JOHN GRYDER
August 10, 1999

Mame Warren, interviewer

Warren: This is Mame Warren. Today is the thirtieth of August, 1999. I’m in 311 Remsen Hall with Dr. John Gryder, who, as we were just talking about, is responsible for a lot of people getting through chemistry on this campus. I want to start with you, and I want to know what brought you to Johns Hopkins in the first place.

Gryder: Well, actually, today is almost exactly the fiftieth anniversary of my coming after I’d been offered a job.

Warren: Well, we should be having a cake.

Gryder: We got married on the first of September, 1949. I had failed my driver’s license and couldn’t go on our honeymoon, so we took a train down to Baltimore, my wife and I. [Laughter]

Warren: That’s a great story. [Laughter]

Gryder: We got here probably the third of September, 1949.

Warren: Oh, my gosh.

Gryder: So I’ve been here a while. I actually came because the man with whom I got my Ph.D. had been my supervisor. I started my graduate work at Cal Tech, and he transferred to Columbia [University], and I followed him to Columbia. When it was time to look for a job, he suggested Johns Hopkins. Honestly, even though Johns Hopkins had been in the history book I used, I had never heard of the place.

Warren: Really?
Gryder: I grew up in California and not in a medical family, so I had forgotten its real magnificent history about the first graduate school in the country. Dick Dodson suggested that I apply to Hopkins, and I did, and I liked it.

Warren: Dick Dodson?

Gryder: Yes, Richard Dodson, who got his Ph.D. here probably in 1936 or '37. Yes, something like that.

Warren: So you came here with a clean slate, then.

Gryder: Absolute clean slate.

Warren: What were your impressions when you arrived?

Gryder: Actually, I was very impressed by the place. I wish I could say that I thought it had carried through its potential, but it hasn’t. It was the mix of undergraduate and graduate school reminded me very much of Cal Tech, where I was an undergraduate and continued in graduate school. The interplay between the undergraduates, the graduates, and the faculty was really absolutely magnificent, despite the sort of rumors that it’s always been a bad place for undergraduates. We were probably one of the best two places for undergraduates before the Second World War and immediately thereafter. The other one actually being Cal Tech. But we were an excellent undergraduate school for the right kind of student.

Warren: Tell me what you mean by that.

Gryder: That’s exactly what I was going to do. The right kind of student was someone who had really decided on his profession rather early and was interested in academic matters. That kind of person had all sorts of nurturing. The undergraduate student body was here, I guess, just slightly bigger than the graduate student body. Cal Tech was actually much smaller. That’s why I’m
comparing the two schools. This meant that the undergraduates were really treated very much like graduate students, and so they were mentored from the time they came.

There weren’t any special advanced courses for undergraduates. In chemistry, there was freshman chemistry and quantitative analysis and organic chemistry, I guess. Then all of the advanced courses were joint with the graduate students. This meant that they knew the graduate students very well because they were taking classes with them, and those same graduate students that they were taking a class with might well be their lab instructors in the lab they were taking. So that kind of interplay was really very, very good.

But it had to be for somebody who wanted to have his social life fitting into his academic life. There was never much what is called now student amenities, because it was sort of built in. It was a community, and almost everything that’s been done to keep a community has done the reverse; it separated the undergraduates from the graduates, from the faculty. That was the thing that impressed me most, partially because I had a similar flavor at my own undergraduate training, which I think really is still the best in the country, and the stupid U.S. News and World Report just discovered it. [Laughter] But again, it’s only for the right sort of person. A history major going to Cal Tech would be out of place. Well, actually, it’s not about Cal Tech; it’s about Hopkins. [Laughter]

I lost my train of thought by going off that way. Well, as I said, I was very much impressed with the place when I first came.

Warren: I’m interested that you came in 1949, which I hadn’t realized, because that’s a time when there were a lot of veterans here.

Gryder: Oh, yes, that’s right.
Warren: Describe that for me.

Gryder: Well, actually it was a very interesting group of people. I was talking about the small size. Actually there was a brief period where it increased rather dramatically because of the returning veterans. So for chemistry—I’ll talk about chemistry—there really weren’t enough slots in the laboratory and so in the halls there were little boxes for holding laboratory equipment. They’d leave it out there and then bring it in at their section.

Warren: Oh, my gosh.

Gryder: But when I say “large,” I mean probably the freshman chemistry at that time probably had a little over a hundred people in it. It was really pretty small compared to present-day things. That’s one of our mistakes we’ve made, is to increase the size of the student body, the undergraduate student body, particularly in relation to the graduate student body.

Warren: Go ahead and talk about that.

Gryder: All right. Unfortunately, for the past fifty years, with a few exceptions, presidents have thought that they could balance their budget by increasing the number of undergraduate students, and that’s by saying, “I’m going to keep my expenses the same and if I have more tuition coming in, I’ll be able to balance my books for this year.”

So a little bit of increase each year they think isn’t costing them anything, but then after a while they suddenly discover that I can no longer take care of those people in the lab by putting boxes in the hall. And you have to have remodeling. Then you can no longer get people that you’ve rather carefully established with the sort of student that will probably be appropriate for your institution, because there are too many.

Admissions back in those days was actually done by the faculty itself. They would talk to
people. There was Irene Davis, who was the registrar, was also any admissions officer that there
was, but she operated by sending them to the faculty to talk to them when they came around. So
this was the beginning of interaction between the faculty and the students before they ever came.
The total number of undergraduates was small enough that Irene Davis knew them all for years.
They would come back to see her.

Warren: She was the registrar?

Gryder: She was the registrar and also the wife of Alsoph Corwin of the chemistry department.
So the chemistry and Irene had good relationships. Then she later became secretary of the
university and did all sorts of things, but she remained registrar all the time she was here. They
finally got an admissions officer and slowly built up those kinds of things. It was a completely
different institution with the interplay of the faculty. There really wasn’t an administration.

For many years the administration was really two people: Wilson Shaffer, dean for many
years, and P. Stewart Macaulay, who was the provost. He took care of money and Wilson took
care of faculty relations, and presidents would come and go, and Wilson and Macaulay would
hold things together. But the interaction with the president was—these really were the only
administrative officers, the president, Macaulay, Wilson. Then there was an evening college, there
was what they called the dean of the evening college, but it was actually under Wilson, so all of
these things were in the control of that very small number of people. There was also a dean of
engineering, who was only a part-time dean because it was a very small school.

As a result, there really wasn’t any competition between people for power, which I think is
what’s wrong now. People are more interested in themselves than they are in the institution, and
you have people who come to stay for a few years and go off and do something else, and they
really don’t have any sense of the history of the institution. They mouth some words, but they
don’t know what they really mean, because they heard them from somebody else. And the way in
which the administration kept in contact with the faculty was through the faculty club.

**Warren:** Tell me about that.

**Gryder:** Okay. That’s another thing that is really very, very sad, in my opinion. Essentially every
faculty member, which at that time was not a lot smaller than it now is, it was probably maybe 150
total faculty on Homewood campus. That’s now certainly not twice, although the student body is
considerably more than twice.

At any rate, everybody ate lunch at the faculty club, and they didn’t eat in little groups.
The chemists didn’t eat together and the historians together, really. There was a mixing of the
faculty at that place, particularly at something called the “big table.” The the president frequently
ate there. Macaulay was there almost every day. Wilson Shaffer was usually there. And then there
were seats in which about, oh, what, fifteen faculty members could sit down. And it wasn’t the
same people all the time.

A lot of the business of the university was done at that table, and a “yes” or a “no” from
Macaulay at that table after lunch was worth a lot more than something in writing from an
administrator now, because Macaulay remembered what he had said and he stuck by it. Now the
administrator who writes something to you is no longer there a few years later. I think that that
interplay was something again that was, I think, almost unique to Hopkins.

Again there was an analogous thing was happening at Cal Tech, and I keep mentioning
those two because I have left out the intermediate school, Columbia, which was the exact
opposite. Graduate students in one group were told not to talk to graduate students in another
group, because they might steal their ideas. That sense of institution, sense of “This is a great place” really went all the way down from the president to the faculty, to the students, and it was a kind of interplay that I think is very sad that we lost it.

Warren: What do you think happened to it?

Gryder: Well, I think a lot of it was that it grew too much. They decided they wanted to be like every other university instead of being—when they talk about their uniqueness, they also wanted to be somebody else, and I think that’s something that’s happened in higher education in general, that there really are very few institutions that are unique. Sorry. That are different from others. And so it really doesn’t make any difference whether you go to Timbuktu or somebody in the middle of the perceived quality or the top, because they’re all trying to do exactly the same thing. You can’t all do exactly the same thing and do it well. So I think we grew too much.

