is '01.

CARROLL: Oh, really.

FIELD: As a matter of fact, she was famous. She achieved a measure of fame at the Cornell game during the half time. Did you see the game? The Cornell game.

CARROLL: The Cornell game. I saw the second half.

FIELD: You weren't there for the half-time activities where the students punt and kick? Where the two teams, a freshman boy and girl on each team, the pass and punt team?

CARROLL: No. I did not see that.

FIELD: Well, the boy on the team passes twice. The girl punts twice. They add up all those yards and compete against the other team. Those are the freshmen. The next home game, it will be the sophomores. The next, the juniors. The next, the seniors. Then the last game, the Princeton game, the winners, the two that won from each of those four years will meet up for the finals. Well. You can see what's coming, can't you? One of the teams, the girl was [Kathryn] Katie Field, our '01 granddaughter. She did the punt. She did well, too. They won so, if you see the Princeton game, during half-time, you will see her again.

CARROLL: I will be at the Princeton game, so I will have to make sure that we stick around.

FIELD: So why did I come up here? Look. I was elected to the Board in '81. Okay? I retired from the firm in '83. Even before I got on the Board, when we lived in northern Westchester, we were coming up here once every...maybe once a month, certainly once every two months. We knew as many people in Hanover as we did down in Westchester County. So finally in '83, we said, "We might as well move to Hanover." And we did.

CARROLL: Your wife had no objections?

FIELD: No. We knew as many people here. It was an easy move. We knew as many people here as we did down there.

CARROLL: Well, I thank you for this. Is there anything that you would like to add to all of this?

FIELD: I don't think so. If I do, I will...

CARROLL: Give me a ring.

FIELD: I will give you a ring.

CARROLL: Thank you.

END OF INTERVIEW