Donald L. Kreider
Professor of Mathematics and Computer Science, Vice President and Dean of Student Affairs, Emeritus

An Interview Conducted by

Daniel Daily

Norwich, Vermont

April 10, 2002

Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts

February 25, 2003

DOH-34

Special Collections

Dartmouth College

Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: Donald Kreider

INTERVIEWED BY: Daniel Daily

PLACE: Norwich, Vermont

DATE: April 10, 2002

DAILY: Today is April 10. I'm speaking with Dr. Donald Kreider, Professor Emeritus at Dartmouth College. We're at his apartment in Norwich, Vermont today.

Professor Kreider, thank you for making the time to do the interview today. I'd like to back up and hear how you came to physics as a profession.

KREIDER: Well, interestingly, as a high school student and in undergraduate school my interest was physics, not mathematics. I didn't really know that mathematics was a profession.

I went to a small school, Lebanon Valley College in Pennsylvania. During my first year or two there I had a very supportive and impressive mentor who was a young fellow in the physics department. He sort of brought me along there, but also told me about the fact that studying physics at a small college in rural Pennsylvania would probably put me behind the eight-ball by the time I got to graduate school. Classmates in graduate school would be recommending changes in equipment that I had never even seen, and so forth. And he's the one who led me to realize that I liked physics for the mathematics in it, not so much for the physical laboratory activity.

So I remained a physics major as an undergraduate, I have to confess, mainly because my draft board in Lancaster, Pennsylvania was convinced that physics is highly important to the national interest, and they felt that mathematics is only for high school teachers, and they therefore were drafting everyone who was studying mathematics and were allowing people who [inaudible]. So I remained a physics major until two weeks before graduation, and then I switched to mathematics and graduated with honors. Went to MIT.

By this time I was confirmed in mathematics, and enjoyed those graduate years very, very much. I was impressed by a number of my professors at MIT, and many of them still are among my best friends in the world.

When the time came to look for positions I asked the department chair, William "Ted" Martin, at MIT, how one goes about searching for a job. His suggestion was to make a list of all of the graduate institutions in the United States that had PhD programs, and to add to that list four institutions that were top liberal arts institutions that didn't have graduate programs but were rumored or expected to have them within four years. So I made up that list, and there were 72 schools on that list. My wife and I reviewed that list and we sort of crossed off everything south of the Mason-Dixon line, crossed off everything in the American southwest. We crossed off all the schools in urban environments. There was only one school left on the list. You know which one that was.

John Kemeny was at Dartmouth at that time -- this was 1958 or nine -- and I knew some people in the department who had been at MIT during the previous few years, and Professor Richard [Henry] Crowell was one of them. So I responded to an invitation to visit Dartmouth and give a talk in the department in 1958, I guess it was. And I was almost finished with my thesis work at that point, and I talked with John Kemeny at a meeting and he talked in terms of [inaudible] the young research instructors. And I was actually not interested in that, these being terminal appointments, and I decided to stay at MIT for another year as an instructor. And the following year John came back again, and this time it led to an offer as an assistant professorship there. I was delighted and accepted.

DAILY: . . . your area [inaudible]

KREIDER: Well, my field was mathematical logic, and in particular recursion theory, which is, if you please, it's the theory of computing. There was no such thing as computing science then, but what subsequently was called computer science was really being done by logicians, in the 1930s and 1940s and '50s. And I -- my interest in logic was -- sort of jived with the department's interest here because they wanted to hire a logician. John Kemeny actually was a logician, but his interest migrated to probability theory, because he was working very closely with [James] Laurie Snell, and the department had for several years been trying to hire a logician. They tried some of the outstanding ones in the country and nearly got them. Everyone was always impressed by Dartmouth, but then lost out to other schools who were competing,

such as Berkeley, and . . . So I was brought up, I guess, because of my interest in logic and . . .

DAILY: John Kemeny was looking forward to doing work in the field of computers when he brought you . . . Were you working towards computing?

KREIDER: Well, I was not, I didn't know anything about computers -- well, not entirely true. I was aware of the research projects: Project Whirlwind at MIT, while I was a graduate student, and I worked some summers in the Dynamic Analysis and Control laboratory at MIT, which had one of the largest analog computers in the world. Every piece of it was some electrical engineering graduate student's thesis. It was a magnificent device.

So I was amongst all of the people who were carrying on the debate as to whether analog computers or digital computers would be the future. We know the answer to that now. But I had no knowledge of or real interest in computing *per se*, other than the fact that my field of research was recursion theory, which was the theory of computing.

I did not know that John was interested in computers when I got here, and the very first year they had this project in which the little -- I always forget the name of the computer now, they had a little computer over in College Hall that the undergraduates used to do research, and John Kemeny used it for research. He was interested then in developing programs and languages that could support undergraduate education. He felt that computers really were a wave of the future, and that every undergraduate should in fact know something about them. So he was aiming in that direction.

DAILY: [inaudible]

KREIDER: Yes, yes. That was very early on, because I remember writing programs for that computer in my first year at Dartmouth. And I remember some of the -- there was a program to do up some logical manipulation. I was very impressed with what computers could do. And it took that computer probably about five minutes to solve a problem that today is probably solvable in about a thousandth of a second.

DAILY: What kind of impressions did John Kemeny make on you, both as a scholar, leader and as a person when he first came here?

KREIDER: Well, I -- he was a remarkable person. He was a master teacher, and he had an incredible ability to switch gears. He could teach a class,

walk out of the class; walk into Professor Snell, Laurie Snell's office, contribute the key step in their little bit of research that they'd been working on, in ten minutes; walk over to the library, occupy his carrel, do some research on his own for an hour; come back, teach another class; chair the department --I never knew anyone who could carry on so many tasks at a high level of ability as he did.

He was one of the most sincerely sensitive people I ever met. He -- my first impression of him in my first fall at Dartmouth -- I was standing on a landing in Dartmouth Hall looking at the most gorgeous sunset you could ever possibly imagine, and John Kemeny and Laurie Snell were walking up the stairs, and I commented, saying, “Have you seen this beautiful sunset?” John said, “I don't have time for sunsets!” I was kind of shocked at the time, but it fit in with his high sense of priority; he knew exactly how he would spend every minute of his time. He never wasted a second. And he was not basically an aesthetic or artistically motivated person. He was very logical, analytical, but very sensitive person.

I remember we were on sabbatical leave in 1962, I think, at Berkeley. Our youngest son at that time was diagnosed as having a [inaudible] that had to be surgically repaired. He was eight years old. I remember the phone ringing, and it was John Kemeny asking if it was all OK, and, you know, if this was something financially we were prepared to handle. He said, you know, “We have a little bit of money sort of nested away, and we would love to help you if you need any help.” When would a department chair call up a member of the department and offer to stand behind him in a situation? . . . it was not necessary, but the very fact that he would do that.

He was just a very active person with the national and mathematical societies. He wanted a graduate program at Dartmouth; it was a very high priority. He felt that to have a graduate program in which you could have students who could write expository pieces, not necessarily the so-called narrow research pieces, was something that would be important for Dartmouth to do. He invented this idea of the Doctor of Arts in Mathematics as opposed to the PhD in Mathematics; managed to convince the national mathematical establishment that this was an acceptable idea. And they did. But then he couldn't convince the science division of Dartmouth College that this was a good idea. So he changed gears and worked directly for the PhD in Mathematics, and that came about shortly thereafter.

DAILY: What was the hallmark of his teaching style?

KREIDER: Hard to say. He -- first of all, he was brilliant, and that came across in absolutely everything he said. There was never hesitation, and he was -- he was the kind of person who could walk into a room, you could turn on a video recorder, and he would go up there, totally oblivious to any such distractions and give a talk or a lecture or an explanation, that was just letter-perfect. Most of the rest of us would be cowed by being presented with a situation that is different from what we're accustomed to; like giving a talk to your colleagues rather than a talk to students [inaudible].

He was very clear, he was not afraid to speak in the simplest possible terms. Most less-experienced people, and certainly beginning teachers, are afraid that somehow they will not be seen as in command of their subject or completely knowledgeable if they talk at too low a level. They make the mistake of giving a talk, even to their colleagues, which goes over everybody's head. Somehow they feel protected by sort of speaking in their own arcane subject language. And John was never subject to that. He would speak exactly to the level of his audience, and he was very good at deciding what that was. I think it's why he was such a successful teacher.

He was -- he had a very strong ego, very strong self-confidence, and was not afraid of what anybody else thought. He knew what he was doing was the right thing. He could care less what anybody else thought, and as a result he was very down-to-earth, spoke right at the proper level to his audience. And he managed to be tough with the students when they needed to be reined in. I saw him dress down one of our best math majors who was being disrespectful to a visiting professor in that year, and John Kemeny was not going to have any such thing going on in his department, and the students just respected him.

DAILY: Why was there resistance in the science departments about starting a Doctor of Arts program in math?

KREIDER: I think there was a fear that it was a second-rate degree, that if they were to have the Doctor of Arts program it would hinder the chances of the other science departments to develop their own PhD programs. I think there was a fear that it would be looked down upon by the external academic community; that if we really wanted to allow students to write expository theses that's fine, but call it a PhD, because in fact it would be a PhD in most other disciplines.

Those kinds of theses are actually much harder to write than a traditional research thesis, in a certain sense. They require a lot more

scholarship, and in many of the humanities and social sciences, what were the normally accepted and high quality theses were what John Kemeny was calling expository. So it was not that he was saying, “I want a watered-down degree.” He simply wanted to loosen up from the very traditional rigid mathematical concept of what would be an acceptable thesis. A mathematics thesis could be five pages if it's an astounding proof. And a five-page thesis in history probably would never fly. So he – I think that he, as I said, he was not able to convince the science division of the wisdom of this, and I think they feared that it would hinder Dartmouth's reputation and their chances of developing their own PhD programs.

DAILY: What was your experience in the classroom. How did you find Dartmouth students’ preparation for mathematics?

KREIDER: In the '60s I was extremely impressed with the Dartmouth students. I liked them; I enjoyed teaching very much. And I enjoyed teaching large groups of students, and was -- became one of the department's so-called “lecturers,” people who could handle the large sections of introductory courses, which some people have great difficulty in doing. They somehow don't communicate with the class and manage to lose control of it for various reasons. I mean, these are 18-year-old kids you are dealing with, usually anyway, and I don't know -- it was never an issue for me and [inaudible]. Students were just about as good students as you could find anywhere. They were bright, enthusiastic. If I -- in the 1990s I had different views, but in the 1960s I felt somehow that Dartmouth students were interesting and very unique. It could have been me changing from the '60s to the '90s.

DAILY: What were the differences?

KREIDER: In the '60s I had the impression (it may have been false), but I had the impression that all the students were dedicated, were motivated, were at Dartmouth because they really wanted to learn.

In the '90s I had the impression that at least a certain fraction of the students were not really interested in studying mathematics, they were studying it because they had to; they wanted to go to medical school and they were required to take a course in calculus and they just wanted you to get off their back and let them get their grade and not try to be imaginative in any sense in terms of what you asked them to do.

One can think about, how do you learn mathematics more deeply, how do you realize what mathematics is really used for in the world, and I had the impression that about one-third of the students would have

said, “Get off my back, I'm not interested in that, just let me learn to differentiate x squared, and get my A, and get on.” Another third of the students were scientifically oriented or technically oriented students.

These, by the way, were not the honors sections, these were the regular sections and about a third of those students were very bright, they were well motivated, they knew exactly where they wanted to go; and they were very obedient, they would do anything you asked them to do. You could ask them, “Did you really like that particular assignment?” They would say, “Well, not particularly, but if you want me to do it I'll do it.” Sort of that . . . and they were excellent students. You also sort of came to the realization that they were going to learn and do well no matter what you did.

So then there was the third of the students who really didn't want to be there. And then there was about a third of the students who were quite scared of mathematics, felt they couldn't do it -- in a real sense that's the group I liked, because you had a chance to convince them that in fact they can do it. And you see their eyes light up when in fact they succeed in something. I think that's what every teacher likes [inaudible].

In the '60s, of course it was a very different era. This was in the Vietnam War era, and attitudes of students were evolving over that ten-year period in very interesting ways. During my first five years I was totally unaware of anything, sort of anything like that.

DAILY: When I spoke to Charles Dey [Charles F. "Doc" Dey '52] , he said when he left in the spring of 1963, the students were like the students of the 1950s. When he came back in the fall of 1965, they all had changed in dress and attitude.

KREIDER: It changed a lot. There was a period of a number of years when the students were very suspicious of authority, of any kind of organization. They were suspicious, I think, of narrow focusing on career goals as opposed to world issues.

During that period, by the way, my impression was that the majority of Dartmouth students were still going about the same business they were in the early '60s. The students that I saw in the mathematics classroom, or many of my colleagues saw in the physics labs and so forth, were the same as always. They were studying, they were dedicated, they were interested in their professional development. But they were quiet. They did not make a lot of fuss about that, and the impression I believe that the alumni had of the Dartmouth students in

the late '60s was that all Dartmouth students were kind of wild-eyed radicals, were not really interested in their own education, they were just interested in solving problems of the world before they were prepared and ready to help to solve them. That's a narrow view I think that people had.

But I think even in those years, if you came onto the campus and went into the tutorial rooms in the evenings or the labs or something like that, they were full of students studying very hard, working very hard. But those were not the students who were out there in the vanguard.

DAILY: Before we talk more about the students, were there other faculty who made strong impressions on you?

KREIDER: There were a number -- obviously John Kemeny was one of the more remarkable people I've ever met. Some of my colleagues in the mathematics department who are still active there. Laurie Snell was someone that I just admired enormously. He was, and still is, just very focused and very dedicated, very brilliant, very active person, with a personality that's so laid back and kindly.

I knew [Hazelton] Terry Mirkil [III], who died in the '60s. Terry was a very impressive guy. He was in some sense the more stereotypical mathematician, but a very kindly person, and he was part of the Kemeny, Mirkil, Snell, Thompson quadruple that wrote some of the books. I liked Terry a lot, and I think I learned some things from him about how to focus in mathematics specifically as opposed to all kinds of other activities that you might undertake in a department.