Then this is something I’m going to blame on Steve Muller: they decided that we needed more administration. They decided that you should have people in charge of individual kinds of things, instead of having people looking at the whole picture. So I guess the most unhappy times in my life at Hopkins was when I was associate dean of—the first associate dean of the faculty of arts and sciences. We spent all of our time talking to one another and, unfortunately, most of my colleagues in the administration were really more interested in how they looked than how the institution looked.

We just grew apart. The policies of the faculty club changed. When I first came, the lunches were really subsidized by the dinners. It was very, very cheap to eat at the faculty club, and mostly the faculty ate there, but also there were a few graduate students were members also. There were not many, but there were some. Then the faculty club decided this wasn’t fair, and
they decided to be more like a club, so they wanted to be like a country club of some sort, so they raised the dues and started having special dinner nights and things of that sort for the alumni.

The number of alumni who were eligible for the faculty club who stayed in Baltimore was increasing dramatically after Evening College became a real money-making operation. Sorry, but I think that’s what it became and is. Which meant that there were a large number of Baltimore people who were eligible for membership in the faculty club, and their needs sort of took over, and that’s when they started treating it like a real country club atmosphere instead of an academic gathering place.

And the administrators, as they became larger in number, decided they needed to use the lunch hour to talk to one another. They stopped coming to the faculty club. [Milton] Eisenhower was the last one who regularly came to the faculty club. He didn’t come all the time, but he was frequently there. Muller almost never came, even when he was provost. Macaulay continued, until he died, coming to the faculty club.

So all of these bonds were broken by the faculty club, and now they still have something they call “the faculty table.” On Monday I’m usually the only one there.

Warren: Really?

Gryder: Yes. They keep trying to do things to bring it back, but it’s too late. It’s lost. There are probably—I don’t know, in chemistry, I think, I’m probably the only member of the faculty club in chemistry now. The department itself has a membership, and so faculty members once in a while go on the membership of the department, but there are very few members. Needless to say, the younger faculty attend even less. I think the dues now are $200 a year, and the prices are really comparable to restaurant prices. If you’re only going to eat a few meals a year, even once a week,
you’ve added a sizeable amount just from the annual dues.

**Warren:** So where does the faculty go now?

**Gryder:** They tend to take lunches over to their offices and eat with their own little group, bring lunches from home, or they eat at Levering. But not much mixing. That automatic place where people mixed doesn’t exist. They have tried to do things by having special luncheon memberships, but they did it too late. Who wants to go to the faculty club and meet mostly retired people? And you can’t— it’s a chicken-and-egg sort of thing, and it has become something else, and you can’t just suddenly make it back to what it was. They have tried. In fact, there was an article in *The Chronicle of Higher Education* not long ago about attempts, but they’ve all failed and I’m sure they’re going to fail.

**Warren:** One of the things you said a while ago that struck me was, you said people now don’t understand the history of the institution. How did you learn? How did you find out?

**Gryder:** Well, I think I’ve told you. I found out mostly at the faculty club. You were eating with people from all departments and all age groups, and they would be talking about various things sometimes. They’d be talking about their work, sometimes they would be telling you stories about what happened at Hopkins. So you grew up with it. There was a verbal transfer of the history of the institution, both the good and the bad. It was a community. How do you find out about your own history? It’s only by you talking to your predecessors.

**Warren:** Can you remember who were the keepers of the flame, who were the best keepers of the flame?

**Gryder:** Wilson was certainly one of them, and also Heb Evans [G. Heberton Evans], who became a dean. Actually, he was the first dean of the faculty. There was only Wilson before that.
Heb was the first person with the title of dean of the, at that time, faculty of arts and sciences.

**Warren:** I don’t know that name. Tell me about him.

**Gryder:** He was an economist. Actually, he wrote a little book. I was hoping I could find it, but unfortunately—the library probably has a copy. It’s G. Heberton Evans. He wrote a history from his point of view after he retired.

**Warren:** Of Hopkins?

**Gryder:** Of Hopkins.

**Warren:** Oh, wonderful!

**Gryder:** Of his career. He was a student at Hopkins and continued on to being dean. The difference—when did he become—he was dean, that deanship, up through Eisenhower, I think, and when he became dean, he didn’t know that such a position could exist, because before that, anybody who wanted to talk to the president just went and talked to the president. This was putting a layer between the president and the faculty, and he didn’t really think that was a good idea until he talked to faculty members and they decided that, well, maybe it was all right. So the difference, there was no hierarchy, is what I’m saying.

Of course, the duties of a president have changed and gotten bigger as we got bigger, but presidents up to the beginning of Steve Muller, and even he, to a large extent, were very available. They also tended to know what was going on among the faculty. They were sort of like a super dean of arts and sciences. The medical school was really a different operation. It had a separate board of trustees and things of that sort also.

Well, to indicate the extent to which the president got involved with academic matters, I was thinking of going to Rice [University] back in—probably in ’52, something of that sort, shortly
after I came. I had essentially decided to go to Rice, and we were visiting my wife’s family in Long Island that Thanksgiving or Christmas, and the phone rang and somebody said that they wanted to talk to me. My mother-in-law gave me the phone and the person said, “Hello, John. This is Dev Bronk.” [Laughter]

Warren: Tell me about that conversation.

Gryder: Well, I was a little unhappy with some of the things that were happening in the chemistry department. We didn’t have a chairman. Chemistry was in a little disarray. I was an assistant professor. Actually, I may have still been an instructor. I was the last instructor hired at this institution. I was a low man on the totem pole in all regards. Jose Donnay was a professor of chemistry, a joint appointment with geology and chemistry, was very unhappy that I was thinking of leaving, and he got to Dev Bronk and said, “You have to stop this.” [Laughter] But he found out that I was visiting my—I don’t know how they found her, they got that telephone number, and he called to assure me that chemistry was going to get his full attention and that there would not be a chairman that I didn’t approve of. [Laughter]

Warren: That’s pretty impressive. Got your attention.

Gryder: It certainly got my attention, and it reinforced my feeling that this was a good place. And I think the things that Bronk wanted to do weren’t bad [unclear]. You, since you’re just starting, you never heard of The Bronk Plan.

Warren: I have heard of it, but I don’t know what it is. Please tell me.

Gryder: Okay. Well, actually, to tell you about The Bronk Plan, I have to go back and tell you about The Goodnow Plan.

Warren: Great.
Gryder: Goodnow was—I don’t remember which president he was, but he was president right around 1928, ’29, and ’30, just at Depression time. And Goodnow looked at Hopkins and he saw that the people who were most unhappy were the freshmen, because they were separate. They were taking these courses that didn’t really get into things, freshman chemistry and what have you, and some of them didn’t really make a good transition into Hopkins. So he hit upon the idea of eliminating—it later was described as eliminating undergraduates. That isn’t what it was, but eliminating the beginning parts of the undergraduates, and admitting the students really as Ph.D. candidates, but only after a year or two of college, so that they got the basic things and then they came to do their professional education. And he had even announced this.

Then the Depression came along, and although my comment that you don’t make money on undergraduates is true, you can also lose a lot of money if suddenly they can’t afford to come. So it was never really put into effect, other than the possibility that you could get a Ph.D. without getting a bachelor’s degree. That was what The Goodnow Plan became.

Bronk wanted to really go even further along the lines that I said were true, to have every student really under the wings of a faculty member almost from the time they came, and there would be no set curriculum, no set curriculum and no formal requirements for a bachelor’s degree. Your education would be under the control of a particular faculty member or a group of faculty members, perhaps, but it would be designed for you. At the end of two years, you would formally be accepted to some department for a degree, but you had to be accepted by the department. See, it’s sort of like The Goodnow Plan, except you were given the first two years here, but in a special way, Bronk’s idea.

Included in the write-up of it, which was secret for a long time, was that the only way this
could possibly work was if the size of the student body decreased. So his idea was to decrease the student body to the point that each of them really could be treated as individuals, and after they were ready, they would be accepted to a department, saying, “Yes, you have the background to go on in chemistry,” or history or what have you. And then their programs would be designed by these people. And even at the beginning there would be some of that, but you wouldn’t be [unclear].

The stupidity of this was the absolute lack of any curriculum or any requirements. His idea was, well, let’s take a chemist. He was a biophysicist, actually. But let’s take a chemist. Studying chemistry, he learns about oxygen and he learns about Lavoisier, and that takes him into studying Lavoisier’s life, which takes him into the French Revolution, and so on. So you would get the breadth by starting at the specifics and then encouraging the kid to use his curiosity and to go on. That really was pretty pie in the sky, but it also certainly would work only in a very small place. Well, Bronk wasn’t really able to get that done here, and went off to be president of Rockefeller Institute, which has no undergraduates, and is the kind of place that he wanted.

