

Maureen and Mike

# Mansfield Library

UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA

## **Archives and Special Collections**

Mansfield Library, University of Montana

Missoula MT 59812-9936

Email: [library.archives@umontana.edu](mailto:library.archives@umontana.edu)

Telephone: (406) 243-2053

This transcript represents the nearly verbatim record of an unrehearsed interview. Please bear in mind that you are reading the spoken word rather than the written word.

**Oral History Number: 408-007**  
**Interviewee: Howard Reinhardt**  
**Interviewer: David Brooks**  
**Date of Interview: July 3, 2006**  
**Project: University of Montana Oral History Project**

David Brooks: All right, it's July 3, 2006, and I'm David Brooks, the interviewer for the University of Montana's Oral History Project. This morning I'm talking with Howard Reinhardt. Mr. Reinhardt, I was hoping that you could start out by just telling me a little of your personal and educational background that brought you to Missoula and The University of Montana.

Howard Reinhardt: I grew up in Lewiston, Idaho. Did an undergraduate degree at the University of Idaho. Became a math major because I could graduate six months earlier than I could if I was a chemistry major. I then went to Washington State College, as it was then—later it was Washington State University—and took a master's degree there. Took a job with General Electric at the Hanford Project. Worked there as a statistician for a year. Was called back on a one-year instructorship at Washington State University and there was encouraged to pursue a Ph.D. I went to the University of Michigan for my Ph.D., was there from '53 to '57 and came to The University of Montana in the fall of '57. I completed my Ph.D. in the spring of '59 so I came here with a wife and a child and no dissertation. So that's how I came to The University of Montana. I was recruited here by a man name Don Higman, who was a professor at The University of Montana on leave at the University of Michigan and he recruited me for The University of Montana. As I said, I grew up in Idaho and knew I wanted to come back here to the West.

DB: What was your Ph.D. studies?

HR: I was a statistician. My Ph.D. dissertation was called "The Use of Least Favorable Distributions in Testing Composite Hypotheses."

DB: Got it.

HR: Not an earth-shaking document. In fact, all I proved was a technique people were using. Did not have any generalizations at all.

DB: So before getting to UM you had been over in Idaho, over in Washington, Michigan, as well as working for GE, so in the private sector. Talk a little bit about what The University of Montana was like when you got here. You were a Westerner so it probably wasn't that odd for you to be in Missoula.

HR: No, it was not that odd to be in Missoula. There was a student body of under 3,000. I think there were nine people in the Mathematics Department. I was taken in immediately by the department, by the chairman of the department, a wonderful man named Ted Ostrom. I drove

into town—I left my wife and baby in Ann Arbor, they were to fly out later—I came to town, checked into a motel, called Ted Ostrom and he and his wife said, “How dare you stay in a motel! You come and stay with us.” They immediately made us feel at home and then after my wife came, a man named Joe Hashisaki in the Math Department also took us in and were great friends.

The department was—people were all very friendly. It was a very collegial atmosphere. I was surprised to learn when I came here that the University had also hired a man named Bill Ballard, who did his career here. Bill had been my professor at Washington State and he too knew that he wanted to come West when he finished his Ph.D. We both chose The University of Montana and have been very good friends ever since.

DB: So I’ve heard that before, things were very collegial, as you said, at the university at the time and that was late ’50s? ’59?

HR: No, ’57.

DB: ’57, right. You finished your Ph.D. in ’59.

HR: Right.

DB: What are some of the things that faculty did together that make you say that it was very collegial, besides just being friends around the department?

HR: Oh, there was a house that the university owned that had been a residence, across from where the Lodge is now, close to where the Grizzly circle is. That was available to us as a faculty house. We could go there in the middle of the morning and make our own coffee and sit around and talk, so we came to know people across the campus. There was a very small faculty union at that time and through that faculty union I got to know Edmund Freeman and Marvin, some of those marvelous old names. The campus was small enough that you knew people outside your department. The Physics Department was in the same building as the Math Department. Rulon Jeppeson was chairman of Physics and also often chairman of the faculty. We didn’t have a Faculty Senate then, we had a faculty with a chairman. So I got to know those physicists.

DB: So this was more than just the Math Department?