I think the third person I think of is Leonard Rieser [‘44]. Leonard was a very wise man. He -- how shall I say it? -- I think he was just a wise man. He had some administrative weaknesses, which mostly were his style of very deliberately turning over every issue twenty times and looking underneath every little stone, etc., and sometimes gave the impression to members of the faculty that he could never make decisions. He would delay decisions, and I think that was also a strategy: he would be very slow to make decisions because ninety percent of them take care of themselves if you let them go. And he would often delay decisions about the ten percent that wouldn't take care of themselves. But it did give an impression of indecision. I think some faculty members felt that.

He had a way of handling people personally that I often felt was very good. If somebody would come in to Leonard and point out that they'd just had an offer from Idaho or Berkeley or Indiana or something like

that, and such-and-such a higher salary and what have you, and Leonard would listen in a very interested way, and would say, “Have you decided to do that? Have you thought whether you would be more happy there than you are at Dartmouth, that you . . . “, etc. He would just raise these issues, and he basically would not rise to the bait and fight about it, but bring people to think about it. Sometimes they would decide to move on, and his attitude was, “If that's what you really want to do, that's what you should do. And on the other hand, if you really like Dartmouth, seem better at Dartmouth, then you should stay here.” He wouldn’t get into a competing game. I thought that was very clever administration. I liked Leonard a lot. I was friendly with several people during those years; I don't think I knew too many people beyond the department.

One of the hallmarks of non-tenure years is that you're not a member of the institution or the faculty so much as you're a member of a department. It's the department that's judging you, it's the department that’s going to pass on you, it's the department that you have to work with; [inaudible] real difficulties with joint appointments.

DAILY: [inaudible]

KREIDER: Tenure, more than anything else, is the point where you become a . . .

[telephone interruption]

[End of Tape 1, Side A — Side B empty. Beginning of Tape 2, Side A]

DAILY: We were talking about how you -- what led you, basically [inaudible], vice president and dean of student affairs position, I wanted to kind of explore how that occurred.

KREIDER: Oh, yes, and I guess we were discussing the institution of coeducation and the necessary movement to the Dartmouth Plan in order to make that work.

When I first talked with John, I think there were a couple things he had in mind. One of them was that he essentially inherited an administration that was John Dickey's administration, that he had -- that administration was in place for a long time. It was not necessarily an administration that was happy to have a new type of leader. John Dickey was a very -- they were really John Dickey's administration.

I think John wanted to have in his administration at least a few people that he could sit down with and play devil's advocate, shoot the breeze,

essentially explore solutions to problems and not be hampered by "Well, that won't work because . . ." kind of thing.

I think his bringing of Ruth Adams into his administration as vice president for women was both because she's a wise person, but also -- and a tough person, a tough administrator -- but also because she would help to sort out the residual views which were not necessarily. . . that remained within the administration, that were not necessarily enthused about the idea of coeducation and Dartmouth Plans and an analytical president who in fact comes up with pragmatic solutions to problems.

He -- I think his talking with me was for somewhat the same reasons. I think he thought that between the two of us we could talk about possible needs in student affairs, directions that one might take in implementing the Dartmouth Plan, making sure that it happened in ways that were fair and feasible.

He was also interested in the fact that Dartmouth had essentially no data management system that would make it possible to answer questions about Dartmouth College. John Kemeny often said, "You know, I thought when I'd become president I would know the answer to the question, How many employees do we have? And I find I cannot get the answer to that question." And this was exactly the time when the federal government was pressing to have us provide data about minority members, about the way in which we direct our financial aid, all kinds of questions that basically can't be answered in a timely way because you didn't have a data management system to use. And John, of course, was interested in computing and such things, and he wanted to develop a management information system, and I think he felt that this was another place where I could help him. And we did work together on those things.

I don't know how his views emerged about the change of administration to what became known as "all the vice presidents" as opposed to the provost position. But I think John just thought that was a clean and orderly solution.

First of all, I think he saw himself as playing both an inside role and an external role. I think he did not feel the need for a provost who, in some sense, is an inside president. I think he saw himself as able to do that. I think his concept of administration was that you try to find someone who can take care of a particular area of the college, and give them their latitude and have them do it. And that, when it comes to the competing interests of what you might call apples and oranges,

how do you measure the significance and importance of new institutional funding for student activities, or new facilities needed in dormitories, versus the need of a geology department for a new lab, etc. You're talking apples and oranges. And I think his concept of that is that the only way to resolve those kinds of issues is to have someone whose main interest is in laboratories and academic things, etc.; you have someone else whose main interest is in things, let's say, related to student affairs; and you let those two people fight with each other and come up with compromises in fact that will work things out; and you don't rest that kind of thing in one individual, because one individual is trying to compare very disparate kinds of things. And I think John felt that that's one way to handle it, and I think he saw himself as competent to broker the decisions that get made between vice presidents. I really think that's why he went with that model.

DAILY: Do you think it worked in terms of letting the vice presidents duel it out, and he'd adjudicate the process?

KREIDER: He'd adjudicate the process. And he was the kind of person who did his homework extremely well. If two of the vice presidents were in his office to duel something out, or indeed, if anyone else came in because they wanted to ask the president to do something or other, he took it very seriously in the sense that he studied what they said before they came in, and thought about it extremely hard, and when the actual conversations took place, he knew more about it than anybody there. He always knew more about it than anyone there. And this caused him some troubles, because faculty members who might come in pleading for something would get the impression that John Kemeny was not interested in their views at all. The simple fact is, he had done his homework on exactly what they had proposed, and he was able to ask all the questions that they were not able to answer.

So I think John viewed himself as someone who could in fact manage and broker those kinds of situations. The fact that he called them “vice presidents” versus something else was, I think -- I don't think he particularly had a view on that, and he sort of saw the position, but not so much that it had to be called vice president.

He was criticized for having all those vice presidents. My title was created as Vice President and Dean for Student Affairs. And his thought there was that there should be the title vice president so that you have this role with the vice presidents in the brokering situation; and then also that in terms of academic life, the term “dean” means something that vice president does not mean. That, of course, created some difficulties with the existing position of dean of the college, which

was kind of a peculiar title at Dartmouth, sort of a holdover from the past, because dean of the college was not dean of the college, he was really a dean of students. And yet the title was dean of the college, and there was ambiguity in the trustees' minds as to what that position was. That was one of John Kemeny's thorns.

The particular incumbent was an appointment of John Dickey, and there was not a great deal of love lost between the dean of the college and the president. As it came to issues and concepts of coeducation and the Dartmouth Plan, etc., there was a certain amount of resistance and a certain amount of foot-dragging that made life difficult.

DAILY: You are speaking of Carroll Brewster. And this is one of the questions that kind of is out there -- how did or did not Brewster support coeducation and the D Plan? If he did not support it, how did he impede it?

KREIDER: This may be one of the areas where one doesn't want this kind of thing to be out in the near term, but maybe the longer term . . .

DAILY: OK. If you don't want to talk about this that is ok as well.

KREIDER: Carroll was a very strong believer in the austere Dartmouth, the male Dartmouth. I think that Carroll did not think that coeducation was a good idea at all. Carroll was never convinced that any of the efforts to improve life in the dormitories, to build different models of student living, to maybe have different models of student dining -- that any of these things were good ideas. He would talk about the effect on students of the austere dormitories as building some of the culture that made Dartmouth great. His interest in students, I think, was an interest in the fraternities. He was a strong supporter of the fraternities, and not just any fraternity. They had to be fraternity-type fraternities. The idea of sororities was not his idea of where you go; he would speak of some of the fraternities that were not national houses but were sort of -- well, what I would call ordinary students were members -- he would have various ways to describe them. I don't know if he used the term "nerd houses," but he had a way of classifying them in his speech.

Publicly he would support coeducation. Otherwise, there were a variety of ways in which his emphasis on his priorities did not work in support of it. He's -- with regard to minorities, similar situation: publicly he would acknowledge the importance of Dartmouth to do such things; privately he had ways of demonstrating his reservations [inaudible] the strongest word I should use.

So it was not a comfortable time for Carroll who, I think, came to Dartmouth under John Dickey with an institution that was not coeducational; was a sort of very traditional model of sort of undergraduate student life and I think he simply did not approve of the move to coeducation. He did not believe in any solutions that would make that possible, such as the Dartmouth Plan; that the efforts to bring in more minority students and diversify the student body; to develop the Native American population at Dartmouth -- all of these things, I think, were counter to his view of Dartmouth, and I think it was only a matter of time until he had to move on. And he did move on because he went to Hollins College in Virginia.

DAILY: Did he report to you as dean of student affairs or did he report directly to John Kemeny?

KREIDER: Well, at Dartmouth John was always able -- was always careful to say that anyone -- “my office is open to anyone who needs to talk.” However, there was a reporting relationship, and Carroll reported to me. Carroll did not like that.

DAILY: I was curious about the reporting structure.

KREIDER: I had reporting to me in that first year -- and this was part of -- I think John's concern that there was such a diverse structure in the administration that there was no way to actually manage it. There was a dean of admissions, a dean of financial -- they were not called “deans” -- director of admissions, director of financial aid, director of institutional research; there was a director of counseling, there was a dean of the college, there was a dean of freshmen who did not report to the dean of the college.

Then of course there were libraries and Kiewit and student health and -- I think there were 13 individuals that John put in my portfolio, and his wish was that that number should not be 13 but should be maybe half that much. But that he didn't have the time to deal with that particular issue.

Most of these positions were long-standing positions at Dartmouth with loyalties that were very sympathetic to Carroll Brewster's kind of view. It was a pretty consolidated informal little group of administrators who publicly would be saying “Dartmouth College is great and we're going places,” etc., and privately would not use the influence of their offices to try to come to grips with where Dartmouth is now and to help move it ahead. You can invent lots of terms for what it was, but basically they were not using their offices to try to analyze where Dartmouth is, what

changes need to be made, what the realities are and where can it go, and how can they help it go there. And that was, I think, one of John's serious problems in his first five years, and I think it's one of the reasons he felt that maybe I could help him. Because I was sort of in that melee for three years.

DAILY: [inaudible] . . . That seems like a tremendous amount. . . 13 people reporting to you.

KREIDER: That's crazy.

DAILY: In getting ready for this interview, I thought, “How in the world you could do that?"

KREIDER: Well, I'm not sure I had the administrative experience to be able to handle that kind of thing. It was clear to me that, although I would meet with these people individually in the reporting relationship and have conversations and try to support them and try to find out what they needed, etc., that it was always the case that whenever I met with anyone, meetings had taken place before their meeting with me, and so there was always prior agreements that I would not discover until I fell into them on the way.

I did not find that a happy aspect of the administration. It was not my view of what my career was when I became a faculty member and teacher of students and a doer of mathematics, etc. It's a very, very different world. I kind of marvel at some of those people who seem to survive and maybe really be happy in that kind of world. It was not what I'd consider a happy world.

DAILY: What, in that period as a vice president, what did you enjoy about it, and what things [inaudible] you felt you were able positively to influence?

KREIDER: I think -- well first of all, I enjoyed some of my colleagues there. As I said, Leonard Rieser is one of the people that I just plain admired, his wisdom. I watched him operating in very tricky situations with regard to minority affairs for example.

Ruth Adams, just a wonderful person to work with as was John Kemeny, and I think that the opportunity to be part of solutions to problems with [inaudible] to the college, such as working out the knots with the Dartmouth Plan, which was never a simple solution. So often, a big concern would arise and people would start to talk about this horrible Dartmouth Plan, etc., and you would think that, “Oh my, the tide is moving over in that direction.” So then you raised the question,

"Let's look at alternatives, how can we do that?" And as soon as you began to talk about how you might change it or do away with the Dartmouth Plan, another whole tide would come along, because the students in fact were making very imaginative use of it, and were beginning to see this as something that they really liked. They were willing to participate in griping about it, and the things about it, but if you started to talk about taking it away and they started thinking about how they had fashioned their educational programs, they realized that they in fact had taken advantage of this plan, and now suddenly all the arguments went the other way.

It was fun to be in the middle of that. I sat in on a lot of dormitory discussions where we -- I -- deliberately raised the issue of, "What should we do about the Dartmouth Plan? If it's really as bad as it's being described, how do we start moving towards something different and moving away from it?" And opened up the other kind of reaction.

Same with faculty. I think that the humanities departments never really liked the Dartmouth Plan; they felt that the terms were too short, they were too intense; they would describe the fact that great ideas simply could not gel in that amount of time. The biologists didn't like it; they said, "You can't grow earthworms that fast. There's a certain amount of time you need." [Laughter] "A semester is OK, right, but a term doesn't quite work because earthworms don't grow that fast."

Then, however, you would find that many other departments had made very imaginative use of the Dartmouth Plan. It gave them opportunities to fashion variety in their honors sequences and their advanced placement programs; to give a greater variety of courses for students to take, etc.

So the tide would go one way, you've raised the issue, and then out comes the other side. And so I don't know how people's feelings about it are now, but my guess is that the Dartmouth Plan was initially a pragmatic solution to the question, "How do you bring the college through the transition to full coeducation, and subsequently it actually became an important part of the planning process of many students and many departments, as to how they run their programs and their affairs."

DAILY: What were the students telling you that they liked about the Dartmouth Plan?

KREIDER: When they spoke in favor of it, they liked -- they talked about the flexibility; they liked the off-campus programs; they -- and the fact that

they could fashion their program with what they perceived of as some flexibility. What they didn't like were rules and restrictions about signing up for dormitory rooms, and for going off campus and then coming back, and maybe not being able to come back into the same group of students that they had left [inaudible]. So it's -- I think they liked the flexibility, they didn't like the restrictions. Students who really liked the flexibility were willing to buy the restrictions.

I think some of the administration felt that it was all an abomination, that it was destroying the old Dartmouth, for a variety of reasons destroying the old Dartmouth. Just one more piece of that. It led to more dormitories, it led to things like the more or less suite or small group kind of groupings in dormitories; it led to coeducation floor by floor; lots of those things which, by some people's views, took away from the austerity of student life which would breed stamina and character.

DAILY: I'd not heard that before.

KREIDER: Well, that was Carroll's view.

DAILY: [Inaudible] Dartmouth Indians . . . I came across the way the D quoted you as saying the Indian symbol was a thing of the past. Why?