At any rate, we were left with The Bronk Plan and we continued trying to operate under it as the student body got bigger and bigger, and then there was really a big problem. We’d been broken down into groups, physical sciences group, the social sciences group, the humanities group, and those people were in charge of the curriculum in their individual areas, and they were also the people who first admitted students to candidacy. The problem was that no department wanted to have a student who wasn’t above average, and since we weren’t from Lake Wobegone, there were people who were progressing all right, but not good enough for any department to accept them. And how do you kick somebody out who has passed the courses? [ Interruption.]
So you had these people who didn’t have a home. You couldn’t kick them out, so what do you do? So you invented an area major.

Warren: An area major.

Gryder: Right. So you could be a physical sciences area major instead of a chemistry major, a physics major, or what have you. So you had all of these area majors that nobody really wanted to pay much attention to, and they were really getting out of hand, as you can well imagine.

Warren: What time period are you talking about?

Gryder: This is now—let’s see. When did Eisenhower become president?

Warren: ’56.

Gryder: So I’m talking around early ’50s, up until the year after Eisenhower came. There was a committee of young Turks appointed to rearrange the curriculum that consisted of Tucker, Bob [Robert] Tucker, me, Bill McClain, somebody else. Oh, the psychology. Jim Dietz. And it was decided that we would try to redo this. And the big mistake here was they didn’t have anybody who had any power at the university. But we went around and talked to everybody and came up with actually more or less what is now the fact, that there would be a minimum requirement. You were having people graduate with things like 90 credits, because it was all over the map, the quality of your degrees at that time.

So we put in some minimum requirements and some distribution requirements and things of that sort, making it more or less like other places. In those days, curricula were completely under the control of the whole faculty, so there were meetings that had to approve of this.

Eisenhower was all in favor of doing something of this sort, and it was his exposure to the faculty at that time, that he was planning to have the president with the chair of the academic
assembly at that time, whatever it was called. His idea was that he was going to open it up and then he was immediately going to call one of these people, and he had how he was going to arrange things. Really he was planning to railroad it through. [Laughter]

It got roundly defeated, partially because Eisenhower thought he was still at Penn State, and partially because Wilson had appointed the committee, had appointed a committee of people like Heb Evans and [Sidney] Painter and the elder statesmen at the university, had all been talked to, but they hadn’t been involved in the actual writing. So it was shot down, but it was still decided that something should be done and that another committee should look into it. They appointed another committee, which did contain the right people, and actually they essentially put the Tucker committee report back on, but this time with the right backing and without games being played by the president, and it passed. We stayed with that for a long time.

Warren: So how did Eisenhower get along with the faculty? Was that a good relationship?

Gryder: On the whole, it was a good relationship. He certainly was very open and he learned very quickly. He never tried anything like that again. And he had a complete open-door policy. He was frequently at the big table. And because of those kinds of things, he did get along well with the faculty.

To my mind, the best president we had was the one who was an interim president, Lowell Reed.

Warren: Tell me about him.

Gryder: Lowell Reed was professor of biostatistics, I think he was, at Hygiene, and had retired at the time Bronk suddenly left. It really was sudden. He wanted to be president of Rockefeller and Hopkins at the same time, and Hopkins said no, so he went to Rockefeller.
At any rate, they needed a president, and Reed had a good reputation down at the medical school in Hygiene, and he was brought up to be president. I really thought he—to my mind, he was probably our best president. He was adept at—well, he didn’t treat it as an interim presidency. He did have ideas and he tried to put them across, and he was interested in education as well as research. I think the trouble with most of the presidents is they haven’t really thought about what the mission of the institution is, and would go off one way or another without a real idea of what it should be. That’s since we started getting presidents from the outside.

At any rate, he, I thought, did a good job of trying to get the various divisions of the university to interact more, since he himself came from down there, and looked at the whole institution as a single institution instead of lots of separate little institutions.

Warren: Yes, that’s what I’m trying to do. It’s a big job to do that.

Gryder: Yes.

Warren: I need to turn the tape over.

[Begin Tape 1, Side 2]

Warren: So you think it’s possible to look at the place as a whole?

Gryder: I think it’s becoming harder and harder, and right now I don’t think there is any such thing as Johns Hopkins University.

Warren: Tell me what you mean by that.

Gryder: I mean it really is a—this business of every ship in its own bottom, or what have you, that each of the divisions is separate, that really is not the Hopkins tradition. That’s something very new. That’s something that was really started by Steve Muller. You didn’t have to have each group paying for itself. The funds—the money that hadn’t been given for specific reasons was in
the control of the president, and the way in which the presidents before Muller used it was to take care of the needs of different groups who couldn’t, on their own, support themselves. As Muller said, nobody ever died of English.

So getting money for humanities was not always that easy, and presidents before him used the money they had at their own discretion to move around in ways that would help one division relative to another. That was something that I thought his predecessor, Lowell Reed, was really very good at. I think Steve is really very bad at it, because what he used that money for was to do things that he thought would be good for society or for—without looking at what it was going to do to the institution. Indeed, he even, in a sense, lied to us.

Something that I think was a very good thing to do, but I’m not sure Hopkins should have done it, was taking over Peabody. It certainly is nice to have Peabody here. It’s certainly good to have it associated with us, but it was not good that it took money away from our own needs, which it wasn’t supposed to do. They assured us that the bookkeeping would be completely different and what have you, but obviously it couldn’t be and it really was part of us. I think arts and sciences has really suffered by these kinds of things.

The Nanjing Center, I don’t think is a particularly good thing for us. Only if we were really doing our basic mission well could you afford to do the other sorts of things. But the individual items, I think, were good, but I think they also are really at the heart of what is changed. Arts and sciences has become something that the medical school always called, to a large, “the undergraduate division” of the university. It isn’t. It never was. Its principle mission should be, but it’s being harder and harder to be a graduate school. But it’s, I’m afraid, gone really the other direction.
The evening college has become mostly a graduate school instead of undergraduate school, but in my not very modest opinion it's become a lousy graduate school. You can't have a good graduate school that is made up entirely of part-time students. It's certainly no way in which you get anything institutional. Well, let's not go off on my biases, because that's gone so far that it cannot possibly be reversed anyway.

Warren: They seem to be on a path over there.

Gryder: It's on a path in which they will sell the name of Hopkins to anything that breathes, if it's going to pay money. And that's why I retired when I did.

Warren: Let's shift gears and go into the classroom. You spent an awful lot of time. Let's not jump to retirement yet, because you spent a lot of time in the classroom.

Gryder: Yes.

Warren: And you influenced a lot of people. Talk to me about that.

Gryder: Well, actually I was a strange person for Hopkins, because education is what I was interested in. The research was completely secondary to me. Originally I wanted to be a high school teacher, and a very nice high school teacher told me that there was something better than being a high school teacher; you could be a college professor. I came from a family that nobody had gone to college, so I didn’t know about that sort of thing. She said I would like that.

Then time came to go to college, and, as I have indicated, none of my family had gone to college, and we were certainly not rich. We were on the poor side. I got a full scholarship at Redlands.

Warren: Redlands?

have to go to Cal Tech." And I'd never heard of Cal Tech. I lived in Los Angeles, but I'd never heard of Cal Tech. She said, "You have to go to Cal Tech. It's the place for you." So she got me to apply to Cal Tech, and I got accepted to Cal Tech, but they didn't give me any money. But back in those days, tuition was very low. Indeed, it was $300 a year. Mrs. McEntire pointed out to me that if I went to Cal Tech, I could live at home and take the streetcar, because my father was a streetcar conductor, so I had a pass on the streetcar. I could live at home, take a streetcar, and after I'd been there a while, they'd probably give me some money anyway, but that it would cost me that much for room and board at Redlands, where I couldn't. So she convinced me that I should go to Cal Tech. That's really why I went.

So I went to Cal Tech, and she was right, that being a professor was a lot better than being a high school teacher, and that's still what I wanted to do, but then I was graduating and had to go to graduate school. And how could I afford graduate school? Fortunately, Jurg Wasser had a skiing accident and broke his leg when I was a sophomore, and this was during the war. They didn't have people to take labs. Jurg was a post doc at that time, I think, suggested to Ernest Swift that I could do the lab for the physicists in quantitative analysis, and actually the lectures also for the physicists in quantitative analysis.