HR: Oh, much more than just the Math Department. And then I think there was a newcomers group. Yes, there was a newcomers group and so we met periodically. The president’s wife at that time and the wife of the dean of faculty, Mrs. [Patricia] McFarland and Mrs. [Alice] Chatland, visited all the new wives, came unannounced in hats, of a morning, and that was something of a shock to the new faculty wives. There is a story, I don’t know whether it’s true but I think it is, of a woman, a faculty wife, had a baby and decided she wanted to climb a tree.

So she left the baby in the house and climbed the tree in the backyard and here came Mrs. Chatland and Mrs. McFarland. So the woman stayed in the tree until they went home.

DB: Didn't answer the door?

HR: No, she couldn't answer the door she was in the tree!

DB: Right, right. So that sort of congeniality, it wasn't just accidental or by force of people's personality—to some degree it was being cultivated?

HR: Oh yes.

DB: Through having a faculty house and the actions of the president and his wife.

HR: And the newcomers group.

DB: The newcomers group. And how about President McFarland—was he part of that faculty congeniality? And was it just faculty or did it include administration?

HR: No, it was really just the faculty. Well, most of the administration did some teaching. Dean Chatland, who was dean of faculty, his job is now split a hundred different ways, I think. But he taught astronomy and flight mathematics in the Mathematics Department and would come to the department an hour before his class and hold court, b.s. with the troops. So he was part of that. I did not know President McFarland.

DB: Did he have much of a presence with the faculty?

HR: Oh, not with me. He was, as you must know, a very controversial figure on campus. Professor Hashisaki, who I mentioned before, was special assistant to Dr. Chatland, so I came to have a very favorable impression of President McFarland.

DB: So, you say you have a favorable impression of him but you also mention that he had a controversial time here. What are some of the things that you recollect that were part of that controversial place he held?

HR: Oh, I think nothing particular comes to mind. No, I don't know why he was so controversial.

DB: How about student and faculty relationships, both in your department and what you saw on campus?

HR: Well, we were very fortunate when I came here at the number of mathematics majors that we had and how good they were. The most notable of those was Jack Silver, who was a 15-year-old undergraduate. Went on to do a Ph.D. at Berkeley and has been on the faculty at

Berkeley practically ever since. A world-class logician. But a number of those really bright people went on to get Ph.D.'s. Three of them came back to teach at The University of Montana: George McRae and Merle Manis and Keith Yale. They wanted to live in Missoula. Went off to get a Ph.D. and came back about as soon as they could.

DB: What was the draw in the Math Department here, in terms of specialties, areas of strength, that would bring a world-class 15-year-old mathematician, as well as other students who went on to Ph.D.'s and successful careers?

HR: I think at that time, at least when I was an undergraduate 15 years before that, people went to the university to go to the university. They usually went to the state university. Jack Silver was a Missoula boy; Merle Manis was from Charlo; George McRae was from Jordan; Keith Yale was from Livingston. They had a choice, they can go to Bozeman or they can come to The University of Montana. Just didn't think about applying out of state and would come. I think it was a very good thing that they came without the notion of a major. That was the case with me. I told you I chose between chemistry and mathematics on the basis of not a very good reason. So I get very discouraged these days when I look at the *Missoulian* with the stories about the high school seniors and what they're going to do. Well, what they're going to do is go to School X and study business administration with a specialty in overseas accounting. Well, 18-year-old kids have no business making those kinds of decisions. My own notion is you go to university, you get a liberal education, and then you decide what you're going to do with your life. That's what those young fellows were doing. In the course of doing general education they would take a mathematics course, find that there was really a very good faculty in the Mathematics Department—the classes were small and they took good care of the students—and they decided that they—well, they were bright people and they would do well at mathematics so decided to become mathematicians.

DB: And was the school at the time providing exactly that, a very liberal education for most of its students? Was that its mission, would you say?

HR: That's what I would say, yes. Even the professional schools. Forestry was a very strong professional school, but they did require their students to take courses in arts and sciences and they took standard botany and a whole raft of general education courses. I don't remember...I don't think the Business School was very big. School of Education wasn't very big. Pharmacy and Journalism were very small.

DB: And of course those have all grown, as has the Math Department.

HR: As has the Math Department. There was a good School of Fine Arts. Again, the people from the state who had some talent, they don't go off to conservatory, they come to the university.

DB: So you were hired before you had finished your dissertation as a young professor. There were certainly older faculty there, but you eventually became the chair of the Math

Department. Talk a little bit about your career and moving from young faculty to the chair of the department, a department you've described as very capable.