KREIDER: Well, a number of reasons. It wasn't a “forever” symbol, it was invented by Boston sports writers. I think it was a symbol, and I think academics ought to know the power of symbolism. Symbolism is our way of taking extremely complex issues -- in logical mathematics we'll assign a symbol to something which is supposed to instantaneously, somehow, bring to your mind the essence and the guts of some particular concept or idea or topic or what-have-you. The Indian symbol did that.

Now, different people, as always is the case, will see symbols in different ways. It's not necessarily the same idea that comes to their mind. But they all think that it's the same idea coming to their mind because they're using the same symbol. Symbols are powerful, extremely powerful.

When the decisions were made, in the '70s, to diversify the student body for the benefit of Dartmouth and its place in the world, and to be serious about encouraging Native American students to come to Dartmouth, and to build that program, and also the other minorities' programs, we brought onto the campus a significant number of students who came from backgrounds and cultures that are so far different from ours that it was hard to believe. The view of what

constitutes good behavior versus bad behavior; thievery versus insensitivity, etc., differed very much in the minds of many of our Native American students and many of our so-called “white Dartmouth Anglo-Saxon” students.

We brought the Native American students to this campus, and one of the things that they found was a symbol which trivialized them and trivialized their culture. And we can say, “Oh, come on, you came here and you knew this was part of Dartmouth College.” It's not that easy. A symbol is very deep. A symbol is something that predisposes people to think about and to treat those people and their problems in a particular way, without thought. It simply predisposes you to treat a culture in a certain way. And the Native American students felt this, and they felt it intensely.

I felt that the Indian symbol never really was an essential part of Dartmouth, and it certainly was not, should not be part of the Dartmouth that was making a deliberate effort to bring new people, new cultures, new ideas. The symbol itself was the problem. The symbol trivialized and the symbol made it harder for people to look at those as an interesting and important culture on campus, etc.

I worked rather closely with Robert [Dudley “Bob”] Kilmarx [‘50] at that time, who felt similarly. It was Bob Kilmarx and I who brought to the trustees the motion to sort of officially disassociate ourselves from the Indian symbol. And I think that was the right decision; not a popular decision, but the reason was not just that, you know, the symbol had images of the “noble savage,” etc. down in Campion's store, and that sort of thing. The real issue was . . .

[End of Tape 2, Side A — Beginning of Tape 2, Side B]

DAILY: You were speaking about the Indian symbol. One thing that comes to mind in relation to that, working on the symbol as well, is that you were on the Committee on Organization and Policy; you chaired the subcommittee that was reviewing the judicial process. One of the outcomes, or one of the recommendations was to have minorities on the judicial panel when minority students were charged. I was kind of curious about the circumstances, and I think you've already sort of touched upon the reasoning behind that. Would you mind commenting on how that came about and the reasoning behind it?

KREIDER: That's a little more vague in my mind, but I remember through that period -- let's see, a number of things happened. The whole view about student judicial processes started to change considerably earlier,

when the college moved away from its *in loco parentis*, strong views about student life. And this led to some changes in at least the attitude -- I don't know if it did the structure -- of the Student Judiciary Committee. But there was then a period of time when -- hello?

[interruption]

KREIDER: I think that -- so that was one change that took place, that was in the '60s. I remember cases that came before the Student Judiciary Committee in the early '60s which were as simple as, what do you do with a student that happens to share a sleeping bag out on the golf course with his girlfriend on Saturday night? It was very different -- very different solutions to that issue in the early '60s versus the late '60s. So there was a very fundamental change there.

Second thing I think that half came out in the late '60s was the concerns about fairness, authority, faculty committees versus faculty-student committees, and I guess I don't know what changes there might have been in structure at that time. But that certainly raised issues of structures of committees, and do you accept it -- do you have students on it, etc. That did lead, I think, to greater difficulties, because when you got into the '70s and '80s, in getting faculty to be willing to participate in those kinds of committees. There were many faculty who would have been willing to sit on a committee that passes judgment on students; they were not willing to sit on a committee which in fact has to fashion resolutions of issues jointly with students. So there was a much smaller group of faculty who would be willing to participate in that mode, and I think the Committee on Organization and Policy, which was the one that was charged to staff committees, among other things, had constant troubles in finding faculty who were willing to provide any kind of continuity on that committee. They might go on for a year, then they'd become disillusioned and go off, etc. So there were difficulties there. Just the practical difficulties.

I think this was beginning to also run into the fact that the faculty was in fact becoming more professional, more departmentally focused to the discipline and the research of their department. Interest in the lives of students and student affairs was less than it had been; and if you're going to have a student judicial system that works well, you've got to have good faculty members who are willing to go and give quality time to it. And that was getting more and more difficult to do.

I think -- one of your questions was about reorganization of the faculty in the '80s, and I think this all sort of grew into the need for some reorganization just because of the nature of the faculty was changing.

DAILY: Do you think that with the student protests of the '60s and '70s, it scared off the faculty who wanted less to do with what happened outside of the classroom and turned it over to student life staff?

KREIDER: Well, I read that question, and my first thought was that the faculty was not dissuaded so much by that; but then as I thought about it more I started thinking about particular instances. There was -- I sense that there was a period in the late '60s; in that period, when the students were in fact, although they said, gave lip service to saying they'd like faculty to be interested in their affairs, did not particularly want faculty to be meddling in their affairs. And that faculty who would actually go to dormitories, talk with students, sort of open themselves up to that kind of thing, often said they did not feel particularly welcome; that they felt that they were intruding; that the students were doing this because they sort of thought it was cool or nice to involve the faculty.

The students were still saying they wanted the faculty to be interested in what they were doing, but I think they didn't want the faculty meddling in what they were doing. And I think that sense began to emerge, especially as students would sort of publicly resist authority and, you know, that -- a change of attitude, a very definite change of attitude in the late '60s.

So I think two things: I think the attitude of the students as to whether or not they really provided a receptive environment for faculty, whether the students felt they didn't want it or not we won't ever know, but I think the faculty began to sense that they were not *really* welcomed, and that the faculty were better off back in their offices and doing their research.

And I think the second thing was the increased professionalism of the faculty, which more and more people were really being advised very specifically by their departments: "Don't waste so much time doing that kind of thing. That's what you have deans for, and let them do the job." Certainly junior faculty were advised that way, and it's often the junior faculty that the students would have wanted to associate with. These were more near their age, they sort of felt closer to them, but those were exactly the faculty that the department was saying, "Come on, don't hurt your chances here. Be careful."

DAILY: Would that hold true for faculty that were involved in some of the student protests [inaudible] they were junior faculty?

KREIDER: I think that -- I thought about that. I don't know how to think about that. I know a number of faculty who were personally involved in that way, in

my own department, and I don't think the faculty actually feared so much that they were really hurting their tenure chances. I think that sometimes they disagreed with what they were doing because they disagreed politically with the stand they were taking. But I'm not sure that there was concern that somehow this was -- that somehow there was going to be retribution.

Now, I think that if there was retribution it would be within departments. I think that someone would get the idea that -- "OK, such-and-such a faculty is making an awful lot of trouble and is not spending time doing what we would like them to do, really be doing: publish more research papers, maybe spending more time with their students or something like that. They're over there busy protesting at the president's office or something."

However, I think most faculty were liberal enough that they were sympathetic to the activities of people even when they disagreed with them. That's certainly what I felt. I did not agree with all the positions taken by some of the protesters. I agreed with some of them but not all of them. But I really don't think I -- I somewhat admired the fact that these people were able to have the principles to actually go and do these things, and I think I didn't have the guts to do them. Still I didn't always agree with their positions.

DAILY: When John Kemeny took office, I think he felt he would stay at Dartmouth but not stay in the office of the president. What was the general expectation about how long he would stay in office? Did Dickey stay too long?

KREIDER: I think that there was some feeling that 25 years is too long for someone to be in office because there was more change that takes place in the world and takes place in an institution in that period of time; it's harder for an institution to evolve as required.

I [don't] think people really applied that so much to John Dickey. I think they viewed John Dickey's 25 years as being during a period when there were a lot of difficult problems; the war, and post-war problems. I think they sort of thought, "Well, there wasn't too much Dartmouth's going to do anyway." But I think as they looked into the future they felt that 25 years, the way things are changing now, is just too long. But I don't think, beyond that, there was any thinking about how long should John Kemeny be president, other than the fact that college presidents are coming and going much faster than they used to, and there's no reason to think that John would stay on forever.

John said, whether he said it publicly or privately, he said that, he says, “No college president should stay more than ten years.” He believed that, he really believed it. And his argument that he would make, when he was sitting down talking with them, is that there is a natural cycle of coming in, of bringing about change, accommodating change; bringing the institution into a position that it can afford that change; dealing with all the human fallout that goes with it, which has to be dealt with. And then finally there has to be a fund drive, a capital fund drive, which will put the institution in a position to pay for its new position. And he felt that ten years was just about the right amount of time for a president to do that. If he doesn't do it in ten years he's not going to do it. So he just always said ten years.

DAILY: When he became president, what was the general, say, mood, among the faculty? What was the expectation for his presidency among the faculty?

KREIDER: Well, I think at least initially he came in with an announcement of coeducation, and -- he had, by the way, through the '60s, in faculty meetings, put forth proposals for changing the Dartmouth calendar. I think John may well have been responsible for going to the term system. And I think there was certainly a feeling that here was an important conceptual change in Dartmouth, this is what John is really going to do, and he's going to spend, now, a number of years making it work. That and the minority thing. And I think the faculty were supportive of that.

I'm not aware that they -- beyond the fact that events were happening, that they sort of thought, “Well, things are going to be different now that John is here.” I think they did think that, “Well, he is of the faculty, and therefore he will be much easier for us to talk to than John Dickey was.” I don't know that John Dickey was not easy to talk to, but John was an academic, he was from the faculty, people knew him. I think people thought, naively, that maybe they can now get things from John Kemeny that they wouldn't have been able to get from John Dickey as easily, and I think that led to some disappointment when people came in with ill-formulated proposals. And as I say, John does his homework and he does it thoroughly, so he knew more about their proposal than they did, and was able to ask them about the implications of it, and they didn't like it when they were shot down.

So I think there was an initial period when people did not yet realize that; there was a subsequent period when they thought maybe -- this was also attributed to arrogance on John's part, which it certainly was

not. But I think that there was a period when people thought, well, we're not getting as much out of this man as we thought we were.

DAILY: I read in the D that you were seen as a possible successor to John Kemeny. Did that seem likely to you, and why were people talking that way?

KREIDER: No, that was not likely, nor would I have wanted it. One of the great things about the chance to be in the administration for a number of years, a couple of years, was that I was able to really assess what that kind of career is like and compare it to the kind of career that I had always planned. And I knew exactly what I wanted to do. So it was no likelihood from my point of view. Now -- and I don't think there was any likelihood from any other point of view. I think students -- at least some groups of students thought that this might be a likelihood, but I think that was a dream, and sort of an ill-considered dream of a few students.

DAILY: Then when you stepped down from the vice presidency in '75, what was the specific occasion for that? Were you ready to go back to teaching?

KREIDER: I was ready to go back to teaching and research and become active in my professional organizations, which I did immediately thereafter. I had had enough of administration and the kind of interpersonal frustrations that go with being responsible for producing solutions to unsolvable problems. There was never a culmination; there was never a problem neatly solved and wrapped up. It was always only ever half solved and half wrapped up, and there was never a case that anyone felt that you had really done a great job. Half the people did and half the people didn't. And where the rewards -- also I don't think that I was really cut out for the high level of administration. That's my own subsequent judgment, and I think that it was wonderful to have had the experience, and I can count some ways in which I made contributions. I can count some other things at which I would view myself as a failure in not being able to solve some of the problems, etc. So John and I very graciously worked out a way to let me go back to what I truly loved.

DAILY: Do you think John Kemeny would have shared some of your sentiments about kind of the no-win situations in higher level administration?

KREIDER: Well, no, he was different about it. John would often say that he realizes that the president essentially has a lot of power and no power

at all. And he took that as simply part of the game. John's personality was such that he would be hurt by some of the kinds of things that go on inter-administratively, but it didn't hinder him. He would analyze it and go about it, find solutions. He had many personal difficulties with people that he had never appointed, that he had to deal with; that a president can't order anything when it comes to academic policy, etc. There's the faculty and there's the other administrators, and many of those administrators were not appointed by you and they don't agree with you, and what have you. Nevertheless he was analytical enough to say, “OK, what can I make out of this situation? Let's keep moving forward.” And he did. That's what I found to be an impossible situation.

DAILY: Did you see any unfinished business of John Kemeny’s presidency? Were you aware of things he wanted to get done that he did not?

KREIDER: I'm not aware. He -- and as I say, he had a cycle in mind, not the least of which was a capital fund drive to pay -- he said every president has the responsibility to do that, to pay for what the president decided to do, and he felt that very strongly. I sort of had the feeling that, sort of at the end, he was at the point where he realized that he must now stop any other major initiatives. He knew he wasn't going to go much past the ten-year point, and that would not have fit his cycle.

He -- I think maybe in his last years when, even though he knew it's what he should be doing and what he planned to do, missed a little bit of the excitement and feelings of the first years when he was basically bringing Dartmouth from one era into the next. So I think he made a lot of changes in ten years, very fundamental changes. As a matter of fact the choice of his successor was directly related to that fact.

DAILY: [inaudible] about the changes [inaudible].

KREIDER: Well, I think fundamentally his decision and determination to bring Dartmouth into line as a coeducational institution, a first-rate coeducational institution, and to do whatever has to be done to make it possible to do that without just changing Dartmouth from one thing to another. As I say, he had strong views about the football team and the fact that you can't maintain a quality football program if you don't have 3,000 male undergraduates figured strongly in his strategy! etc.

I think he was very much interested in strengthening the faculty. I think he wanted the faculty research programs to increase; I think he was interested in having more graduate programs at Dartmouth; he felt that Dartmouth can only play its role, you know, in the education world if, in

fact, it keeps itself strong academically. He would always talk about the 50/50 rule: fifty percent research, fifty percent teaching.