So as a result of that, I got to know Ernest Swift, who was a professor at Cal Tech, and when it came time to apply for graduate school, he said I should go to graduate school at Cal Tech. I said, "Well, I don't know if I can afford it." He said, "Well, graduate students don't cost. We give you room and board at the Athenaeum or $75 a month." So I applied to Cal Tech, the only place I applied to.

Then I got a job offer from Shell Development, and Cal Tech hadn't told me they were
accepting me. Shell Development wanted an answer. So I went to Swift and said, “I really have to take this job if I don’t get accepted here, and Dr. Nieman [phonetic] says he can’t make a decision,” until some magic date. I’ve forgotten what it is now.

And he said, “Don’t worry about it. You’re going to be accepted.”

I said, “But I have to know that.”

And he explained to me that that date was because the agreement between universities that you couldn’t give out acceptances before certain dates at the time. I said, “Well, I believe you, but what am I going to do?”

So he arranged for Nieman to send me a letter, which was essentially an appointment letter early, so that I could turn down the job at Shell Development. So again, that still made me want to be a professor.

So the teaching part was always my main goal, but I also wanted to be teaching something that I felt was important and had high standards. So that, again, made Hopkins a pretty good place to be, because they did have high standards and they tended to get some—well, they had a mixture of students, but many of their students were really quite good students. So I enjoyed the teaching. I particularly liked seeing students on an individual basis. Freshman chemistry almost killed me at the beginning.

Warren: Why?

Gryder: Well, in those days they had gotten pretty big. It was 125 or something of that sort.

Back in those days, as you gave a course, you gave the lab, as well as the lecture part, so there were labs every day of the week and Saturday morning, and you had graduate assistants, but I thought that the professor should go wandering around, too. Then I thought they should be able
to see you, so I had office hours constantly. So there were long lines of people in front of my door and I was wandering down there, and my research was not going very well there for a while.

Then a terrible thing happened. By the end of that first year, I actually knew the names of almost every member of that class. I’m very bad with names. I would wander through the lab. Then this terrible thing happened. They went on and a whole new group came in. [Laughter] So I decided it was foolish to try and learn any names, and I stopped learning names. I knew a few of them at the top, a few of them at the bottom, but the “C” in the middle, I stopped learning names.

At any rate, I would say that the people who had me in class either thought I was great or terrible. There were very few in the middle. Some of the ones who got the lowest grades thought I was the best, because they all thought I was fair, but some of them thought I gave incomprehensible lectures. Indeed, it was sometimes called “Dr. Gryder’s Mystery Hour.” [Warren laughs.] And I explained to them that that was really what its intention was, which was that I tried to give them the feeling of how you discover things instead of, “This is what’s going to be on the exam,” and read the book to them. So sometimes even though it was a large class, I would have conversations with them. I would ask questions and get responses, and try to use those.

I would sometimes allow them to go down a false path that seemed reasonable, and then find out why it was wrong and have to start over again. You can see how that could be very annoying to some kinds of people, because it wasn’t telling them what was going to be on the next exam. But the ones who really understood what I was trying to do, I think, liked it, and I still think it is the best way of teaching.

I would say that—well, I would pass out questionnaires before they invented their own
idiot one, that is the same for everybody, the important questions that I asked were free-will offerings of the kinds of things I was trying to find out was had their interest in chemistry changed as a result of the course, and things of that sort, which I had a number of ways of questioning about that. Then I wanted them to give me a free-will offering about what the best and worst parts of the course were, things of that sort, which is what I liked to read when I got them. Then the students made up a multiple-choice kind of thing that I found completely useless, but since they had to fill that one out, I stopped handing out my own.

But at any rate, I would say that given the fact that I always gave courses that they had to take, that they weren't taking because they wanted to, I think that I came out pretty well in feelings of the students. They once gave me an award for teaching.

**Warren:** Really?

**Gryder:** Which I thought was good for that kind of course. Because the other thing was that my grades were never very good. I mean, I did have—back in those days, “C” was supposed to be an average, and it was an average. You had to really work to get an “F.” I gave very few “Fs.” But I was generous with Cs. As grade inflation crept up, I also crept up, but I was always below the average.

Actually, that was another thing that made me decide to quit, was when the course became too big for a single lecture. Even the 300 lecture hall was too small. We now have over 500 people in freshman chemistry.

**Warren:** Oh, my gosh.

**Gryder:** And that means you have to have two. I wasn’t about to give the same lecture twice, because I never gave the same lecture twice. I always threw away my notes from one year so that
I had to go about them, think about the lecture I was going to give that day, and then it became it was going to be given by two people, and I thought it was important that if you were just going to read the book, that they can get the book and read it. If you’re going to have a lecture, it should be going beyond the book, if you assume that they learn some of the things from the book and you take it a different way or look at it differently. And when you’re giving it with somebody else as a single course, you’d better have some—at least the grading better be the same in the two classes. And I found that very painful, because by this time a “B” was looked at as a terrible grade.

I couldn’t take it anymore. But I do miss teaching, although I don’t really miss the teaching the students that we now have. I thought it was just because I was getting old, but about a month before I was just fully decided to retire, I was walking over to Levering, and there were two people in front of me that I thought were maybe graduate students, but they were talking to one another about, “No, I couldn’t give the same exam that I gave a couple of years ago,” that they only want exactly what you’ve told them in class and they want to regurgitate. They don’t want to think about things. This I found interesting, because they were talking about a humanities course. Turned out they were two young assistant professors who hadn’t been doing it very long, but had already noticed a change in just a few years. And it’s true. Toward the end I couldn’t possibly have given exams I had given in the past. So I don’t think that they’re now number seven on the list means a damn thing, but that’s not for your book. [Laughter]

Warren: But it is for the record. It is for the record. I think it’s very important to get down. I found some articles over in the library about a period when you thought that grades should be eliminated altogether.
Gryder: [unclear].

Warren: Yes.

Gryder: Yes. Well–

Warren: What was that all about?

Gryder: Well, actually, when I came, it wasn’t altogether. There was an R–let’s see. There were four grades. There was an “H” and an “R,” an “S,” and a “U.”

Warren: Tell me what they meant.

Gryder: “H” meant honors. “R” meant recommended or very good or something of that sort. “S” meant satisfactory, and “U” meant unsatisfactory. That’s as far down as it ever went. The reason it got changed back was because of—I guess mostly because of the medical students. How do you translate that into the [unclear]? And they were deciding that our “H” had to be an “A,” and our “H” actually was maybe 1 percent of the people would get “Hs.” It was a very restricted grade. Most of the people got “Rs” and “Ss.” In that sense it was ungraded. But the competition made us have to put grades in again, and what we first did was to put “plus” and “minuses” on the “Ss” and “Rs.”

Then we looked at them and said, “You know, if we look at the number, we can go back to an H, A, D, C, D system,” and so we did that. But that’s when the “H” became looked at as it was really an “A,” so our people were really being discriminated against on that basis. So we then decided to go to a regular system, and then they wanted "pluses" and "minuses" on those. But nobody goes below "B" anymore.

Warren: So in this period in the–if it was the early ’70s, you decided that grades were meaningless?
Gryder: No, no, no, no, no. The '70s, they were not eliminated.

Warren: No, but I found these articles from the paper where it seemed like you were proposing eliminating grades altogether, but it was a News-Letter article, so-

Gryder: I think the students may have suggested that at some point, but I don’t remember anybody wanting to eliminate—unless we’re talking about graduate school.

Warren: Well, it was a News-Letter article, so I’m not real sure.

Gryder: I’d have to read the News-Letter article to put myself back in the-

Warren: I’ll send you a copy.

Gryder: Okay. I don’t remember that at all.

Warren: So a lot of your students were pre-med.

Gryder: Yes, the bulk of them. Hopkins was, and still is, to a large extent, a pre-med factory.

We never really wanted to be, but that’s what it—

Warren: A pre-med factory.

Gryder: Well, by that I mean the student body was at least—if you include what we call the crypto pre-meds—

Warren: What does that mean?

Gryder: Hidden pre-meds. History majors who suddenly take the—when they’re admitted as history majors, come and they take the standard course for somebody who wants to go to medical school, because all the time I’ve been here, we’ve been trying to get a better mix of the student body, and sometimes they would try to do that. I don’t know what they’re doing now. Try to do that by being much easier on admissions for somebody who wanted to do a history major than for somebody who wanted to be a chemistry major or a biology major. So people would know that
and they’d apply as an English major and then come and take all the courses that they would take to get into medical school. So if you include crypto pre-meds. I don’t think I ever had more than two or three people in freshman chemistry who didn’t want to go to medical school, let’s put it that way.