HR: Well, what happened was Ted Ostrom, who was the chairman of the department—I'll tell you a story about Ted Ostrom. When I was hired, I was hired sight unseen. Often the hiring was done without an interview. Ted Ostrom—there was not a departmental secretary so he typed his own letters, and he said, "Well, we might have you teach the elementary statistics course. We might have you develop a statistics course for the Biological Sciences," and we might do this, we might do that. He signed it across the bottom. He had written by hand: "This is a mighty letter." So we were charmed by Ted before we ever came.

Ted—I don't know how much of this was associated with McFarland leaving. A lot of hard feelings when McFarland left. Joe Hashisaki did leave, Hal Chatland did leave, and that was because they were McFarland's right hand men. Ted Ostrom left about that same time for Washington State and I think he was called there. He's had a very distinguished career there in geometry. Some of the other people left. It was very much a buyer's market in mathematics in those days. There was a very good number theorist who went to Boulder. A couple of the other people left. So all of a sudden I was one of the senior members in the department. The university hired a professor from the University of Washington, Art Livingston, who came to be interviewed for a position in the department and he was being interviewed by the president and the president offered him the chairmanship. He said, "Well, I've come to be interviewed for a professorship. I will have to check with the department." So he consulted with us. We were all quite young, the ones of us who were left, and we said we'd be happy with him as chairman. So he came and served as chairman for several years. Then he left. [Arts and Sciences] Dean [Robert] Coonrod wrote a memo saying that the department was run by a cartel of middle-aged professors. I didn't think of myself as a middle-aged professor, but I was supposedly part of that cartel.

DB: So you didn't disagree with the cartel part, just the middle-aged part?

HR: Well, I disagreed with the cartel part too.

DB: Why would he have said such a thing?

HR: Who knows. You'll have to interview him. As it was a buyer's market, we hired the people we could. We actually hired some very good people. One of the good hires we made was Gloria Hewitt, I think the first black Ph.D. from the University of Washington. She came here and we hired her because she was a good mathematician. She liked that very much. So we had a good department. In the nature of things with this cartel, we took turns.

DB: Took turns at the chair?

HR: Uh huh. Bill Myers was chair for three years and I was chair for three years. I think Bill Ballard was the next chair for three years. The department was run very democratically. We'd have department meetings, everyone with a vote, and the chair took care of the paperwork.

DB: So you weren't necessarily guided by the chair as much as just coordinated?

HR: That's right. There were some chairs around the campus I think acted as heads. I'd make a distinction between a head of a department and a chair of a department. We definitely were not heads of the department, we were the chairs. The whole working group deciding what wanted to be done and then it was up to the chair to represent to the dean or the academic vice president.

DB: And what were the issues at the department? What were you deciding on? What were important things?

HR: Oh, undergraduate education was always important. There were some difficult promotion cases that we had to deal with. I think every department will find occasionally that it's hired somebody that just doesn't fit in and you have to face up to those issues. The university at that time—this would be about the late '60s I guess—was starting Ph.D. programs. There was a Ph.D. in geology. Psychology must have been one of the first ones to start. History started one early on then. Chemistry may have had one. Physics absolutely refused to have one. There was pressure on the Math Department to have one. Bozeman was initiating a Ph.D. in mathematics. We decided that there was a niche for training people who has Ph.D.'s who would become college teachers. We had in those intervening years a lot of N.S.F. money to train high school teachers, give them master's of arts in teaching mathematics. We had some success at that and I hired Bob McKelvey from the University of Colorado, who was also interested in those non-traditional kinds of Ph.D.'s. People, give them a broad training, get them to write a good, solid thesis but with the expectation that they would become college teachers.

DB: As opposed to researchers?

HR: Right. And so Bob came and we put together a grant proposal to the National Science Foundation. Bob and I agree that we wouldn't have gotten that money if he hadn't been the contact with NSF and if I hadn't have been the contact on campus. There was a good deal of resistance on the campus. There's the Math Department just giving a Ph.D. for master's level work. It wasn't that. It was good, solid scholarship.

DB: And who was the resistance from for doing that? It seems like a lot of the departments on campus were encouraged to get Ph.D.'s at the time.