He viewed himself as an excellent teacher, and he thought that every Dartmouth faculty should be a very good teacher. And he viewed himself as a reasonable researcher, and he thought that every Dartmouth faculty should be a good researcher. He did not say they both have to be excellent, but there should be excellence there; you will have people who are really excellent researchers and are very good teachers, and he would say very good teachers, and you can also do it the other way. But he would not agree to not having both pieces of that present in a respectable way.

I think his -- he presented an image of Dartmouth, externally, that was respected. It was respected by foundation people; it was respected by the National Science Foundation. I think there was confidence that Dartmouth was going in right directions, and that was important, I think, for Dartmouth. I think John did that through his own reputation, but also through his going out there and actually talking with people. John could go down to Washington and talk with anyone. He could talk with the President's cabinet, he could talk with the National Science Foundation, the National Research Council; all respected him and took him seriously. He could talk with the Mathematical Society of America, and they respected him and they took him seriously. He could talk to presidents of other institutions and the same was the case. That was a very key thing for Dartmouth.

DAILY: Anything else you want to mention about John Kemeny, or some of the subjects that we've touched upon?

KREIDER: I don't think so.

DAILY: OK.

KREIDER: OK.

DAILY: Thank you very much.

KREIDER: You bet.

End of Session

INTERVIEW: Donald Kreider

INTERVIEWED BY: Daniel Daily

PLACE: Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts

DATE: February 25, 2003

DAILY: Today is February 24, 2003. I'm speaking with Professor Donald Kreider. I'd like to start today's session off going back and talking more about John Kemeny. There were some more things I wanted to touch upon there. And you spoke quite a bit about coeducation in our last interview and I just wanted to get your own personal reflections on what your reactions were to coeducation and kind of use that as a launching pad into John Kemeny's career.

KREIDER: It's kind of interesting. One of the things that I think John did was focus attention on the coeducational issue and when I came to Dartmouth that was the furthest thing from my mind. I wasn't pro, I wasn't con. It's just, you know, that wasn't Dartmouth. And so I came to Dartmouth to enjoy Dartmouth for what it was. I guess it was in conversations with John. He would -- when he was not yet president -- would comment about the fact that Dartmouth is really missing out on its opportunity to educate half of the human race. And he was convinced that an enormous amount of talent was simply being wasted. I think Jean's influence here undoubtedly came to play as well. Jean was a remarkable person, as we just heard recently [chuckles] and they both had strong feelings about the inequity. I think John's thought was that Dartmouth is a powerful institution. He loved the place very much and it always bothered him that Dartmouth was missing out on the educational opportunities for women. He would have liked to have had women in the mathematics department .

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Mathematics majors and so forth and there wasn't that opportunity.

DAILY: Okay. Were there things that... Let me put it this way: Did coeducation distract from some issues that you as a faculty member or other faculty members thought needed attention?

KREIDER: No, I don't think so.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: When John came in and in his inauguration speech made that one of the goals of his presidency, it seemed just the perfectly right thing to do. I mean, from the point of view of the faculty, that would mean we could finally have women students and we were aware in our own profession, the mathematics profession, how few women mathematicians there really are. And it was a profession that was itself not benefiting from, you know, the brilliance of half of humanity.

Many people, you know, started raising all kinds of issues. You know, how are you going to have equal access to sports facilities, etc.? How are you going to modify the dormitories? All of the logistic questions, which of course had to be solved. We weren't really [chuckles] interested in those.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Somebody had to solve them, yes. But I don't think we felt that it was distracting to us as faculty.

DAILY: What are your recollections of some of the women who were brought on to campus at that point to help bring... or, who were put in administrative positions? Ruth Adams comes to mind first of all. But what do you think she brought to the whole process?

KREIDER: Well, Ruth is, was a neat person. She would bow to no authority. [chuckles] I shouldn't say that. She was not afraid of speaking her mind and she did that. And that was really necessary, I felt. There were definitely, very definitely, entrenched views in the Dartmouth administration at that time which were anti-coeducation. And this went very far to saying, you know, women were going to simply ruin the college, spoil the college, dilute the college. And in all kinds of very indirect ways, administrators would undercut, subtly but very definitely would undercut the attempts to make progress toward some of those things. I think John felt he needed to bring in Ruth Adams just because she had a lot of experience. She was outspoken and she came in as a vice president so she was on a level with all these people.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And she just called a spade a spade. She had very little direct authority. She had basically no portfolio...

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: or people reporting to her. That wasn't necessary either. It was a matter of her calling a spade a spade.

DAILY: What were, if you can recall, any specific instances where people tried to basically undercut education or some aspect of coeducation?

KREIDER: I think it was all part of the mentality that boys are boys and in the spring the sap runs up their legs, and they get into trouble in normal ways. And so if they go out and are abusive to female students, that's what you expect. It was sort of a protective mantle thrown over what I would, what today would be just out and out harassment -- you know, sexual harassment.

And the same attitude that says, you know, you don't want to upgrade the dormitories because part of what makes Dartmouth what it is is the -- crude is not the right word -- stoic, I'm not quite sure. The hardness of the dormitories, the long corridors with lots of rooms and minimal comforts is what makes Dartmouth men so tough. It builds class spirit and so on. I mean, these were things that were just openly said and believed by some of the administrators who were in a position to influence student opinion and make decisions about facilities and so on. That was sort of hard to take.

DAILY: Okay. How did Ruth Adams kind of tackle some of these subversions, essentially?

KREIDER: Well, first of all, nobody would openly tackle her in a meeting. They would do so at their peril. Not that anybody [chuckles] was going to punish them for doing so, except Ruth Adams herself would simply call it as she sees it. And by verbalizing what the... Some of these people were hoping you would think when they did not directly say it.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: You know, one can very subtly suggest something and you know perfectly well you're building an image in peoples' minds who are there, but you have never really said it directly. And Ruth would say, "So what you are saying is..." [chuckles] and she would verbalize it and that was extremely effective because the avenue of subvertly trying to influence decisions and so on didn't work.

DAILY: Okay. Any other specifics that come to mind in that context of how Ruth Adams dealt with some of the mossbacks, if we can call them [chuckles] that.

KREIDER: Well, in some ways, I think she would... There were occasions when I think she even helped John to take, to see a harder line where, in his very pragmatic role as president, he had to live with, supervise, get cooperation from the people in his administration. And so he would only go so far in sometimes pressing issues, chastising, if chastisement [chuckles] was called for.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: But Ruth would do it.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And John didn't have to do it. And I think that was, that was a great value to him.

DAILY: Okay, that's good to know. That was one of the things I was curious about. I'm going to do a quick audio check, okay? [tape turned off/on] Okay, we're back on.

KREIDER: Okay.

DAILY: Well, continuing on with John Kemeny, one of the... I see his presidency as -- this is not to slight John Dickey when I say this, but -- really a focus on the intellectual climate, in the intellectual spirit at Dartmouth. How do you... If you agree or don't agree with that, I'd be interested in hearing your opinion; and also what John did to maybe foster the intellectual spirit or intellectual climate at Dartmouth.

KREIDER: Well, first of all, I agree that that was certainly one of his foci and I think his plank to bringing coeducation was simply part and parcel of that. I think he felt that you could not really have a quality

institution which played the national role that Dartmouth could play if you were not coeducational. He believed the same thing about the Native American Program, about the minorities programs.

In some ways I guess John was ahead of his time, affirmative action-wise. Dartmouth was practicing affirmative action before the feds came in and said, "You must do this and you must do that." It was actually during John's first few years as president that some of the first pressures came from the federal government to provide equal opportunity for students, faculty. And I remember that the federal government started calling for reporting procedures.

You know, if you got federal funding for your research programs, then you were obligated to satisfy federal guidelines about how you kept records on people, so bringing in an affirmative action officer, which happened at that time... These are. . . That was part of what was behind the need to have a management information system so you could in fact extract information about students, faculty, etc. and see established trends, because you had to begin to prove to the federal government that you -- not only you were -- had policies that were consistent with affirmative action, but you had to be able to show progress.

And when John came in as president—he often tells the story. He asked a simple question. You know, "How many employees does Dartmouth College have?" And nobody knew. It was a very different day than it is today. And so one of his projects was of course to develop a management information system. What was it called? Project -- I forget the name of it now. [chuckles]. Oh, yeah, FIND.

DAILY: Project FIND?

KREIDER: Forecasting Informational Needs for Dartmouth.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: F-I-N-D. [chuckles] The idea was to use the computer to set up a system which would enable you to keep records. Do you know how many employees you had? [chuckles] But more to the point, I mean, to know how many offers were made to women and minorities, how many were turned down, and all the kinds of information that you are now required to produce if you wanted to

get federal funding for research. That was part of the early ‘60s, sorry, ‘70s.

DAILY: ‘70s.

KREIDER: Early ‘70s. So I do think of John as being primarily motivated by his own intellectual standards. He certainly, he certainly, I think, brought those standards into the Committee Advisory to the President as it pondered issues of tenure, evaluation and so on. He tried constantly to build the research strengths of Dartmouth. But John may have been the last president to still feel that somehow there’s a 50/50 weight on issues of teaching and service to Dartmouth versus your research contributions to your profession and to Dartmouth.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: I think he really felt that this was -- should be 50/50 split. He felt that a faculty member should be very good in both of those. He was not prepared to have someone who was, let’s say, 100 percent in teaching and nowhere in professional reputation and research, or conversely.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And I think... I admired him for that. It was an interesting intellectual honesty I think that motivated him in most everything. That’s why he thought coeducation was essential, why attention to minorities and their representation at Dartmouth was essential, diversity in the faculty was essential, because you can’t have a world-class institution that is all white, or all male, or all female or all anything. It doesn’t work.

DAILY: How did he encourage faculty during his presidency to -- in terms of research, in terms of teaching, going after grants, those areas. Were there specifics that he might have done?

KREIDER: I think probably his influence there was indirect. I mean, he was, as president, he was the person who could say yay or nay on someone gaining tenure at Dartmouth College, working, of course, with his Committee Advisory to the President. He would certainly work with, he certainly worked with that committee to have its strength and its standards. I think his influence on the issue of faculty quality was indirect and was of that sort.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I think he felt that a president is limited in terms of how much you can jawbone solutions to problems, that when you're chairing faculty meetings you can't be lecturing the faculty. You can't, it just doesn't work.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: Even if you come from the faculty and even if you are respected by the faculty, as soon as you become president, there are powers that you lose. Powers to stand up and persuade in a faculty meeting are in the same way not open to you.

DAILY: How do you kind of master Robert's Rules and kind of -- how to play the politics in a faculty meeting -- does that ring true to you, or any instances of it?

KREIDER: Not particular instances, no. I think he... What John was a master of is analyzing a problem in advance of treating it. He did this when he was chair of the department and I think he did it when he was president. He would know what he wants the outcome to be in advance, and he would have thought out in advance what battles he's prepared to lose and which battles he will not lose no matter what. And he would run the meetings -- he did in the math department and I think he did as president -- in such a way as to allow things to progress apparently unhampered by himself, apparently unmanipulated by himself. And he would, as president, lose some points. These were points that he was prepared to lose right from the beginning. And I think he would bring things up at a time and in an order so that by the time they got to the things he was not prepared to lose, people were inclined to go along.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: He didn't try to win every battle. [This] made him a very successful department chair as well, because the department honestly felt that he was treating the whole process democratically, because he lost battles.

DAILY: Right, right.

KREIDER: He knew which ones he didn't want to lose.

DAILY: Were people perceiving this at the time or . . .

KREIDER: People who were close to him.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: Well, he would tell you himself.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: He would say that you can't win all your battles. The key thing is to pick the ones you're prepared to lose and to make sure that you get brownie points [chuckles] by losing them and you know in advance which ones you're not going to lose.

DAILY: Okay. That sounds wise to me.

KREIDER: So in a certain sense, in some department situations, why, people would almost at a certain point say, "Oh, well, we've got to go along with John on this. We've been hammering him all day long." But he would often bring up things that he knew people would get all concerned about and which he was prepared to lose. And he would just let it go. He would lose it and then he would get what he wanted.

DAILY: Okay. In your last interview you made a statement that he would kind of act as a broker between... You gave the example of somebody on the student affairs side of the college and somebody on the academic side. Limited pool resources, both want, one, a new dorm and maybe the other one wants a new lab. And your example was a geology lab. And it -- so you've got apples and oranges, basically.

KREIDER: Yeah.

DAILY: How... and you made a reference that he would just kind of broker the situation. Can you flush that out and any kind of...

KREIDER: I think he sensed that when he became president. It's certainly one of the reasons he adopted what was not always the popular administrative reorganization of creating vice presidencies. Vice presidents smack of corporation...

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: ... organization. But John felt that you have to have people with responsibilities in some areas in the college that do not have responsibility in other parts. And their job is to really be the advocate for that particular area. You have to have people in student affairs who are advocating for improvement of dormitory life, or for student life, or judicial systems, for counseling quality and so on. And you have to have people who are advocating for academic matters, for faculty and so forth. So John didn't have to make decisions about, "Do we build a dormitory or do we build a geology lab?" because he had a vice president in each area whose responsibility, in his view, was to fight a strong battle, you know, on behalf of that argument. And he could then run the meeting in which these people could argue things out and he could broker a solution.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And he was good at brokering solutions. So he was brokering solutions among his top administrative officers. But if you had one administrative officer in charge of both of those areas, then it would have come under his lab to ultimately make a hard decision.

DAILY: Okay. To move toward some specifics then, you as vice president for student affairs, can you recall some instances where you had to advocate for a certain program or a certain building or whatever against, say, the dean of the faculty, and how that played out?

KREIDER: Well, examples might be the moves to improve the dormitory facilities, especially after coeducation was fully operational. The proposals to create some dormitories which had common rooms, or create common rooms in dormitories, to try to make clusters, to build a facility like the one down in the river cluster area, which were sort of apartment style kind of things.