**Warren:** Really? And they were these huge classes.

**Gryder:** Yes. That’s why we furnished one percent of all doctors in the country.

**Warren:** That’s an impressive statistic. So is there a relationship between the work you were doing and what was happening in East Baltimore? Did you have a rapport with the medical school?

**Gryder:** It varied over the years. For quite a while the medical school had the B.A./M.D. program that they would admit to the B.A./M.D. program at the end of the sophomore year.

**Warren:** Was that the 2-5 program?

**Gryder:** The 2-5 program.

**Warren:** Tell me about that, because I found an article about that, but I didn’t understand it. It didn’t explain it well enough.

**Gryder:** The idea was that they wanted to get people that the medical school again might go on and do research, of getting them early enough so that they would get their degree a little early and also expose them to medical research. The idea was that they would admit them to get both a bachelor’s degree and a Ph.D., counting some of the courses they took at the medical school toward their bachelor’s degree. They were admitted at the end of their sophomore year. Then they’d get their bachelor’s degree two years later, based upon one year that would be mostly up here and then the four years of medical school. How long did it actually take and why was it 2-5?
Yes, the 2 was the two years they had before they got there. The 5 was the five years here. The first of those five years would be mostly at Homewood, and then the last four were essentially the four years of medical school. So it was condensing undergraduate years into three years, two of them from Hopkins and one of them from where they came from.

In order to get the bachelor's degree, which was a biological sciences area, biological area degree, they came in and counted some of the first-year medical school courses toward the bachelor's degree.

**Warren:** So these were students who were not necessarily Hopkins undergraduates.

**Gryder:** They mostly weren't. I was on that admissions committee and was also pre-med advisor up here. During those days when Ron Fishbein, who's now the pre-med advisor up there, was dean of admissions down there, our relationships—and also when Norm Anderson, during the time of Anderson and—I just gave the other fellow's name. What name did I say it was?

**Warren:** Ron Fishbein.

**Gryder:** Ron Fishbein. When Ron Fishbein and Norm Anderson were dean of admissions at the medical school, the relationships were very good. They trusted me, I trusted them, but there still was not ever a large number of undergraduates from Hopkins who went to Hopkins medical school. After all, this is a very good medical school, and we don't have all the good students. They wanted to have—over the years there were more people from Hopkins than anyplace else, but it was still, from the point of view of our huge number of pre-meds, it was a drop in the bucket. But they would also help me on advising students and things of that sort. There was a really very good relationship. I think that deteriorated a lot after they were deans of admission.

Actually, Norm, when he became—Norm took over from me as pre-med advisor at the
same time he stopped being dean of admissions at the medical school, because he didn’t like some things that had happened down there. The relationships got pretty bad, I think, during that time. I don’t think they’ve really improved a lot now, talking to Ron. They used to invite me down to sit in on their regular admissions committees and things of that sort, and then they got to the point that they said that was unfair, even though other medical schools were invited to come sit in. They wouldn’t let the people here.

Warren: So when you look back at the people you’ve influenced, I presume there are some pretty stellar people. Not necessarily naming names, but how does it feel to have had a very early influence on so many?

Gryder: Actually, it’s a very nice feeling most of the time. Actually, people that you didn’t even know that you knew will sometimes come up to you. I was over at the Coffee Mill sometime back, and somebody came up and thanked me for sending him in the right direction. Actually, this is the kind I really like. He’s become successful in a completely unrelated field, although he originally wanted to be a doctor. He thanked me for talking about both the good and bad aspects of medicine, and he was so happy that he decided not to go into medical school and partially because of what I had said to him. I liked that sort of thing.

Warren: That’s a success story, too.

Gryder: Yes, the success is if somebody ends up doing something that’s making them happy, and that you had something to do with it. So I think that’s more important than whether or not you—I’ve had some people who ended up as pretty high in various academic and medical situations, but I really like the ones that have done something else.

Another one is—I have trouble with names. It’s not Steve Hanke. Steve Hanke is—one of
the people in the art program, who was a pre-med originally, again one that I told him that he
could do things other than be a doctor and be perfectly happy, and he also has thanked me for
that.

**Warren:** What is it you most want your students to learn?

**Gryder:** How to think for themselves. The chemistry they’re learning may not be useless, but it
certainly is changed by the time they’re actually going to use it. I guess from the point of view of
their chemical career, what I wanted them to learn was how to find out things themselves, how to
check whether or not what they’ve been told is true or false, to analyze data in a critical way. And
I think it’s really the same sort of thing whether it’s in chemistry or philosophy or even literature.

And the only thing I got from being associate dean of the faculty was to decide that I
wanted to find out more about those crazy Frenchmen. The French department was—I sort of
became dean of the romance language department, because they were always fighting with one
another. [Laughter]

**Warren:** Tell me what you mean.

**Gryder:** Well, actually I’ll tell you what I consider to be sort of amusing kinds of things. I’ll
compare the—I was the language dean. I’ll compare the German department with the French
department. The French department had all sorts of machinations going on within it. The
chairman and some of his colleagues were always trying to do one another in, and they had all
sorts of deals they were trying to make with one another, outside people to get around rules. You
could tell the French department, “You have to do this. We can’t tolerate what you—“ [Laughter]
And they would say, “Yes, I understand. Yes, we’ll do it.” And they would go out and do exactly
what they they’d been doing before.
On the other hand, if you told the German department something minor, that wasn’t really—"Yes, sir." [Laughter] And it would be changed immediately.

After they would do one of these egregious things in the French department, they would find ways of making themselves loveable anyway. One time I got a copy of "101 Reasons to Hate the French." [Laughter] And it really was all of the things that they’d been doing that were spelled out.

As a result, I decided that—well, my wife and I wanted something to do after we both retired that would keep the brain operating a little bit, and we’d been studying French. I now read French very, very well. I don’t speak French well, but I can read. This is on the bestsellers list, *Le Grand Livre de Moi.* Actually, I bought that in Canada. At any rate, I spend a lot of my time reading French literature of one sort or another, and some of the skills you use in chemistry are the same sort of things of trying to track down a word that is being used in a strange way. I have dozens of dictionaries, French-English, all French, what have you.

Warren: All ready at hand there.

Gryder: Right.

Warren: Let me see. I think my tape is getting low, and I’ve got a big question I want to ask you. So may I switch over?

Gryder: Sure.

[Begin Tape 2, Side 1]

Warren: This is Mame Warren, and this is tape two with John Gryder on August 30, 1999.

You were here through a pretty unusual period that went on in the late ’60s and early ’70s.
Gryder: Oh, my. There are all sorts of stories about that. Oh, yes.

Warren: Let's talk about that. What did you witness?

Gryder: Well, actually it was more than witnessing; I was involved in some of the things. One of my best friends is Chet Wickwire. I don't know whether you've heard of Chet or not.

Warren: I've interviewed him.

Gryder: You did interview him? Okay. He's one of my best friends.

Warren: I'm a big admirer.

Gryder: My wife said I was a chaplain's chaplain. [Laughter] I personally feel that he is almost singly responsible for nothing really terrible happening to Johns Hopkins. There were some people who would have done some pretty bad things, and Chet held them together. He was both a—it's hard to explain. He would egg people on, but at the same time try to make them be responsible. And if he had an idea that he wanted to check out, he'd ask you about it. If you didn't really give him the answer you wanted, he'd come back and ask again. He kept things together.

The major incidents, I guess the times that I remember most, I was chairman of the board of managers of Levering Hall, and he was allegedly under their control, under the YMCA control. There was one day that we were having lunch with—what's his name? Bayard Rustin. [1910-1987. Special assistant to Martin Luther King, Jr., organized March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, president of A. Philip Randolph Institute, wrote Down the Line and Strategies for Freedom.]

Warren: Who?

Gryder: Bayard Rustin.

Warren: I don't know him.
Gryder: He was a black leader who at this point was in trouble with people because he was also a homosexual. I'm not sure what his job was, actually, at that time. At any rate, he was speaking on campus, and we were having lunch with him before his talk. Chester was also at that time—we didn’t have student amenities except for Chester, who did a hell of a lot more with no money than they do now with fortunes. At any rate, he’d brought *The Subject is Roses*, a play that was being given at Shriver Hall. He was having lunch with Bayard Rustin, and the Fighting American Nationals and the Nationals and the Ku Klux Klan were expected to be at the meeting. Okay? And in the midst of lunch, there was a desperate call from Shriver Hall that the union isn’t going to let the play go on. [Laughter] He thought he had agreement that he could use students for arranging the stage and things of that sort, and the union said he couldn’t. So he had to go over and settle that.