HR: Yeah, a lot of the departments were encouraged to get Ph.D.'s at the time without all the necessary resources. As you may know, history put its Ph.D. in mothballs for many, many years just because they felt the research resources just weren't there. Our grant called for four new

faculty members, I think, with the University committed to picking up the money when the NSF money ran out. Well, it's always been hard to get teaching lines in this university. So if there's the Mathematics Department going to get four new lines, that's going to raise a lot of eyebrows.

DB: And who was raising those eyebrows?

HR: Oh, everybody.

DB: Everybody who wasn't getting new lines?

HR: No, of course there was a lot of encouragement of us. If there hadn't been encouragement on campus we couldn't have done it. But those kinds of small disagreements—you have to disagree about something—they go away.

DB: What year was that that the Math Department got a Ph.D.?

HR: Well, you shouldn't have asked me that because I didn't look it up!

DB: Approximately? Are we up to the mid-'60 by now?

HR: Oh we're in the late '60s, maybe '70.

DB: And how was the Math Department in terms of growth at that point? I mean, that's a—I've talked with other people about the Vietnam War and losing students to that and just the dynamics of—you know, there was a time in the university right about then when growth was really stagnant.

HR: Oh, yes. In fact, that was one of the problems in the Mathematics Department. We didn't go into it with total enthusiasm either because it was clearly going to take resources away from undergraduate education and put it into graduate education. We were very proud of what we were doing with undergraduates and I don't know what the number of math majors is now but it's not high. We recruited graduate students. When you have graduate students, the nature of undergraduate education changes because you have teaching assistants teaching the undergraduates, rather than full professors. I remember Ted Ostrom talking to some student who had come in and complained. He said, "You don't know how lucky you are to be taking remedial mathematics from a full professor." And that's right.

DB: So that changed. There were more T.A.'s.

HR: More T.A.'s, yes. That's, I think, continued to change since I left the department. I think there are a lot more adjuncts and the Ph.D.'s are doing research and teaching upper-division and graduate full courses. It's kind of what happens.



DB: And that was happening campus-wide as those Ph.D.'s came in?

HR: Yes.

DB: So you eventually became dean of Arts and Sciences. Talk about your transition from a very democratic Mathematics Department where just almost by default everybody got the chair for three years, it was a rotating chair it sounds like, to becoming the dean. That certainly wasn't a rotating position.

HR: That was not a rotating position. I had a number of people across campus. By then I had been chair of the Faculty Senate twice and I had been president of the teacher's union and had been involved in lobbying the legislature. Before I became dean I was lobbying the legislature. We got big faculty raises. The buzzword was 12 and 12. It wasn't exactly 12 percent a year but they were big raises. We also got money on the performing arts, radio-television part. We got funding for that and that was a surprise to all of us that the legislature thought that Bozeman was going to get a building for movies and we had no chance of getting this performing arts building. They changed their minds. I think we really did change the legislators' minds.

DB: How so? What did you do to change their minds? What was your argument?

HR: My argument was that a good liberal arts school needs a performing arts component. That's an essential part of a liberal arts education: exposure to the performing arts. That was my argument. I don't remember what the president's argument was.

DB: Maybe I'm wrong, but it seems like a fairly unique position to hear from someone in the Mathematics Department, which strikes most people as a very specific study. Somebody who might not care what's going on over in performing arts. To hear that you were very much supportive of a liberal education and going to the legislature to fight for money for performing arts—radio and TV—but meanwhile you're in the Mathematics Department. Is that a fair analysis?

HR: Well, yes, I suppose that's a fair analysis. Some people would conclude that I must not have been a very good mathematician.

DB: I wasn't implying that!

HR: Well, some people would infer that and, well, I did a little bit of mathematics research but I was not primarily a research mathematician. I was a mathematician by chance. If I could have seen through the microscopes I might have been a biologist.

DB: Well before we get to your time as the dean of Arts and Sciences—since you mention being chairman of the Faculty Senate, president of the teacher's union, representing the teacher's

union or the faculty at the legislature—what were your motivations for being involved in those activities, which were certainly above and beyond just teaching?

HR: Well, the presidency of the union seemed to me—I'd been a member of the union from its beginning and these distinguished professors [were involved.]. They had a vision of the role of the faculty in the university that struck me as being correct. So when I was asked to be president of the union, I saw that as a chance to improve the conditions of the faculty so that's why I was willing to do that.

DB: What was that vision that you thought to be correct?