This was where there was still a lot of regressive opinion I think within the student affairs area as to whether that's healthy or not. Are you going to coddle your students when, after all, Dartmouth built itself on situations which gave people tough characters --

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: -- the granite of New Hampshire and what have you. But certainly in costs of dormitory improvement, building clusters, having faculty members sort of as masters and all those questions which cost money came head to head against other priorities, such as faculty salaries, departmental needs, geology laboratories.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And Leonard Rieser, of course, was the person who very effectively advocated for those areas. And the important thing was to get the problems defined, to get studies made. You had to have somebody who said, "We're going to come up with plans for clustering dormitories or building more facilities so that the year-round operation program can work more effectively with fewer disruptions for students." The odd thing, of course, was that Leonard Rieser himself believed all those things too.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: So he sometimes, almost artificially, had to put himself in a position of, you know, sort of arguing against something [chuckles] because -- very deliberately... He still was the kind of person who would have liked to have been president of Dartmouth College and thought that way.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And so it was tough for him sometimes, I think, just to stick to one area and be the unwavering advocate for that area. I'm a great admirer of Leonard. But he had a bit of a tough time with that aspect of John Kemeny's administration, because I think John expected the director of athletics to be really hard-nosed, arguing for things that no faculty members are sympathetic for.

DAILY: Right, right.

KREIDER: And he said, "That's Seaver Peters' job. He's got to make those arguments." And even if John abhorred the recommendations that he made, he wanted them made. He wanted those recommendations out there and well defined, and then they could be put head to head with the other competing needs and ultimately John would broker a solution.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: But without that happening, he couldn't have achieved it.

DAILY: It must have been tough for you in some instances where, being faculty and understanding departmental needs, to put yourself in that student affairs role. Were there any issues with that for you, kind of intellectually?

KREIDER: Personal issues, yeah, because you come out of the faculty and you have a certain amount of respect coming from the rest of the faculty. And I think part of it is the faculty is thinking, 'Oh, let's get one of ourselves into that area and we will clean it up. We will set priorities correctly. We will not waste money doing this and that and sit around.' So you find that some of your colleagues suddenly think you have become a traitor to the faculty interests when, in fact, Leonard Rieser was supposed to be taking care of that. [chuckles] And I was supposed to be taking care of something quite different.

DAILY: Was there any view during John Kemeny's presidency that the student affairs side of the college, particularly staff, grew too much? Did the faculty feel...

KREIDER: Oh, faculty felt that. Yes, they certainly did. I think the faculty likes to think that we're sort of a small, intimate institution where all the needs of students can be handled by faculty members taking an interest in students, sitting and talking to them in their offices, etc. What is all this need for counselors? What is the need for the psychiatrists who are down there in Dick's House? Why do we have to pour all this money into common rooms and dormitories? And so on.

I mean, the faculty's solution would have been to assume that there are no issues that students have of accommodating themselves to, you know, their new life, their maturation to... They don't have problems that they couldn't handle themselves with just good adult advice. So there's... Faculty has often felt that student affairs just was rampantly overstaffed.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: That's a perpetual argument.

DAILY: Okay. When you took up the position in student affairs, which side of the fence do you think you kind of fell on... that the students needed those things, or did somebody kind of counsel you along and educate you, for lack of a better word?

KREIDER: Oh, I guess I was sort of vaguely aware that deans . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side A – Beginning of Tape 3, Side B]

KREIDER: I think my views were probably fairly naïve along those lines. Ruth Adams would often say, you know, if I were sort of taking an intellectual point of view to a solution of some problem or other, Ruth had a way of just sort of calling you on it, saying, "You don't really remember what it's like to be a 19-year-old anymore, you know, with all the stresses and problems that go with that." And from her experience as president of Wellesley was able to talk about the infrastructure that they had there for students, saying why it was important and so on. So, yeah, these things were called to my attention but I was predisposed to believe that students needed more help and attention, and yet we needed people in the dean's office who were not only sympathetic to students individually, which most of the deans really are.

But a dean's office that itself takes a bigger picture of what student life is and could be. The questions of fraternities versus trying to improve dormitory atmospheres and lives, and what kind of facilities do you have to provide and how do you sort of raise the standard of intellectual life for students and social life for students? Dartmouth was not what I would call a pleasant institution from the standpoint of the kind of social life that is structured for students.

DAILY: Right, right.

KREIDER: That was very tough changing that, very tough changing it. Still going on.

DAILY: Mm-hmm. How did you come along into the role of vice president for student affairs? What precipitated that? Did John come to you directly or did you have to apply among other people?

KREIDER: No, John did come to me directly.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And John felt that in order for him to be president, he would need to have someone, I guess, whose inclinations and views he trusted as the person who is advocating for the larger area of student affairs.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: That there was and would be entrenched resistance to coeducation, to issues of trying to change attitudes of students about social life. There were people in the administration who would work subvertly to make it go in the opposite direction. And I think he felt that, as president, he could not act as the dean of student affairs...

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: ...that that simply would not work. He had to have someone in that area. So he felt that there, you know, [chuckles] should be a vice president in that area, because that area should have the same administrative perception and level, rank, if you please, as the faculty area, the facilities areas, the athletic areas, all the apples and oranges issues. They need their own advocates and yet, he wanted to have someone whose philosophy and way of analyzing problems was not alien to him.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: It had to be somebody he could work with and trust. And I think he felt that he could not trust the people whose life careers had embedded them in a Dartmouth that was a different Dartmouth than John was envisioning, and which it was becoming.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: So, yes, he approached me.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And I had not had administrative experience at that level. I had one heck of a lot to learn. Ruth Adams was a wonderful counselor. Rod Morgan. These were quite good people.

DAILY: What would you consider as your . . .

KREIDER: Oh, by the way, Ruth was unique in that she could not have an area that she had to advocate.

DAILY: That's true.

KREIDER: She didn't have portfolio.

DAILY: True.

KREIDER: So she was, she had a freedom that none of the other vice presidents had.

DAILY: What would you count as your achievements while you were vice president? Last time we spoke about your decision to leave it, to go back to teaching. But what would you count as your achievements in those several years?

KREIDER: Well, [chuckles] I have a lot of mixed feelings about that. I think just to keep the student affairs area moving in the direction of better quality of student life and living conditions, I think I can count as some of the things we achieved. The decisions that were made to have different kinds of living residential models, because that was resisted. So, defining some of those things and bringing them as proposals to the trustees and getting the college to move in those directions; constantly working to make sure that the people who come into the positions within student affairs are positions of responsibility and influence, were sort of thinking of the larger picture...

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: ...and not thinking of an old picture and ways to sort of move us back to it. So that gets into personnel issues and yes, there were some. There were some there.

DAILY: Any hires that particularly come to your mind as being really positive and kind of bringing about this new Dartmouth? Anybody who would have been hired in the student affairs area?

KREIDER: Well, we ultimately got a new dean of the college.

DAILY: That was Ralph Manuel?

KREIDER: Yeah. Ralph is a pretty neat guy. He was in an awkward position. He was dean of freshmen at a time when the freshman office was a completely independent entity.

DAILY: Did it report right up to the president then or...

KREIDER: Well, yes. Then Ralph... Then he reported to me. So Carroll Brewster and Ralph both reported to me. Incidentally, the director of counseling reported directly to me; that was a separate office.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And admissions and financial aid. There was an interesting grouping of people. If you sort of go off . . .

DAILY: That covers such a large area. [chuckles]

KREIDER: Well, there were 14 and one of the things that John felt was wrong is that that's way too many. He wanted some reorganization and consolidation, etc. in those areas. So there was a lot of resistance.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I ran into a lot of resistance.

DAILY: Okay. [chuckles] All right. We'll leave it at that.

KREIDER: Ralph was one of the people that I thought was... He was a future college president.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And I admired him. He would just sort of shrug his shoulders at some of the things that would go on because they basically weren't his business. But he was intelligent enough to stay out of it. But he didn't automatically go along either with the Dartmouth Row conspiracy. [laughter]

DAILY: That was a good way to put it. Well, fraternities obviously would come up as a question in terms of your area. Before we get into specifics of fraternities at Dartmouth in the 1970s and even beyond, what was your general view on fraternities, like, say, when you first came to Dartmouth as a faculty member, or even back in your own student days?

KREIDER: Well, when I came to Dartmouth, of course, it was an all-male institution.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And, as I mentioned, that was one of the things that was simply not... Student life affairs were not on my mind. The fraternities were sort of generally recognized as being kind of barbaric and what have you. My own undergraduate college had no real fraternities. It had social organizations but they were not allowed to be national fraternities.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: So I didn't think much about it during the '60s and it didn't at that time come up against any internal problems as severe as the ones that came to the surface on coeducation. Okay, if you want to have a place that is more accepting, and more compassionate, and more open, and that welcomes women and welcomes minorities, as well as all kinds of men students, you're going to run up against fraternities by definition in that situation because they were kind of an anti-intellectual grouping of students and they really controlled social life. Back in the '60s I think a lot of the problems that they caused could simply remain under the surface. But in the '70s they could no longer remain under the surface.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: So then gradually you had to start to deal with fraternities. And so during the '70s certainly there was study committee after study committee that would make recommendations. And then something wouldn't happen and then it would be five years later there'd be another study committee. And our current president [James E. Wright] was one of the people who was very instrumental in coming up with some of the forward-looking recommendations back in those days. But it's always been a knotty problem with Dartmouth's long history of, as an all-male, basically white institution.

DAILY: Right. In your view, while you were in student affairs, you know, if it would have been your prerogative solely to... Would you have chosen to reform them or to move them out of campus, or move them off campus?

KREIDER: Oh, that's a good question. I wish I'd had the foresight to think of that question [chuckles] back then when I was in that position. I

guess I felt that fraternities had a place but what had come wrong at Dartmouth was that they were so endemic, and so much controlled the social life and defined the social life that that's what had gone seriously wrong. There were not alternatives, though I think my thinking always went in the direction of making sure that there were equal alternatives.

I think it was in years later that I began to feel that that isn't going to work, because bringing in alternatives was by definition trying to bring in "one alternative way of thinking of social life to counterbalance this way" where, as a matter of fact, the thing you want to bring in is serving a much more diverse group of students for which one model isn't what's going to work. And I think that fraternities, as one model which stood for one point of view, could really throttle all the efforts to try to bring in diversity in the other areas.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And then I think the fraternities, because of their dominance, began to think that they had all kinds of privileges. And they would openly take the point of view that they were being unfairly expected to change or bring about certain social conditions. I'm not sure.

My feelings certainly then evolved over to a position which said that fraternities, just by virtue of their dominance in the social system on the campus, have on their backs certain responsibilities which they don't necessarily want. They do have a responsibility to keep their properties in order. They do have a responsibility to help to improve the accepting and diverse social climate of the campus. And the fraternities were quite openly saying, "That's not our responsibility." I mean, "That's not us." And I think, as a small part of the campus, I might have bought their argument.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: But because of their social dominance on campus, I felt that they did not have a right to cede their efforts to help to make it a more diverse and accepting place. And when the fraternities took a belligerent attitude about the fact that they shouldn't have to worry about the attitudes of women or the positions of women, etc. on the campus, then I felt that they had given up their right to retain that kind of social dominance.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And I came around to the feeling that we'd be a lot better off without them.

DAILY: Okay. That's an interesting argument.

KREIDER: But it was their success that I think gave them some obligations, which they were not willing to accept. And when they started to become belligerent about the fact that they don't have any responsibility in those areas, then I felt they were out of date and harmful to Dartmouth College.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I've known some fraternities that were just great places, you know. The one next to the math building. What is it? Phi Tau or something.

DAILY: Yeah, I don't know.

KREIDER: The one that's undergoing all the construction now. You know, just wonderful kids. They do not have the attitudes that the fraternity row groups… My son, when he was at Dartmouth, was in a fraternity. But again, it was a peculiar one, Tabard.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: [chuckles] It was different. It was slovenly. [laughs] He would invite me over to tell me proudly what they had done to their house and fixed it all up. And I went in and there were springs sticking out of the sofas that we were sitting on and, you know, with the stuff spilled all over everything. It was slovenly. But they were not, they were not actively resisting the fact that Dartmouth is evolving into a new private institution.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And some fraternities did and some didn't.

DAILY: What do you... Did you ever talk to John Kemeny about fraternities or did you ever hear him really hold forth on fraternities?

KREIDER: He didn't really get into that a lot. When issues of fraternities would come up, he would shrug his shoulders and it was clear what he thought, that he just... That was for me to worry about. That was for somebody else to worry about, not for the president.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: He would, if he thought that something had gone too far, such as the safety conditions in the houses and that the houses were not being responsible in maintaining their conditions in their safety and that sort of thing. And by the way, [they] were a very important part of the housing on campus when there were serious issues with year-around operation brought out, when we needed more rooms, we needed more space and so forth. And again, the fraternities, because of the historical hold on the numbers of students who actually resided in fraternities, they... He felt, though he wouldn't say it publicly, but I felt, and I would have to take that position, that the fraternities are not just independent organizations that have the right to do any darn thing they want to do by virtue of their dominant position with regard to housing, not just social life. They have responsibilities, whether they want them or not. And so there were... Minimum standards were approved and fraternities had to accept some of those sorts of things.

DAILY: Are there... Do you recollect any instances where you and John really disagreed on an issue that involved student life and student affairs?

KREIDER: No, not specifically. We disagreed on a few other things from time to time. But [chuckles] they had to do with [inaudible], oddly enough. I do not recall.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And I don't think it's a lapse of memory. I think that it's really the fact that he deliberately stayed out of things that he felt I was supposed to be doing. And he was very good about, sometimes, about letting you make a decision quite independently. And he might say, "All right, but how are you going to pay for that exactly?" You know, because he was making it clear that you not only have responsibility to make decisions in certain areas, but you have responsibilities to make the whole decision.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: How are you going to do it? How's it going to work? Have you really thought it out, etc. He would bring things up like that. Whether they were disagreements or whether they were simply him doing what he always did so perfectly, namely, he thought every problem out before he walked into it. And he expected everyone else to do that and not everyone else does that.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And I didn't always do that.

DAILY: In the last interview we talked about, you know, John publicly made it clear that a president shouldn't stay longer than 10 years or so. And so what I wanted to kind of launch into is the appointment of David McLaughlin as president and some of the -- your initial reaction as a faculty member and the other faculty reactions to that appointment. So with that kind of base, what did you think that Dartmouth needed as a next president, you know, when John Kemeny retired? What kind of a person did you think Dartmouth needed?