We finished the lunch. We go over, and, sure enough, the Fighting American Nationals are at the meeting. That was an interesting day, to say the least, but I guess that was probably after most of the problems had taken place. That was later.

Homewood House was taken over, as you probably know, but no trashing was done.

Warren: Tell me about that. I've seen some photographs, and I don’t want to be reading too much into pictures, but it looked like there’s Lincoln Gordon, and he looks like the least important person on the steps of Homewood House.

Gryder: I think he was.

Warren: It’s a very odd picture, looking at it from today’s perspective. What happened?

Gryder: Well, actually I wasn’t at that particular situation. I don’t even remember what they were demanding at the time.
Warren: I think it was during the Cambodian invasion.

Gryder: It was certainly around that time.


Gryder: But I don’t know what they were demanding from the university at the time. I don’t remember the sequence of events. It may have been that they—everything is a jumble, mixing this together. Was this before or after Kent State?

Warren: It would have been—Kent State was part of the whole thing. Kent State was as a result of the Cambodian invasion.

Gryder: Yes, but was the takeover at Homewood House before or after?

Warren: That I can’t tell you. That I can’t tell you, because I don’t have things finely honed here.

Gryder: Chet is the only person who would know what’s going on. The things that happened at Hopkins, the trouble with some things, some people sat in at the Academic Council meeting, a couple of students and Rick Pfeffer, a faculty member, which is a terrible thing to do. I don’t even remember what they—they wanted the Academic Council to be more open, I think. I don’t remember. I don’t remember what their beef was with the academic—why they sat in on the Academic Council. They asked for something and they hadn’t received a response or something, and they decided to go and get an answer, but I don’t remember what it was. And they took over Homewood House. It’s a terrible thing to say, but I don’t really know what they wanted the university to do.

Warren: A lot of schools were closing down or trying to close down.

Gryder: Yes, that’s right.
Warren: But I don’t know for sure--

Gryder: I think that they may have wanted classes to be called off or something of that sort.

Warren: Well, let’s not talk about the specifics. Let’s talk about the feeling of the place.

Gryder: Okay.

Warren: At that time.

Gryder: The feeling was very tense because all of these things were happening at other places. People were worried that similar things would happen here. I personally wasn’t worried about that because I really thought Chester would be able to keep things under control, which turned out to be correct. But people were making such stupid decisions.

I remember one time there was some—again I don’t remember what it was about, but there was some truce being reached between the president’s office and this group of rabble rousers, and they were having a meeting in Levering Hall. I was supposed to get their final—they were writing a document for the president to approve of, and they spent all morning arguing about the wording and what have you. They finally agreed to something and I had it in hand and took it up to see Lincoln Gordon—this is before Fort Gordon had been built—in Gilman Hall.

Warren: Garland Hall?

Gryder: No, that’s Fort Gordon. Or the Lincoln Memorial. [Laughter]

Warren: Garland Hall is the Lincoln Memorial?

Gryder: Right.

Warren: I hadn’t heard that.

Gryder: Or Fort Gordon. Both for Lincoln Gordon, because before then, the president’s office, all of that and all of the administration was at Homewood House. But for some reason this day he
was in Gilman. The dean’s office had moved to Gilman, and Gordon was over there. That’s probably because he was hiding from the students back at Homewood House. [Laughter]

At any rate, I take it in to him, and he said, "You would think that people who had that much education would know not to split infinitives." And that is my feeling about Lincoln Gordon.

Warren: Go on. Keep talking.

Gryder: He said, “I can’t approve of this with a split infinitive.” And I said, “You can’t make me go back and tell them that you’re not going to sign it because of a split infinitive. Do you agree with what they’re trying to say, even if they have phrased it poorly?” And I got him to reluctantly agree to what they were saying, even though the English was poor. [Laughter] I don’t understood how he could have ever been in the diplomatic corps. He was just the wrong person at the university. He would have been fine at a different time, I think, but he was completely out of it as far as any of these things were concerned.

Chester had a magnificent ability to keep the students in line, and I really think it’s almost entirely because of him that there was no trouble on campus. One time there was a march downtown that started here and moved off, but no violence occurred. I think it was because of Chester that it didn’t.

One time there was a strike going on at that time, that they weren’t letting people on to campus. That’s right. They’d let them on, but they had to stop them and listen to a speech. One of my colleagues, who I later sort of liked, was all ready to shoot them. But they just wanted to be sure that everybody who came on campus heard their little speech. [Laughter]

Warren: I have a whole file of pictures of protest. This place seems to engender a lot of protest.
Gryder: Oh, yes.

Warren: About a lot of things beyond Vietnam.

Gryder: APL has been--

Warren: Tell me about that.

Gryder: Well, APL, to my mind, really isn’t part of the university, but it’s becoming more and more part of the university because they’re selling. At any rate, it was supposed to be separate from the university. The students, I think incorrectly, thought that it was involved in nuclear armaments. I don’t think it ever was. But they felt that it wasn’t an appropriate thing for a university to be doing, and certainly Chester is one of the first people who egged them on in that regard. But they were always peaceful demonstrations. One time I think somebody did climb over the fence.

Warren: At APL?

Gryder: At APL. Many of the demonstrations were actually on campus. Sometimes they were at APL. I think although they don’t know that they succeeded in anything, I do think that for a long time they kept the intimate mixing of the university and APL. It’s gone. In the process I think they’re really joining the two together with the engineering school being—it began by engineering school offering evening colleges at APL, and I think there’s more cooperative research going on between them, and I think it really is becoming part of the institution. I don’t think—well, my personal feeling is that no commercial enterprise should be part of the university, whether it’s a government or commercial enterprise or Merck & Co. And that’s no longer true either at the medical school or here.

And I have lost that battle, but again I think the French are right. I think they should keep
the McDonald's and doped-up beef and genetic engineered grain out of their country.

**Warren:** They do have some points to make. One of the things that I have begun to pick up on is that there are some Hopkins myths.

**Gryder:** Yes.

**Warren:** What do you think falls under that category and where do they come from?

**Gryder:** I'm not sure I can—can you lead me on some kind of myth?

**Warren:** Well, there are several that I've heard, but one is that all Johns Hopkins students are pre-med. And in a way, now that you're telling me about these crypto pre-meds—

**Gryder:** No, no, certainly not all, but until recently—I don't know recently—there was certainly fifty percent. Their data never said that. One of the nice compliments I got from Mike Hooker, Michael Hooker, whom you may know, after he was here, he went off to be president of the girls' school Miniken [phonetic] and then he came back to be chancellor of UMBC—no. Well, he ended up at North Carolina, but suddenly died last month. At any rate, he was another dean at the same time I became a dean. He became a different dean. We had an explosion of deans, which was a stupid thing to do.

At any rate, he had received some information from the registrar's office that they were only going to have twenty-five percent pre-meds a year, and did I agree with this. I obviously didn’t agree with it, because I had an increase in the number of people in freshman chemistry, and by this time they'd also started having some engineers come in as biomedical engineers. At that time, if they were biomedical engineer, they actually were pre-med.

At any rate, I figured out three different ways for making an estimate that would include everybody really who was probably going to apply to medical school, and I came up with the
usual fifty percent. But the way in which I did it, by the three different ways, they were all convincing, made Mike think that I was great at looking at data, and agreed with me. So the exact number is somewhat difficult to come by, but it certainly was in the fifty percent for almost all the time I was here.

I think that they probably have decreased that number now, but some real efforts were made to increase it, because it isn’t good to have one group that large a fraction of the student body. It really isn’t even good for the science courses, because pre-meds really aren’t interested in chemistry for chemistry. Since we gave only one course, because medical schools only want one course, it restricted what you could do in the course.

At any rate, the kinds of things that were done—have you ever heard of “Johns Hopkins File Nine”?

Warren: No.

Gryder: That was one of the very early television programs. It was on the Dumant Network, was broadcast nationally, got reviewed in *The New York Times* and various other places.

Warren: What was the title of it?

Gryder: There were two of them. One was "Johns Hopkins File Nine," and I’ve forgotten what the other one was. It later became mostly science. But it was originated to try and show the non-science things that were going on and the non-medical things that were going on at Hopkins. It got national publicity, but it didn’t do a damn thing in increasing the number of non-science people. [Laughter] Non-pre-meds applying to Hopkins. Then it went on to—the other name almost came to mind. All of these things were done live.