HR: That the faculty would have more control over curricular matters and that they would be paid accordingly. So there were the two issues: faculty control and faculty compensation. The Faculty Senate—I think it still does it this way—faculty are elected representing various divisions: the arts, the sciences, the professional schools, I think. I was elected to represent the sciences and that group elects its own officers and I didn't learn very fast I guess. I agreed to do it twice. I may be the only person who has been president of the Faculty Senate twice. It's not a very rewarding job, or it wasn't when I was there.

DB: Why's that?

HR: Well, the faculty does its business through committees. The Faculty Senate listens to the neckties in Main Hall pontificate and—somehow it just was not very rewarding. I overstate that, actually. I was chairman of the Faculty Senate when Bob Pantzer was president and he was a marvelous man to work with. He knew through the channels he did, he knew there was a lot about the teaching side of the university that he didn't understand and he would listen to the Faculty Senate on those matters and act accordingly. He was very open, very receptive. Actually, that's probably why I became chairman a second time was because I had enjoyed working with Bob Pantzer.

DB: Yeah I've heard that about him. In fact I think everyone has spoken well of President Pantzer.

HR: Oh yes.

DB: Mainly for his ability to relate to faculty, students even.

HR: When I was chairman of the Faculty Senate it was during the Vietnam War and that was when the ROTC building was occupied. President Pantzer gave a very good speech on the Oval and I chaired a Faculty Senate meeting in which the motion before the house was to move ROTC off campus. That was a very tense meeting and it was a very close vote. We voted to ask them to leave the campus and they never did.

DB: So it wasn't a binding vote, you were just asking them to leave and they declined?

HR: That's right.

DB: And did that issue simply dissipate with the end of the war?

HR: Oh, it did dissipate. I think that there was a change in the attitude of the ROTC faculty toward the university. I think they tried to be more collegial. I don't know what the situation with ROTC is now.

DB: So you've definitely had a number of leadership roles in your time. Before I ask you about becoming the dean of Arts and Sciences I'd like to continue with that. How did that come about and more specifically what were your inclinations or motivations to move out of teaching and into that more administrative role?

HR: There were two things happening, I guess. One of the things that was happening is that statistics, which was my discipline, was changing dramatically because of the advent of computers. All the statistics I had learned—goes back to R. A. Fisher—came about because you couldn't do all the number crunching that needed to be done so you invented ways to circumvent the computation. R.A. Fisher was very good about that. He could see things in—he could see end dimensional space so he could see how these points were congregating in dimensional space and see what kind of computations would show the way they were congregating. So all of the things, well, [inaudible] isn't due to R.A. Fisher but essentially is. But the analysis of variants and the standard techniques that served science very well for many, many years. The advent of computing—well, people still do analysis of variants, as they should, but a whole lot of statistics is now done using the computer. Very elaborate regressions that we couldn't do because they are number crunching. And so I was going to have to learn a whole lot about computing and though I did learn basic programming but it didn't ever seem natural to me. I didn't really like doing it. So it was that. I was going to have to make a lot of changes in my own mathematical behavior if I was going to stay teaching mathematics.

And then I thought being dean would give me a chance to serve undergraduate students, which has always been a love of mine. It turned out not to be the case. I hired Jim Flightner as associate dean and he took care of improving undergraduate education and I worried about troublesome faculty and troublesome students.

DB: And how long were you the dean?

HR: Well I was acting dean for one year and then I was dean for four years. I was in the dean's office for five years. I don't know how Jim Flightner did it for 13. Dick Solberg, his predecessor, did it for I don't know how many years.

DB: Why do you say that, that you can't imagine that they did it for that long?

HR: Because it is a very stressful job. It was for me a very stressful job. I aged considerably. People remarked about the fact that I was aging considerably. I spent some time in the hospital.

DB: What were the stressors?

HR: Personnel. It was a time of low budgets and if I had any successes as dean it was because I worked very hard at figuring out ways to say 'yes' because I didn't like to say 'no.' And I spent a lot of time saying 'no' as well.

DB: So when was that? When were those years?

HR: Those years were '83 to '88 I think.

DB: And if I recollect that was sort of at the end of when budgets are tight and retrenchment and things were maybe starting to be turned around in terms of the budget and hiring and student population.