KREIDER: Well, this was exactly at a time when Dartmouth was, thanks to John's presidency, had achieved an amount of national recognition that it had not had previously. I mean, it was a more parochial institution just 10 years earlier. And that's, that was sort of part of the natural growth of institutions. It was not that and John Dickey was not a backward president.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: John Dickey was, I think, quite a good president. It was just the times were different. Federal funding for research was something that was growing throughout that period and becoming a more important part of every college's budget, hiring and firing decisions, everything. It permeates the whole picture. I think I felt that the next president needs to be someone who is seen as intellectual by the national community, the National Science Foundation, and the National Research Council, and by the other colleges and universities, and needs to be someone who can hold up an image of Dartmouth as a place where things are changing and things are going on. I have always felt that Dartmouth, that it would be a mistake for Dartmouth to try to make themselves into a "research university" in the sense of Princeton.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Princeton made that shift after World War II at the time when it was easier to do that. And Dartmouth had achieved a national recognition because of its balance of research and teaching. It was highly ranked among institutions in the United States. And I don't think it would have been that highly ranked if it was being viewed as a research university and would not have been that highly ranked if it was viewed as just a teaching institution.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: It was the fact that it was sitting on that fence.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: It's kind of an unstable place to sit.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: You can topple off in either direction. And I think he would be toppling down in either direction.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I think... I felt that we needed a president... I think John had that view and I think we needed somebody who had that view and who would command the respect of other institutions.

DAILY: Okay. So what was your reaction then when David McLaughlin, when the trustees appointed David McLaughlin?

KREIDER: Well, I took a wait and see approach, because I had known David when he was a trustee and very pleasant and very affable, a very sociable person.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: I knew he was, you know, CEO of Toro or something of that kind.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: So I had my doubts about whether someone coming from that background would be able to fulfill what I had in mind. But I didn't know that he couldn't.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And I think I did feel that the trustees sort of deliberately took a step backwards at that point. I think they felt that... Oh, some of them said that, you know, "John did wonderful things for Dartmouth. Now we need a breather."

DAILY: Oh.

KREIDER: "We need a breather." That was the term that was used.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: John had brought in coeducation. John had been an advocate for affirmative action, for minorities programs, for women on the faculty. He was an advocate for higher standards for faculty professional scholarship, albeit balanced with quality teaching. He brought in year-round operation as a mechanism. He brought in our management information system. He brought Dartmouth into sort of a modern reporting era and some of these things were controversial. We came out remarkably well at Dartmouth on the coeducational issue. We didn't have nearly the troubles, let's say, that Princeton had.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: But I think, directly or indirectly, John was constantly in a position of pushing the trustees. World affairs didn't help at all. I mean, the oil embargo in the early '70s that brought about a quadrupling of the fuel costs for Dartmouth and a severe budget crisis required that the trustees had to deal with the question of how much of the income of the endowment can we use in the annual operating budget. That's one thing I worked closely with John on -- coming up with models, which would be able to sort of predict 10 years out what different kinds of decisions with regard to use of total return would mean with regard to the next fundraising, capital fund drive. John felt strongly that every president has to end each presidency with a capital fund drive. A president has to do things and a president has to pay for it. He felt that strongly so he was able to present to the trustees a proposal for use of total return that would,

as he put it, share the crisis, the administrative crisis between the present institution and the future institution.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: You can't cheat the present institution solely and not hurt the future institution. They'd have to share in this. [chuckles] So this meant something about total return policy.

DAILY: Can you explain... I've seen total return explained in one other interview. Would you mind explaining it, what the concept was?

KREIDER: Well, if you have invested funds, an endowment, some investment committee has to wisely decide what's the most appropriate way to invest these funds so that the future institution is well served, that you preserve the buying power . . .

[End of Tape 3, Side B – Beginning of Tape 4, Side A]

DAILY: Okay, we're speaking about total return [inaudible].

KREIDER: Yeah. You, of course, want the endowment to grow. On the other hand, there are... The issue of what constitutes the income from the endowment depends very much on your definition and on the way in which you choose to invest your funds. If you put all of your money into stock funds in good times (not like the present time, but in good times), this may serve the future institution very well because this will grow rapidly. On the other hand, the dividends that you actually get paid, the so-called direct income is very small. That would cheat the present institution.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: So somehow you don't want to define the income that you may use from your endowment in terms of what the income is defined to be by the stockbrokers or the bond people and so forth. So you have to somehow come up with a total return policy that says that the endowment is to be managed in a way that will cause it to grow, let's say at an annual rate of 9 1/2 percent taken over a long time period. And we will just by definition say that we will allow ourselves to use 4-1/2 percent. Let's say we use half of that as "income." Now, in fact, of that 4-1/2 percent, some of it may be ethically coming out the corpus of the funds because the actual income in a given year may be lower.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: It would certainly be lower, depending on how you have the things invested. If you have it all in bonds, you may get 4-1/2 percent or more in a year. On the other hand, the darn thing won't grow in time. So, in order to uncouple sort of long-term growth requirements, and you want to free your investment people to manage this with the best long-term track in mind, you would have to uncouple the question of how much income do you use. And you would call it, I guess, a total return policy.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: You simply say, "Okay, we expect our endowment to grow 9-1/2 percent per year on the average. We will allow you to build 4-1/2 percent of the value of this thing into your annual budget." And, therefore, to go to say that in a time of crisis that we should, for the period of, let's say, three years, or four years, move that from 4-1/2 to 5-1/2 percent, that's a big decision. That's one the trustees would not take lightly.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: On the other hand, if they were to do that for a crisis situation for several years, they would build a plank into the next fundraising drive and say, "That's money that has to be replaced."

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: That extra percentage point is... Because that does not fit the long-term picture. Those kind of things. So there were simply many, many issues that came up in the '70s where I think the trustees felt that they constantly had things on their plate that maybe they would have preferred not to have to make decisions about.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: But they did and they made good decisions.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: But then I think when John was at the end of his presidency, some of them, I think, couldn't understand him. And they took the point of

view that, “What we need is a breather. We’ve had coeducation; we’ve had, you know, land operation. We have all these things. Let’s take the time to digest these things. Let’s make sure they’re adequately funded,” and so on.

DAILY: Now, the controversies, and this is a…

KREIDER: Oh, and I think by implication a businessman is better able to do that than...

DAILY: Than an academic. David McLaughlin ended up in a lot of controversy. But what intrigues me is this idea of, that his presidency was really supposed to represent a breather from diversity, or some of the ways the college had grown in the ‘70s. Do you think really that he was a breather in those respects? I mean, he was not. The board was constantly having to deal with some of the controversies that happened during his presidency. This isn’t well formulated in my head but I guess I’ll show my hand. Maybe that’ll be a better way to get this question. I look at David McLaughlin’s presidency that he didn’t back off some of those initiatives that John Kemeny started. Is that a fair thing to say, and if not, why?

KREIDER: I don’t think he backed off.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I don’t think he... I can’t think of anything that was a leap forward.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: But maybe that’s what the trustees were... Maybe they just didn’t want another leap forward.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I don’t think the trustees wanted anybody to back off.

DAILY: Okay. All right.

KREIDER: I think the trustees basically believed that this was a good 10 years and it was important for Dartmouth to grow in this way. And it has and we’re proud of that and we need a breather. [chuckles]

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Maybe it was partly that they just felt they would be more comfortable if they could be the more traditional board that just worried about the financial security of the place, and not have to worry about big leaps forward in terms of remaking the institution in a new form, which is what John Kemeny did.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: So I don't think that McLaughlin, David would have necessarily said, "Let's back off of some of these things." I think what David ran into is an expectation on the part of the faculty and the academic world in the large outside -- National Science Foundation, funding agencies -- an expectation was built, the fact that Dartmouth is a different place. And David, I think, accepted that.

I can't explain how else he would have had the nerve to go down to Washington and make speeches on behalf of the engineering school, or speeches on behalf of faculty research when the very first question that would come out of any of those audiences, he would not be in a position to answer. And he couldn't. And the word [chuckles] was going around that this guy doesn't know anything about these things. He talked well. I mean, his initial rhetoric on these things, I think, will show us where his heart was. It was not that evolved. I think he really believed these things needed support and I think he believed that he could do it.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And that was the sad thing.

DAILY: Okay, okay. So word was coming back to Dartmouth that he really couldn't hold forth in front of...

KREIDER: Yeah, the word was coming back, "Who is this guy?"

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: What's wrong here? And then you find out some of the things he did and said, you know, when he was talking before groups. He was talking on behalf of engineering education or something of that kind. Nothing wrong with that.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: But he couldn't do it. So he was basically a corporate and his world was of a different sort. And I think he got caught.

DAILY: Would it have been... This is kind of the "what if" situation but in that scenario would it have been appropriate for him to send the provost or the dean of engineering school down to speak to, let's say, a forum of engineers?

KREIDER: Oh, I think so.

DAILY: Rather than himself going. And that would have been okay?

KREIDER: I think so. But I had the sense that he played things pretty close to his chest and that he had some of his own feelings, which I think were, you know, worthy ones about [chuckles] the worth of Dartmouth and what the institution was, etc. And I think he kept things close to his chest and I think he wanted to do certain things. I think he believed he could.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And it was, I mean, it would have been better somehow if he had accompanied his engineering colleagues down if he wants to put the presidency of Dartmouth, you know, behind the importance of what they're saying. But that was a serious problem and you don't have to make that kind of mistake too often before you can spend the credibility that had been there.

DAILY: Okay. If you're comfortable, what are some specific incidents in this area where he'd gone down to Washington or wherever to speak on a topic and then kind of fell short?

KREIDER: Well, I think the ones I have in mind are probably one or two incidents where he went and spoke before probably what were advisory committees at the National Science Foundation.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And this is where funding for a lot of the academic departments to sciences, engineering comes from. And this is the point at which I think people in the faculty can become pretty unforgiving if they somehow feel that they are being taken less seriously in the world

because their president came down [chuckles] and presented a case which didn't make any sense.

DAILY: Okay, all right. This helps. I mean, understanding David McLaughlin's presidency is complicated because it always seems that he's well liked, with good intentions, and yet had a lot of problems with the faculty.

KREIDER: If David had followed John Dickey, he very likely [chuckles] would have been a fine president.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I don't think the institution would have changed as dramatically. And that ultimately would have hurt but he wouldn't have... It wouldn't have been put on his shoulders.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Whereas, John changed the institution and changed the external perception, and, in fact, where John... When a search committee was searching for the successor to John Dickey, they traveled and talked with heads of foundations: Ford Foundation, National Science Foundation; major universities: University of Washington, Berkeley, Chicago, places where there were, in fact, presidents in place that knew Dartmouth, were sort of friends of Dartmouth and so on. And the search committee got some of those people to talk about how they saw Dartmouth as part of the national educational scene. And they were basically saying that they saw Dartmouth already at a more advanced position and thought Dartmouth, in fact, had already achieved.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And I think the trustee members of the search committee were quite surprised that Dartmouth had that kind of respect in the external world. And that was a large part of why the trustees were willing to reach out in that search beyond what was considered the obvious appointment. And it was the trustees who had ultimately brought up the question, "Why haven't we considered John Kemeny?"

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: In fact, the faculty search committee had considered that but decided the time had not yet come to raise John because, if the faculty had raised John, they were convinced the trustees would view this as self-serving, and, "He's merely an academic," and what have you.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: But, instead, the whole process educated the trustees to the perception of Dartmouth in the external world. They eventually came around. In fact, they heard the name John Kemeny.

DAILY: From outside.

KREIDER: Oh, yes. From outside.

DAILY: Wow! Okay.

KREIDER: So they eventually asked the question, "Why haven't you considered this?"

DAILY: Right, okay. You had mentioned that David McLaughlin kept -- I don't want to put words in your mouth -- decision-making and things like that close to his chest. What other characteristics of his leadership style really struck you, though you had stepped off the administration at that point?

KREIDER: Yeah, I can't say that I really ever observed his administration closely.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: At that time I was on the Committee on Organization and Policy. I guess I was chair of it sometime. I don't know if I was chair of it at that time. And that's a committee that ultimately got involved in sitting down with the trustees when the trustees asked the question, "What's wrong?"

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: "What's wrong? Why does the faculty have this perception of President McLaughlin?" And so we, as that faculty committee selected a subcommittee to sit down and meet the trustees and talk about that . . .

DAILY: Okay. Were you on that subcommittee?

KREIDER: Yeah, I was.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And that was, you know, that was a discussion that took place over in, somewhere in the Hopkins Center. And David, of course, being on the board of trustees, was there. So we were supposed to talk to the trustees about what's wrong. Why does the faculty have the perception that they did? It was uncomfortable.

DAILY: I imagine so.

KREIDER: But David was, as he always is, I mean, was totally in control of his emotions and . . .

DAILY: So he was sitting right there?

KREIDER: He was right there.

DAILY: Okay. About... Would this have been like '85 or so, do you think?

KREIDER: Must have been around . . .

DAILY: Okay, because I'm not seeing mention of this meeting before.

KREIDER: He came in—when? '71? '70?

DAILY: He came in '81...

KREIDER: He came in '81.

DAILY: And then left in the fall of '87.

KREIDER: Seven?

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: That must have been around '85, yeah. So that's a meeting in which there was a lot of frank discussion about exactly the kinds of things that I was discussing here.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And the trustees listened and David listened and... That's what we were supposed to do. We were supposed to try to build up a picture of why the faculty had the view and attitude that they did.

DAILY: What were some other features of that picture? We talked about his losing credibility outside of the institution.

KREIDER: Well, with that comes not very much moral leadership within the institution as far as the faculty was concerned. I think there was not much confidence that... See, here's where, probably, opinion went beyond fact, because I don't think David... David was not known [inaudible]. I think David believed that the changes in the '70s were appropriate and he was part of making them.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: [chuckles] I think he thought they were appropriate and okay. He probably also subscribed to the point of view that a breather is appropriate because, "We need to back up and improve the quality of, and hone and fund these things." Not back off.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: I don't think he would have wanted that. I think his downfall, if you could call it that, was more personal overconfidence in his own understanding of it all, and overconfidence in his ability to represent that to other people.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: But I think the faculty, especially when they started getting the sort of feedback from their people they have to go and sit down with when they're trying to say, you know, "Will you fund my research?" and the conversation turns to, "Who is this guy?"