Warren: Did you participate?
Gryder: I participated in one fiasco, yes, in which I left out a minute and a half of the program.

Warren: What happened?

Gryder: Well, there was no practice, okay? And I was supposed to ad lib at spots and I was supposed to read from the teleprompter at spots. At one point I forgot to go to the teleprompter, which left out a minute and a half. And Lynne Poole, who was in charge of all of these things, always made them come out all right. After I had left out a minute and a half of the program, Lynne added a minute-and-a-half speech of the importance of technicians.

The reason I had been called into this is that "The Glass Blower" had been a program previously, and he was from New Jersey and he talked about [unclear] points. [Laughter] Things of that sort. And the reviews came up about almost as stupid as the president’s later comment about splitting infinitives, that you would think that an educational institution would have somebody who could speak English, so they decided to have another one. This time they would have me do the talking to explain what he was doing. [Laughter] But I was not a television success, I’m sure. I never saw it. I didn’t have a television at that time. I’ve been tempted to go over and see if I can look at it.

Warren: I think they have a bunch of them.

Gryder: They have a bunch of them. Right. I don’t know that they’ve all been converted to a way that you could look at them now.

Warren: I don’t know.

Gryder: Because that’s what bothers me about the new way of keeping historic records. They’re going to be in forms that nobody’s going to be able to look at.

Warren: Videotape is going to fall into that category, too.
Gryder: Yes, that’s right. And so are hard disks. The other thing that’s going to happen there, I think, is that it’s going to be very hard to do historical research, literary historical research. It’s very interesting to look at manuscripts that have changed as the author didn’t like that, crossed it out, wrote something else. You won’t be able to do that anymore, because you’ll do it on your computer, change it, and it’s changed.

Warren: I’ve actually left manuscripts for my books with all the Post-it notes on them. That’s where a lot of the corrections are. I don’t know whether that adhesive is going to last, but for a while at least the Post-it notes are still there. I don’t know whether anybody wants to go in my tracks, but I think it’s important, too.

Gryder: I think that those things, people are losing sight of it.

Warren: Last question, at least from me. Do you think you can define a personality of Johns Hopkins? Does this place have a personality?

Gryder: I don’t think the university as a whole does. I’m not sure I can really define a personality to a person. I can’t define it now. I think that I sort of defined it when I was talking about Hopkins when I came. Unfortunately, I guess, from my point of view, what I would now describe it as is a bunch of entrepreneurs who are out for themselves, and that’s not a very nice personality. But I do think that’s sort of what it’s become.

Warren: Sort of what our society is.

Gryder: Our whole society has become that. Again, it’s the reason we need universities that had their own mission. Complaints about these things came from academic communities before, and I guess now it’s hidden in some people on the Internet perhaps, but I don’t think they really have much effect on what’s going on.
Warren: What haven’t I asked? What haven’t we talked about that we ought to?

Gryder: Well, I think some characters mostly from the past.

Warren: Colleagues. Tell me. Who should we remember?

Gryder: Well, let’s see. Actually, I guess most of them that I think should be remembered were a little before my time here. During my time, it’s harder for me. Well, Wilson Shaffer and Chet Wickwire are two people who should really be remembered, even though they were frequently on opposite sides of things. They both were, I think, very good for the institution.

And Painter from the history department.

Warren: Tell me about him.

Gryder: First of all, I have to remember his first name.

Warren: Sidney.

Gryder: Sidney. Right. He, again, was a person who had high standards, mixed well with people, I thought, even people way out of his field. He was in charge of something I don’t think still exists. What was it called? It was a monthly meeting of people.

Warren: History of Ideas?

Gryder: History of Ideas Club. It doesn’t still exist, does it?

Warren: What I understand—I am fascinated by that group. What I’ve been told is that it evolved into the MLA program.

Gryder: Oh, crap. The MLA program is nothing at all like History of Ideas. History of Ideas was the faculty and students, graduate students, just getting around and somebody would present a paper on something. The MLA is a program for the man on the street to get some liberal arts background, which was completely different from the History of Ideas Club. It may have been
that somebody had a History of Ideas Club, said it would be nice to be able to have a service to the community, have the M.L.A., but I don’t see any connection between History of Ideas Club. And that was mostly Painter at the time I knew about it.

Warren: Dick Macksey told me about it.

Gryder: Yes, Dick Macksey. You’ve talked to him?

Warren: Yes. He told me about it, and I got into the files from the club, and if I could ever get into a time machine, that’s where I would go, to the meetings of the History of Ideas Club.

Gryder: Yes. That was really, I think, a very–

Warren: So you attended them?

Gryder: I was a speaker for them a couple of times. I wasn’t a regular attendee. But, you see, that’s the other sort of thing that used to happen, I think is almost completely gone, the interaction between people in completely different fields. They wanted me to talk about it because they’d gotten interested in entropy.

Warren: Entropy.

Gryder: Right. They wanted me to talk about entropy and what I thought it had to do with, with the things they were interested in. Unfortunately, my feeling was that it was a misuse of the word “entropy” the way they wanted to use it, but the fact that they were interested and wanted to talk about it, I thought was really very good. And Macksey, of course, is very interesting.

Warren: Yes, he kept me on my toes for three hours. He was pretty impressive.

Gryder: Yes. He has thought about the subject that you’re interested in also.

Warren: In depth.

Gryder: In depth. That’s right. Whereas for me, you’re getting things coming from the top of my
head.

Warren: Well, I like that, too. I like that, too. I really want to thank you. I have gotten a lot of wonderful material here. It’s exactly what I was hoping for.

Gryder: Good.

Warren: Obviously you’re somebody who’s thought a lot about this place.

Gryder: I think I’ve definitely thought about the place, and it does pain me. I even thought I had done some things that were useful, but some of the things that I really had kept from happening for a very long time, they just waited for me to get out the door. [Laughter]

Warren: It’s called progress, right?

Gryder: Right. One of the things I stopped happening was a part-time Ph.D. for the local industries, which is essentially back. Indeed, we didn’t even give part-time M.A. degrees. That’s something that you may not—actually, let me go into this a little bit, if you might be interested. The degrees at Hopkins are very strange. We don’t give an M.S. in science or in chemistry or things of that sort. It’s an M.A. We don’t give—we mostly give Ph.D.s, and we don’t give a B.S. degree in chemistry; it’s a B.A. That’s because the only school that can give a B.A. degree at Hopkins is arts and sciences, which is no longer called arts and sciences.

Warren: Yes, it is.

Gryder: Yes. It used to be the faculty of philosophy. It’s no longer called the faculty of philosophy. But it can give a B.A. degree, an M.A. degree.

The medical school wanted to give degrees, and the requirements for those, you have to have a year of residence.

Warren: I’m going to need to take a break. [Tape recorder turned off.]
I apologize.

Gryder: That’s all right.

Warren: I’m very interested in this subject of degrees, and I’m thrilled you’re explaining this to me.

Gryder: Okay. The Ph.D. was also an arts and sciences degree only. The medical school started getting graduate students, actually mostly Ph.D. people, and they wanted to give an M.D. Ph.D. They wanted to have complete control of it. I don’t know whether it’s still this way or not. At the time I was chairman of the graduate board, and all such degrees had to come from the graduate board, which, since there were other divisions giving Ph.D.s, the board was a majority from arts and sciences, a member from medicine, a member from hygiene, and a member from engineering, and the rest were from arts and sciences.

Medicine was a little unhappy with this, because we were insisting that the final oral be given by a majority from outside the department, and all of their people are joint appointments, and they were having final orals in which everybody on the oral had actually worked on the thesis with the fellow, which was the reverse of what was supposed to be happening. So they wanted to take control of their degree. Actually, the provost at the time, Longakre, was all ready to go along with them, and I got the dean, Sid Suskind, to make sure that I was going to be his associate dean be there when he discussed it with my friend, actually, from the medical school, who was going to be explaining why they should be granted their own Ph.D., and I succeeded in stopping that.

A similar sort of thing was true in hygiene. They had adopted a—oh, the medical school and hygiene both had a doctor of science degree they could get, but they both wrecked the doctor of science degree and nobody paid attention to it anymore. Then hygiene had a doctor of public
health degree, but they also wanted to give a Ph.D. I succeeded in it happening only if it had to go through the graduate board. But those things last only as long as the boards take their job seriously, and I’m sure that they aren’t taking their job seriously. So that also is going to go down the drain. But I think it is important that the people tend to say, “I don’t care what degree they give,” but if it has the name “Johns Hopkins” on it, it reflects on all of us. And they don’t realize that.

Warren: Why is it that arts and sciences can’t give a bachelor of science degree?