HR: Well, there was retrenchment in '88, I think, but then there was another retrenchment several years later. Well, things have certainly changed. Certainly not all the changes are for the better. I think it's wrong to put so much financial burden on the students. I think that the state doesn't recognize the value of having an educated populace and should be willing to pay a bigger share of the students' tuition. Part of that, though, is this business of students coming out of high school deciding exactly what they want to be. So the University has become a career track and if all it is is a career track then the people on the career track should pay for it, I suppose. That's that argument. I don't like that argument, I don't like either part of that argument. I don't think that the university should just be a career track and I don't think students should pay so much for their education.

DB: You know you mentioned that early on in our conversation, your distrust, or your dislike of that, of students at 18 saying that they know what they're going to do and the university trying to provide that for them, as opposed to a liberal education. When did that change? When did the university's role change in terms of being an opportunity to get a liberal arts education to a career track?

HR: I don't know when that was. That's been gradual. It's nationwide, although there are some great liberal arts institutions that keep that old model and do work very hard at [it]. They have a high tuition, but that's if your parents can pay it, and they have very good scholarship programs if your parents can't. I don't know how many schools now have needs-blind admissions. Some still do. They're great schools. But in general the state universities, there are epidemics of things. There was kind of an epidemic among state legislators of saying, "Well, university students ought to be paying for more of their education." And I don't know which comes first, the early decision about careers or the making students pay for their education.

DB: Speculate for me on that change, why the state would encourage the university to change in that way, and subsequently have students take on more of the cost burden?

HR: Oh I think it may very well be a matter of just looking around saying, “Where can we cut our budgets so we don’t have to raise taxes?” I think there’s been, in my lifetime certainly, well, I think there’s been a change in the attitudes of people about the role of government. The notion now is you keep them from taxing because they’ll just waste your tax money. It used to be that there are things that we have to do together and the best way to do them together is to do them through our government and give them the money to do it. So I’m a non-reconstructed New Dealer. I still believe the F.D.R. vision, going on through Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, of the role of the university in taking care of everybody—the role, not the university, of the country, the government. Taking care of everybody is very important. I think it’s scandalous that we don’t have universal health coverage. It’s not the only thing I think is scandalous but that’s one of the things. I think it’s scandalous that the state doesn’t support education the way it ought to at all levels, K through 24.

DB: You mentioned already before that you think that the state doesn’t appreciate the role of education or a generally educated population, I think is somewhat how you put it. Why? What do you think are the benefits of that to the state, to the country, to the community? What role does a liberal education play?

HR: A liberal education lets us see our continuity with the past, shows us the dangers that we can fall into if we’re not careful—and we’re not careful just now—and out of that arises a sense of community and I think that sense of community is tremendously important. There was a greater sense of community here on the campus when I came here than when I left in ’88 or ’89. A liberal education, a good liberal education, keeps people reading and thinking throughout their lives. The only hope of being a good citizen is to read and think and talk. If you’re going to have something to say, then a liberal education is the basis for that. There are some self-educated people, certainly, who got their own liberal education. There are a number. I run into them every once in a while, people who have never been to college but have said, “By the way, have you read this book?”

DB: So I want to pick up on something you mentioned there. You know, in the time you were on campus there was a deterioration or demise of the community on campus. We started out by talking about some of the indicators of that congeniality, I think is what we were calling it then. What are some of the indicators to you that by the late ’80s when you were approaching retirement that that had evaporated or at least gone downhill.

HR: I think it started its evaporation during the Vietnam War. When young people started asserting their rights to decide what their education was going to be. For a while we dropped general education requirements. There were no general education requirements at all at this university and at any number of other universities. Students were devising their own majors.

The faculty, mostly the young faculty, bought into that and said—the notion that the faculty doesn't know any more than the students do about what the students ought to be doing. Partly that's right. We're 40 years older than they are so we've got a whole different—our memory of what it is to be 18 is very different from their experience of what it is to be 18. Actually our memory of what it was to be 18 is probably very different from what it was when we were 18. So that dialogue between elder and younger, it's always had some tensions in it. They can be very good tensions. They should be very good tensions. But the young people have a lot to say to the older people. But the older people have a right to say that's not a liberal education.

DB: Well, certainly my idea of a liberal education in part is maintaining some education or familiarity with the classics, so that speaks for some continuity.

HR: Oh, heavens, yes. Actually just now I'm reading *The Odyssey*. That speaks so absolutely to us still. You don't study the classics just because everybody's studied the classics. You study the classics because they have a lot to tell you.