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And the word starts to come back that, you know, "He's doing things that just make our lives all the more difficult. And yet, we are required to do this. We are required to raise these funds. We're required to get these. Our promotions depend on it; our lives depend on it."

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: "The quality of our department depends on it and this is not making it any easier." And so then it was very easy to start to say, "Well, what would you expect from somebody who was just a CEO of Toro Corporation?"

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And I think he started to be dismissed.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Some of that was probably unfair.

DAILY: Okay. I'm going to try to press on specifics here a little bit, just because I'm thinking about somebody who would use this interview down the road. Are there certain grants that come to mind that you thought were lost because of...

KREIDER: I certainly don't know.

DAILY: Okay. All right.

KREIDER: I don't know.

DAILY: Okay. That's what I was trying to get at.

KREIDER: I think there was a perception that things were getting harder because some faculty members did run into having to, if you please, defend Dartmouth. They wanted to defend their research; they wanted to defend their work. They didn't want to defend Dartmouth when they were sitting, talking with the person who happens to be the person who is handling the piece of funds that they have to draw from...

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: At NSF.

DAILY: Okay. All right. The progression... What I see as the culmination of the faculty stirrings against David McLaughlin would have been the entire faculty meeting. I think this would have been February or

March of 1986, winter of '86 where there was a call for a vote of no confidence. Do you recall that?

KREIDER: No, I don't.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I remember that things got, went pretty far. [chuckles]

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: But I can't say that I specifically remember that.

DAILY: Okay, all right. We'll leave that aside then. I don't want to beat a dead horse here. [chuckles] Are there other incidents or events that you really see kind of causing the faculty to lose confidence in David's leadership beyond the things we've spoken about so far?

KREIDER: I guess I would have to say that the faculty probably never had confidence...

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Because I think the sort of instant reaction for people who didn't know David McLaughlin was that, "What a stupid thing for the trustees to go and just pick a CEO of a lawnmower company." [inaudible] put things in the weakest light if you possibly can.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And that doesn't come to grips at all with what he might have been as a man or the kind of things he might have done apart from being CEO of Toro. I think there was definitely an immediate perception that the trustees kind of wimped out here and just figured they're going to knock heads together, and put the place in order, and get these budgets under control and so on, and we're going to get a businessman in here. I think that was the perception.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And so anything that would happen of any kind that would feed that view would just make it even tougher.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I don't think people really sat down and said, "Well, you know, after all, he was an influential member of the board of trustees during the 1970s supporting all of these innovations and changes and growth and what have you." [chuckles] "This doesn't just look like a lawnmower CEO."

DAILY: Right, right.

KREIDER: But that wasn't the topic of conversation.

DAILY: That got lost.

KREIDER: So then, you know, as the years went by, I don't think... David was not really very visible somehow academically, except off campus. And that was . . .

DAILY: [chuckles] Okay.

KREIDER: That was sort of the ultimate sin.

DAILY: Okay, all right. What were his accomplishments under his presidency, or what would Dartmouth, what were Dartmouth's accomplishments under his presidency?

KREIDER: Well, I think Dartmouth continued its efforts to recruit minorities, both of faculty and students. And I think it continued with the year round operation, and I think it continued to work on issues of fraternities and student life. This doesn't look to me like backing off.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: It's just that there were not any, there were not any monumental sort of new initiatives.

DAILY: Okay, okay.

KREIDER: And any one of those things is a, has land mines in it.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: You start dealing with fraternities or what have you... You know, it's kind of, it's kind of almost as though there's a missing five years in there.

DAILY: Oh, really? Okay.

KREIDER: From the standpoint of, from the standpoint of, "What does Dartmouth stand for?" There was a missing five years. There was, I think, there was... You would like to... Well, I think of Freedman [James O. Freedman "Jim"] when he came in and he, I think, very deliberately set about to improve the image of Dartmouth College nationally. Now, that's exciting. I mean, that's got to be exciting for the people in an institution to know that there's somebody who's competent to do so and is going out there saying good things about you [chuckles].

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And convincing other people that Dartmouth is really a place to come to, to improve the quality of students who apply to Dartmouth, to try to get a bigger share of that top echelon of students. I think maybe, if I felt there was something most seriously wrong with David McLaughlin's administration, it's that there was sort of a gap...

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: That there wasn't really anyone speaking somehow on high levels to the potential of Dartmouth, the quality of Dartmouth, the advantages of Dartmouth, the opportunities here, etc.. You didn't hear it.

DAILY: Okay. You felt like James Freedman brought that back to Dartmouth?

KREIDER: I think the feeling was he did. He certainly tried to.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Yeah, and he was very much an intellectual.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And it's not surprising that the faculty would resonate to Freedman differently than David. I mean, David came out of a different world. And I think part of the problems that David ran into were sort of

unfortunate. I mean, it's kind of sad. They were not of his making. I think they were not things he wanted to happen.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: Freedman was a different animal.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: So David was sort of pinched in there between Kemeny and Freedman.

DAILY: Okay. Are there any other comments you want to make on either John Kemeny or David McLaughlin's presidency?

KREIDER: I probably have said as much about David McLaughlin's presidency as I can.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I've tried to... I've tried to speak to the issue of what was it that could account for the faculty's attitude." And I think we've hit that.

DAILY: I think that's... I'm glad you took that tack.

KREIDER: Right. Yeah, because on a personal level, I like David. [chuckles] I just saw him at Jean Kemeny's memorial service and he was affable.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: I mean, he's a competent man. In a position... In the right kind of position...

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: John Kemeny's? We've probably said quite a lot about John. I said, I know the last time, last April, I talked about some of the things which contributed to attitudes about John. And I don't know if those were things that were lost or not lost.

DAILY: Yeah, I think those were actually some of the pieces that were lost. If there's things you want to bring back to that discussion...

KREIDER: Well, I think it's sort of in line with why attitudes about David... I think why certain attitudes about Kemeny, and I remember specifically mentioning that his penchant for analyzing problems in advance, figuring out his options, deciding where he'll give and where he won't give and he would do this for every [inaudible].

If somebody wanted, if a member of the faculty wanted to come and talk to John about something that was like academic apple pie, how could he possibly disagree with me, etc. And they would come in and make their argument but they hadn't done their homework to the same extent that John had. They hadn't thought about the consequences. They didn't have the answers to all questions, and John had thought about it and he would come back with these questions, and [they] couldn't answer these questions.

And a faculty member would go away feeling that he was somewhat disrespectful of their proposal. And the point of view was he was not really taking them seriously and was "arrogant." [chuckles] I think some people felt sometimes that he was arrogant.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: He was not. He was just... He had just thought out the problem in advance and the people who were making the proposal had not done their homework.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: John had a little bit of impatience with stupidity. I think as president he... That didn't come out as much as when he was just department chair. He did not have patience with someone who was either unprepared or just plain stupid [chuckles] in making a presentation. He had a hard time with that.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: But underneath he was, he was extremely loyal to the people who worked for him.

[End of Tape 4, Side A – Beginning of Tape 4, Side B]

KREIDER: ...might take, you know, the responsibility of the matters.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: So he... John had some rocky times too. I think he felt... He found it difficult to step out of the faculty where he was a spokesman. He introduced, I think, the arguments for the so-called term system at Dartmouth, you know, and he had very pragmatic arguments in mind when he argued those things before the faculty. He was very much interested in advanced placement programs, mathematics and the semester system itself significantly reduced the opportunities for a department to build advanced placement and honors programs. He felt that having the smaller chunks...

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: ... the terms rather than semesters gave a lot more flexibility. And it did. The mathematics department really built on that, as did all the sciences.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Humanists didn't like it. And I think, if there was suspicion of John Kemeny, it was from the humanists mainly who felt that he was too scientific or too analytical, not humanistic enough.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And they never, at least... A lot of them don't like the term system because they say that it takes more than 10 weeks for -- or nine weeks for -- good ideas to germinate.

DAILY: Right, right.

KREIDER: And the biologists, who say it takes more than nine weeks to grow mold, if you want to study it. [chuckles] But he made those kind of arguments. So he was very influential in the faculty. When he became president, he said he felt he could no longer play that role. He missed that.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: But I think he expected to miss it. He expected that he wouldn't be able to do that.

DAILY: Okay. If it's ok, I want to shift the conversation a little bit here to teaching mathematics, your own experience with it at Dartmouth, specifically how... We talked a little bit about how the students had changed. But really, we can continue that... But how it had changed in the 30 or so years that you taught, and how you tried to make it applicable to a broad range of liberal arts students. So let me start with the first question. What were the changes, if any, that you saw in the 30-plus years that you were at Dartmouth, or not quite 30 years, excuse me.

KREIDER: Well, let's see. When I came to Dartmouth there were no Ph.D. programs. And they had their proposal in the works. For my first couple of years we went through the arguments of trying to get approval for a doctoral program in mathematics.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: John Kemeny was interested in not just having another Ph.D. program, but he wanted a special Ph.D. program. He wanted a doctoral program in which exposition of mathematics would be a legitimate subject for a thesis of a student. So he was always interested in exposition and in teaching, as well as research. I think he was aware that a quality expository thesis is basically harder to write than a traditional research thesis where you get a problem from your thesis advisor. And you do a certain amount of work on it until your thesis advisor says, "Oh, you have enough results now." And then you write that up and then suddenly you're famous and you have a Ph.D. The other one is a whole different matter. Anyway, he made those arguments.

But the whole atmosphere in the science division where we sat in the science division and made these arguments, and then the faculty basically was that Dartmouth was a small, liberal arts college, and why are we going to muck it up by bringing in graduate students? All that means is you'll pay attention to your graduate students; you won't pay attention to your undergraduate students, and so forth.

Thirty years later it's a very different picture. I think Dartmouth still has retained, by virtue of the faculty's strategy, the number of graduate students isn't supposed to be more than one quarter the number of undergraduates.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I think that was sort of a thing that came up back then. But that issue was a big change and I think in all the departments, mathematics departments that I've observed around the country, every one of them that started off as a "quality undergraduate liberal arts institution" and who then said, "Well, we're going to have a different kind of graduate program and we're going to not allow it to change our way of thinking about the undergraduate programs," I think they have all failed.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: That the... What is inevitable is that it's easier to involve graduate students in your research than it is to involve undergraduates and, it's just easier. And the undergraduates are less able to sort of carry their weight in a research team or what have you. In mathematics the general feeling is that undergraduates are just not far enough along in mathematics to be anything like research partners for faculty. Mathematics is different from some other disciplines in that regard and, to a certain extent, that's true. However, in the United States there are a number of institutions who do not have graduate programs. They do remarkable things with their undergraduates.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: They do... The faculty actively devote themselves to exciting research among the undergraduate students. And Dartmouth doesn't do that.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I've seen institutions that did do that and then once they have graduate students, they stop doing that.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: So I think there's been a... The big shift I see is, "How does the mathematics department faculty relate to their undergraduate students, their mathematics majors?" I think they still take them seriously. I think they still want quality. They still like their honors and advanced placement students. I don't think, however, that they do very much to cause those students to grow beyond the undergraduates.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I think they... We teach our courses and the students take our courses and they learn mathematics. And that's not what happens at Williams.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: It's not what happens at Carleton.

DAILY: Where they're involved in the research?

KREIDER: Yeah.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Faculty that are intimately involved with their undergraduate students and the undergraduate students produce remarkably good stuff. Now, there have been good things that come out of some of our undergraduates. But that's better explained by saying those were remarkable students [chuckles] than that there was a remarkable lifting of those students.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: They were just plain good students.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And the numbers of them are small.

DAILY: Mm-hmm, okay.

KREIDER: So I think there was a time when the department felt like one department when you were talking about issues of undergraduate curriculum and education and so forth. And all the way through the '70s I think it felt that way.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And then it started to feel different. I mean, it started... There started to be a sort of research wing, which for people that, in a certain sense frankly, don't like to teach undergraduates; they do it

because it's part of your job. But they don't have the passion for it that I think was present, sort of in a manner of the department of philosophy back in the '50s and '60s.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And that's partly, I think, just the nature of the world. Dartmouth, as it saw itself more and more as a research institution on the map of the national institutions, and where deans applied more and more incentive and/or pressure to have research be the basis on which people get promoted more than anything else; where for budget reasons, to fund your faculty, you want faculty, in fact, to go and get research grants. These things all had their effect.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And I think the Dartmouth of the '90s was a different place [chuckles] than the Dartmouth of the '60s.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And maybe that was just inevitable.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I found that kind of sad.

DAILY: Right. Let's stay on this thread for a minute with the whole issue of graduate education. When you left Dartmouth, what avenues... When you stepped off the active faculty (I should put it that way) , when you left Dartmouth, what areas of graduate education did you feel could grow or be improved upon at Dartmouth? And what needed to stay the same to retain that balance you spoke earlier about, and that precarious perching of being on the fence between teaching and research?

KREIDER: I'm not sure that I felt that there was anything which needed to grow at that point. I sort of had conceded the fact that it was a *fait accompli* and that...

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: In some sense, other science departments I believe can more easily involve undergraduates in research efforts than mathematics

can. You can bring in freshmen, who are just taking their very first foundational courses and have them work in, you know, a team of people with faculty members, with graduate students and with undergraduates. As a freshman, you may just be a gopher. [chuckles]

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: You may just help keep the equipment in order, etc. As a sophomore, you're beginning to put in some of your own innovations. As a junior, you're actually beginning to perhaps contribute to some of this statistical data gathering and analysis. And, as a senior, perhaps you're almost indistinguishable from the beginning graduate students. And opportunities for real initiation of undergraduates into research seems to me more apparent. I don't see how to carry out that model in mathematics. What's the equivalent of, you know, washing laboratory equipment?

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: He's gathering data, analyzing data, what have you. And mathematics just doesn't seem to be there. So I think it's harder.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And so I'm not sure that... I think in mathematics the key thing is to try to get quality graduate students. For many, many years it was sort of commonly said in the department that our own undergraduates are just, you know, fundamentally brighter and better students [chuckles] than any graduate students that we can get.

DAILY: Oh, really?