DB: You know, it's interesting that you mention the Vietnam War and something social like that as part of the demise of faculty congeniality and that attitude on campus because so often I've heard it said that it was just a product of larger student population and numbers alone make it harder for the school to be as personable.

HR: Oh, well, that's certainly true, yes. I think that's true of any community. It has to have a certain size, a critical mass is a good buzzword. But you see that on a campus. As it increases in size, there isn't so much need to get out of the forestry building, nor so much opportunity to get out of the forestry building. You see it in Missoula. Missoula was, I think, a nicer town when it was 30,000 people, although it's done some marvelous things like cleaning up the river and the open spaces. It's trying very hard to keep from being Anyplace, USA, but there are big pieces of it that are Anyplace, USA.

DB: Right, right. So I want to ask you something more specific about the university. You retired in '89?

HR: Something like that.

DB: That was just before, or just as, Dennison was taking over as president? Just before?

HR: Just before. I left the deanship just after Jim Koch came in. Then I taught one-third time in the Mathematics Department but I wasn't really part of the faculty anymore. I think I left the deanship in '88 and I went back to the department full time and spent a semester in Japan. Jim Koch was only president for four and a half years, I think. So I was on my way out as Dennison was on his way in.

DB: So those four and a half years of Koch is sort of what I want to ask about. You've talked a little bit about McFarland and Pantzer and they were both fairly long-term presidents. Of course, Dennison is one of the longest-term presidents at this point. But in between there we have a fairly quick succession of three presidents: Bowers, Bucklew, Koch. Comment a little bit about those changes, if there were significant changes those years. Why the short-term presidents?

HR: I don't know why Dick Bowers' presidency was short. He was the one I went to the legislature with. Those were successful times. I don't know what the circumstances of his leaving were. I think Neil Bucklew had his eye on the presidency of the University of West Virginia [West Virginia University] from the time he came here. Both he and Jim Koch were upwardly mobile. Each one of them came with an agenda for this place and used that as a stepping stone. I guess Bucklew brought general education back? I don't remember how things go. Did Koch build the stadium or did Bucklew build the stadium?

DB: I think Koch maybe got the final funding for the stadium—was his role in it and had it completed. He was here when it was completed. [Bucklew was president during the funding-raising campaign for the stadium. It opened in 1986, just two months after Koch assumed the presidency.]

HR: I think so.

DB: That was a little before my time in Missoula but I think that's the—

HR: I think that's right. You ought to be reading history.

DB: Well, you know, I've read the one written history of the university but of course it doesn't go up through that time.

HR: No, it stops, that's right. It stops with McFarland, I think, doesn't it?

DB: Right. So the next history is waiting to be written.

HR: Well one of the great pleasures of coming here in 1957 was I knew H.G. Merriam and a number of those grand old people.

DB: So that's kind of what I wanted to finish up with is just any other stories or memories or people that you would like to mention from your time here.

HR: No, I think I've mentioned the main ones.

DB: Any lasting impressions from your time teaching and administrating on campus?

HR: Teaching was almost always a pleasure. There would be some days when the students would, well, we were moving to large sections teaching mathematics, from biologists and classes of a hundred, and I had a section of that and I had started to point out a very interesting application to biology and there were a number of them who would see that wasn't going to be on the exam and would walk out in the middle of class. So that was very distressing. But mostly the teaching experience was very good. There were a good deal of pleasures in being dean. I think I was liked by the faculty. I knew them all by name. I could match name and face of all the faculty. Maybe Jerry Fetz can do that now. But those, again, were personal interactions—personal interactions with students, personal interactions with fellow faculty that were the important—the collegiality. The bureaucracy, I suppose, is necessary and you have to serve the bureaucracy but it's no fun.

DB: I guess there is one final thing I want to ask you and that is that, you know, you're still a Missoulian. You still seem fairly well-connected and informed about the university. What's kept you here? What's kept you interested in the goings-ons at the university after being retired for 16 years?

HR: Well, what's kept me here is we have a marvelous place in the Rattlesnake. My wife and I very much enjoy there. We can't imagine people going south for the winter or going south forever and retiring off-campus. If you're in Missoula, the university is still a big stakeholder and so I'm consequently still interested in what's going on. I despair, but it'll survive.

DB: All right, thank you.

HR: You're very welcome.

[End of Interview]