KREIDER: You know, we are not a big institution. We do not have... We are not a powerhouse in terms of our recognition. If you want to get the top echelon of graduate students, they're going to go to Berkeley, go to Harvard and MIT and other major institutions. And so that could be an argument in, "Why do you have a graduate program?" [chuckles] And yet, mathematicians feel it's terribly important to have graduate students. A faculty member likes to be a mentor.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And so a graduate student is someone that they can mentor.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Now, institutions that don't have graduate programs say the same things about their undergraduates. And I think Dartmouth, back before we had a graduate program, or when the graduate program was still in its infancy said that too.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: They would say that, "Well, the unfortunate fact is that, you know, we can't get graduate students that are as good as our undergraduates."

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: "So why get them?" [laughter]

DAILY: Speaking about the computer science program with another person in the context of the oral history project, it amazed me how much undergraduates were involved in some of the real foundational, important computing things that happened at Dartmouth in the '60s. I'm having a harder time picturing that happening now, you know, in the '90s and on into the 21st century here. So that kind of helps me to understand that. I was really kind of blown away by that as I learned that.

KREIDER: Yeah. You see, I think computer science is more like other science departments in its opportunities for involving undergraduates. Undergraduates, you know, if they really want to be involved, can go and talk to Danielle [Daniela Rus] about her robotics laboratory. And she's been wonderfully nationally recognized just recently for her work.

DAILY: Who's this?

KREIDER: Danielle, let's see. She got married. I forget what her last name is.

DAILY: We can come back. I'll figure that out.

KREIDER: Anyway, yeah, she's the robotics person and is really top drawer.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Just wonderfully recognized with an enormous grant to fund her research, sort of an open-ended grant that says, “Here’s money. Now, do your work.”

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And, you know, she has a robotics lab where you can actually take an interested freshman or sophomore who’s bright. And it’s something for them to do. And in that position they’ll grow and they’ll learn from the upper class people. They’ll learn from the graduate students; they’ll learn from the faculty who are around. Yeah, I think there’s a vitality over in computer science that probably exceeds the vitality of mathematics. [chuckles]

DAILY: Okay. Another question was, how do you interest undergraduates in mathematics and how do you, as a teacher, help them apply it beyond the classroom, beyond preparing... [phone rings] [tape turned off/on]

Okay, we’re back on. I was asking about how you involve or interest undergraduates in math who aren’t math majors, who may have been pre-med students, and how you get them to understand that it has, that math has applicability beyond the next test and the final grade for the calculus course or whatever? What was your experience?

KREIDER: Let’s see. I had two experiences -- positive and negative. [chuckles] You’re asking about the positive ones. With regard to answering the student’s question about the relevance in mathematics in the world, I think the students today do need to see specific connections between real-world problems and the mathematics that they’re studying. They are not content just to study a logical body of knowledge, which we might call calculus, which we know as mathematicians is one of the most beautiful edifices constructed by the human mind [chuckles] ever, its gorgeous history, gorgeous tradition intimately connected with philosophy. Students don’t see that at all.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And so they want to know, “What’s this for?” They want to know, “What do I do with this?” And mathematicians tend to chafe at that question. It should be obvious that this is the most important and

beautiful thing ever. Why do you ask that question? But students want to see that. So I think you have to explicitly introduce problems that the students recognize as important real-world problems. And then you have to take the time to ask, "What kind of mathematics do we need to have in order to analyze this kind of problem?" And then you need to develop that mathematics for them and then you have to carry it back and say, "Ah, now that we have this mathematics, look what we can do with that original problem." I think that circle is terribly important. And that certainly was what was behind that project in calculus that Dwight Lahr is heading up and I've been involved in.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And we've had fits and starts in that program. Sometimes we go overboard and lay too much work on the students and they eventually rebel, and come back and say, "You're just putting unrelated extra burdens on us and we just want to learn mathematics."

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: But if you just teach them the mathematics, then they come back and ask the question again, "What's this mathematics good for?" So it has to be done with a certain amount of reality as to what's the proper workload and to identify problems that the students really agree are real-world problems.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: When you hit on one of those problems, they light up.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And they understand why parts of calculus are important and they enjoy that. And then they become even willing to consider the questions which are purely mathematical questions about the internal consistency of these things and the proof of this or that theorem. But they're not prepared to do that independently of, beginning, I think, with some question.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Now, what I've said I think applies to most students. There are some students for whom any mention of an application, just as to a mathematician, is sort of viewed as irrelevant. They say, "I just like mathematics."

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: "When I was in high school, I liked plane geometry. I loved proving theorems."

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: That's not a majority view. And those students can be equally turned off by, so-called real world problems. If you try to be too cautious, they say, "Why don't we just get to work and learn mathematics because I like mathematics." And there are students who just like mathematics, which is why you have honors programs.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: So I think what we're trying to do in the so-called regular courses is, the calculus courses, is correct. But then there are other students who need to be fed in a different way. I think that students can really light up if you then give them a problem to investigate and you don't say, you know, "You're not far enough along mathematically to really do anything worthwhile, so we're not going to give you anything to do."

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: "We're just going to give you routine textbook problems."

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: You give them a significant project that sort of mimics what you've been doing in the course in terms of identifying some real-world problem, developing some mathematics that's relevant to it, applying the mathematics to it, and then interpreting the mathematical results back in the language of the original problem. That circle, once again, is important and students actually can do things like that if you pick the problem carefully. And when you do, they love it. I think it gives them a taste of doing something with mathematics.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: That comes about as close as you can in mathematics, I think, to what can happen when you involve a freshman as, in a lab team, let's say, in chemistry.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: You give them something to do, something that's relevant and they see it's actually part of an end resolve.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: They enjoy that and they learn from it. So I think it is possible in mathematics but it's a heck of a lot more work than the traditional way of teaching the courses.

DAILY: Right, right.

KREIDER: So that's a constant debate in the department. Most people would not agree to teach a freshman calculus course taught that way.

DAILY: Oh, really?

KREIDER: That's right.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: It's too much work.

DAILY: They just want to teach math as math, basically.

KREIDER: Yeah, you teach math as math. And, you know, it is a beautiful subject.

DAILY: Yeah. [chuckles]

KREIDER: So I think your question was sort of, you know, how do you interest students? I think that's the, that really is the fundamental thing for the majority of students.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: Anyway, that's sort of the good news. I think the bad news was my perception in the last decade. Maybe this was because I was just approaching retirement years and it was time for me to retire [laughs], like it or not. My perception was that in a freshman calculus class you can divide it into three equal parts. There's one part, which is students who are bright and obedient, and they will do anything you ask them to do. They do it well; they'll get good marks. They'll do all that sort of stuff. If you ask them, "Did you like this project that just had you doing this?" "Well, not especially, but if you tell me to do it, I'll do it."

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And they do it. They do it well. And in a certain sense, that third of the class is one that I think you have very little impact as a teacher. What is it that you gave them that they didn't have themselves? It's hard to say.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: That's my cynical view.

Then there is a third of the class, which I always, usually describe as the middle, which doesn't really want to be taking this course. They just have to have it because you have to have it for general chemistry; you have to have general chemistry to go to medical school. The last thing in the world they want you to do is to try to be interesting. The last thing in the world they want you to do is to give them something extra to do. They were successful students in high school because they learned how to read a book and solve mundane questions, problems. And they'll do that. And if you try to ask them to think, heaven forbid. They openly rebel.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: "Don't make me think. Just give me a problem and when you give me the problem just tell me what to do."

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And they don't particularly want to be there and they... Those are the ones you kind of despair that, as a teacher, you can have very little influence over them because their motivation is not one to learn your subject but to somehow get around your subject.

And then there's a third of the class that are honestly scared of math. They never felt they were competent to do math. They're afraid of it. They don't end up being your top students. They, on the other hand, they honestly enjoy success if somehow you do something that enables them to be successful. And that third, that group of students is one where you can have an enormous impact on their education. They fundamentally want the subject; they fundamentally think that they can't do it.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: They're not convinced they can do it. They've been told they can't do it. A lot of women students traditionally have been in that group.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: It's no longer the case, I think. Some of the women students are among the best students.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: But there was the case that there was the so-called gender gap of confidence because women had been told that, you know, science and mathematics are really not for young women. But this group of students is the apprehensive ones. And those are, frankly, the ones I enjoy most teaching.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: So you can reach out to them and encourage them. They're willing to be encouraged. You know, they don't view you as trying to lay some work on them that they didn't want to do. So, if only somehow you could get those students all by themselves without the noise created by the middle third [chuckles], life would be nicer.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: That's my cynical view. But I think all students respond to challenge and attention and taking them seriously as a human being, you're expressing confidence in them and so on. Even the most recalcitrant student, if you talk to them on a one-to-one basis, usually ends up being different.

DAILY: Right. Are there other aspects of your career at Dartmouth that you want to bring up today, things that you thought about maybe between April and February here?

KREIDER: Other aspects of my career at Dartmouth?

DAILY: Right, your time at Dartmouth.

KREIDER: Well, I think... I felt very fortunate while I was at Dartmouth to have good advice and encouragement from people that, you know, I was responsible to: the deans, in supporting activities which were not part of your direct Dartmouth responsibility, which had to do with mathematics or with mathematics education in the world, or your mathematics professional society, so on, and never found people to take the point of view that, you know, it's not your business to be spending any time on that. So in the '60s I became involved in the African education program. And in the '70s through the '90s I became involved with the Mathematical Association in various capacities, which took me away from the campus frequently.

[End of Tape 4, Side B – Beginning of Tape 5, Side A]

DAILY: Okay, we're back on.

KREIDER: I feel like I had, I was given an opportunity to have more influence in national educational matters and scenes and policies than if I were, had been constrained to keep my nose to the grindstone, if you will, locally, and I very much appreciate that. I think at many other institutions that would not have been an option. So I think some of the more interesting aspects of my career were... I was involved in things which I think Dartmouth took some pride in, the fact that I was doing and supported...

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: ... but that were not directly related to my meeting students in the classroom or writing another research paper.

DAILY: Okay. What were some of those accomplishments you mentioned that Dartmouth was proud of and some of the things you were involved in?

KREIDER: Well, I think people like Leonard Rieser were aware of, you know, some of the details of these. But I was very active with the College

Board for a number of years. I was part of their advanced placement program and was chair of their Advanced Placement Committee. I had an opportunity to rewrite specifications for those exams, many of which were almost models of our programs that had been instituted here at Dartmouth, our advanced placement programs and so on that Kemeny had been instrumental in.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: And, to a certain extent, many of those got [chuckles] almost encoded because [William] Bill Slesnick had been an active member of the advanced placement program for some years and influenced the specifications. I was active for a number of years and was chair of that program. Then there was a College Board formed, the College Board Advisory Committee to oversee a whole set of exams, including SATs. There was college level entry programs, the CLEP programs. And so I was able to be involved as chair of that program with some of the efforts to revise the SAT exams and introduce some new, different kinds of exams.

When the College Board was considering the question of whether to introduce an advanced placement program in computer science, they asked me to chair a special study group that took on that issue. And we worked for a couple of years and came up with recommendations, which were the opposite of what the College Board thought they wanted to do initially.

DAILY: Oh, really?

KREIDER: They thought, they did not feel it was cost effective to introduce an advanced placement program in computer science. But our recommendation came around the other way and, in fact, took place and they did, in fact, introduce that program. It's now very successful and very influential in terms of helping to standardize what you would call your introductory computer science course in colleges across the United States.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: Because that's what happens when you define that kind of program. That influences the curriculum in essentially every college in the country.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: That was interesting because I was not a computer scientist. [laughs]

DAILY: Right, right.

KREIDER: A mathematician. But my colleague, Steve Garland [Stephen J. Garland '63], who was at Dartmouth then, is at MIT now, became involved -- I believe he was the first -- when they introduced the program, they had to appoint their advanced placement committee. Now, this should be computer scientists because they had to now develop the specifications for the exam, they had to write the exams, get the whole program started. They had many questions to consider. What language should they use? What computer language, etc..

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: But that has enormous impact. When the advanced placement program decided to start off with Pascal rather than Basic, that was basically Steve Garland's work. He, coming out of Dartmouth, he might have thought, "Well, maybe it should be Basic."

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: But no. Computer scientists would never have agreed to that.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: But Pascal it was and then subsequently, when this had to turn to C++ from Pascal. Again, these were enormous decisions because it means that you have to provide facilities for educating all the departments around the country to make the conversion from one to another and this means educating the teachers who are teaching in those programs, many of whom are not computer scientists.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: So I spent actually quite a lot of time in those issues of the College Board. In the Mathematical Association, I was initially involved as a governor and member of their Finance Committee and then their Executive Committee. So I was involved with those positions from the mid-'70s until the late '90s.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: I sort of took my becoming president as the final time to say, “This is now the culmination of all this.”

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: And that came at the same time that I retired.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: But there were opportunities to do within the Mathematical Association many of the same kind of things we had done at Dartmouth with regard to issues of affirmative action, encouragement of women and minorities, as well as all the other things we do. We published journals and so forth.

DAILY: Yeah.

KREIDER: That was sort of a second strand of things. Again, the... Back to the College Board, I was -- in the ‘60s and ‘70s -- very much involved in a number of their committees to review the undergraduate curriculum. MAA has published guidelines for colleges.

DAILY: Okay.

KREIDER: You know, what should a math major look like? And so it was kind of fun being on the inside of many of those decision-making groups which had influence on mathematics and the way it’s taught, undergraduate curriculum way beyond what you could do by keeping your nose to the grindstone per se at Dartmouth.

DAILY: Right.

KREIDER: And those things don’t come without a cost.

DAILY: No.

KREIDER: So you don’t put that kind of time into those and write the same number of research papers. But I have always felt that I had that opportunity at Dartmouth and so I feel satisfied about that aspect of my career.

DAILY: Anything else you'd like to speak about today in terms of this interview? [laughter]

KREIDER: Well, this has been an interesting process. I will be interested in seeing how you bring this to a conclusion while you're still involved in it [laughter] at Dartmouth.

DAILY: All right. Well, I thank you for the interview.

KREIDER: Okay.

DAILY: I've enjoyed both sessions. This has been good.

KREIDER: It's been a lot of fun. It's that... It's kind of fun to go back and start to recollect things which you have literally forgotten. And I think you're very good as an interviewer. I think the process of interviewing often wakes up memories that you were not aware were still there.

DAILY: Good, good. Thank you.

End of Interview