Gryder: We don’t want to, because it’s been ruined. [Laughter]


Gryder: Well, okay. I mean actually our B.A. has been ruined, too. To get a B.A. in chemistry at Johns Hopkins, you can get by with taking absolutely no non-science courses. And even if you take the number you’re supposed to, you have to take fewer than I had to take to get a B.S. from Cal Tech, which is a technical institute. Our B.S. degree has been completely shot. Sorry—all of our degrees have been shot, but the B.S. degree started out being degraded first.

Warren: So it literally cannot be given now?

Gryder: No, no. Actually, that’s an amusing thing. The B.A. degree is given by the engineering school for their bad degrees.

Warren: And do they issue a bachelor of engineering degree?

Gryder: Yes, they also give a bachelor of engineering degree and a B.S. degree. The low man on the totem pole is a B.A. in engineering. They allege it’s because they’ll be able to get a broader group of people applying. It’s only given at the end when somebody can’t make the other degrees, they get a B.A. in engineering.
Warren: I understand.

Gryder: That was a sellout by one of the recent deans. Now it doesn’t mean anything. The Ph.D. still does require a thesis that has to be approved by people outside their department as well as within their department, and there is one examination that is universal. That’s the only quality control on Ph.D.s now.

Warren: So would it be fair to say that at this point you’re disillusioned with Johns Hopkins?

Gryder: Yes, it would be fair. Indeed.

Warren: And if you could write a prescription for the future, what would it be?

Gryder: I’m afraid I think that the institution is on the critical list.

Warren: Well, sometimes there are miracles.

Gryder: Yes, yes.

Warren: So if you could have a miracle happen, what would you see happening?

Gryder: Well, my first miracle to happen would be to stop trying to be the best undergraduate school in the country, which you’ll never be. Indeed, I guess a real miracle, I’d like to do something that George Owen, who had Wilson’s place after Wilson stopped doing it, sort of the dean of the whole campus. George Owen proposed seriously, when one of our former presidents was pushing for increasing the undergraduate student body, instead of increasing the undergraduate student body, get somebody to endow the undergraduate student body so that we didn’t charge tuition, and even worked out a procedure in which that would be possible. First of all, it would decrease the number of students dramatically. You’d sort of go back to the situation that actually came about the same time I did, that we remembered from our youth. And he worked out a way in which it almost certainly could have been done.
And the fact that it’s possible, Cal Tech is an example of that. When I was there, they had a hundred freshmen a year and now there are about 175, I think. They haven’t hurt monetarily because of that. I think that’s the thing that would most quickly change things. Where it is now, I can’t conceive how they could afford it anymore, because you’ve gotten all these students and you’ve started building things for them, forgetting that that means you really didn’t make money on them when you started getting them, because you’re now spending even more. And it’s a vicious cycle.

We’re sort of becoming something that—actually something that I would enjoy as a resident of Baltimore. They’re becoming a service institution for the immediate neighborhood by the things they’re doing, and that’s all good, but it’s not the primary function of the university. And anything that I can see that would help the primary function of the university would just change things to such an extent that I can’t envision it ever happening.

The increase in the undergraduate student body is obscene, over 1,000 a year now. The total undergraduate student body was about 600 when I came in. And the faculty hasn’t gone up by that much.

You know why we became coeducational?

Warren: Tell me.

Gryder: Well, it wasn’t because we had seen the light and thought that women were equal to men; it’s because everybody knew that women would be humanities, social science, and history majors. And so if we admitted women, we’d get all that additional tuition and it wouldn’t crowd our—they’d all go where we want them to go. Needless to say, that was a very bad reason. They split exactly the same way the men do. They weren’t a cheap way of getting additional money,
and it’s cost money to have facilities necessary. So, again, that was not—it was done for money-making procedures which backfired.

Warren: All right. You brought up a subject we ought to talk about. My little light is flashing. I’m going to flip the tape over.

[Begin Tape 2, Side 2]

Warren: Let’s talk about coeducation and the impact it had here.

Gryder: Actually I don’t think it really had much of an impact. It didn’t have the impact they expected, anyway. I think that the women have done as well, if not better, than the men. I think there have been some departments they’ve had some trouble getting appropriate treatment, but I don’t think—

Warren: What do you mean?

Gryder: There certainly were faculty members who didn’t want them in class. Things of that sort. But those have mostly died off. I think they’ve just added to the institution. I don’t think there was any reason not to admit them before.

Warren: Was there resentment at the time?

Gryder: Not a lot, I don’t think. Maybe some of the students, but I don’t remember anybody being upset about it, really. Other than some of us—my wife, who has a Ph.D. in biology, immediately recognized that their reason was stupid, but I really don’t think there was anybody who was particularly opposed to them.

Warren: I’ve gotten the impression that Shaffer wasn’t a big fan.

Gryder: Wilson may not have been a big fan of it, but I don’t think he did anything to fight it particularly.
**Warren:** I wondered about that. I’ve just read a few statements by him. I wondered whether he acted on his feelings.

**Gryder:** I don’t think he did. At least I never heard of anything. Also I know that he was helpful to some of women who came. I think he may have seen some problems that the rest of us didn’t see, because even while he was dean, he was in charge of the psychological clinic, and he saw some aspects of the students that the rest of us didn’t see. So I think it was probably because of those sorts of things, but academically I don’t think he had any objections to it.

**Warren:** That’s a good point. I hadn’t thought about that. All right. Are we really drawing to a close here?

**Gryder:** I think so.

**Warren:** Every time you say something, it takes an entirely different direction. [Laughter] And I’m so grateful.

**Gryder:** You might be interested in how the faculty club became coeducational.

**Warren:** Oh, do tell.

**Gryder:** Well, what is now the Eisenhower Room used to be the ladies’ dining room.

**Warren:** Literally?

**Gryder:** Literally. It was called the ladies’ dining room and it was the ladies’ dining room. At lunch, women were not admitted in the other half of the building. They could eat at the ladies’ dining room. For that matter, men weren’t permitted in the ladies’ side of the building unless they were accompanied by a lady. [Laughter]

**Warren:** And were there no female faculty members?

**Gryder:** There weren’t very many, but then there were a few. Clearly, given the description I
made of the faculty club at that time, it was a big disadvantage to not be able to eat at that big
table, to be able to—you could only be in private dining rooms on that side. You could be in
private dining rooms, but you couldn’t be in the main dining room. Mary—what’s her name, in
psychology? She just died last year, too. You probably know her. She’s psychology of mothering
children.

**Warren:** No, I haven’t heard the name.

**Gryder:** Names. [Laughter] At any rate, she was really very unhappy that she couldn’t stay on
that side. And there are two stories. I don’t know whether my story’s right or this. I’ll tell you this
one first. Is that one day she just came and sat down at the big table and nobody complained. But
I don’t think that’s what really happened.

What I’ve always believed—and I think that Bob Strider actually told me this—that he
thought that it was bad that the women faculty members couldn’t come to the men’s side, and he
was at that time on the board of the faculty club, actually in a position which he could change the
rules to some extent without getting them approved. And he decided to define women faculty
members as not being ladies, and therefore they didn’t have to eat on the ladies’ side. [Laughter]
Knowing Bob, I think that’s really what first happened.

**Warren:** That’s wonderful.

**Gryder:** Women faculty members were then permitted to come to the other side, and that caused
more trouble than making the school coeducational. There were some people who were ready to
resign over that sort of thing, but that didn’t really cause any trouble very long, and so it got
broadened to what it now is.

**Warren:** That’s wonderful. I love that.
Gryder: And that was rather late. I don’t remember exactly when that was.

Warren: Are there any women left from that time period?

Gryder: Yes. Doris Entwistle. She would certainly remember. She was here at that time. Unfortunately, Albright has come into my mind, and that’s not the right name.

Warren: I’m not very good with names either. I understand. I’m going to track that down. I love that story. That’s marvelous.

Gryder: I don’t know which one she will tell you, but I really think that the final—it may be that Mary came in and sat down and Bob was at the table and nobody complained, and then he decided to make it permanent.

Warren: Sort of a melding of the two.

Gryder: Yes. I think a melding of the two may be the one. Allowing blacks in was also a—that’s a real change here.

Warren: Tell me. Talk to me. You’re absolutely right.

Gryder: Well, when I first came, this was not only an all-white institution, it was an anti-Jewish institution also. Indeed, Isaiah Bowman didn’t hide his anti-Jewish feelings and had a real quota for Jewish admissions. He had just resigned when I came. Our paths didn’t cross. But my wife is Jewish, and I didn’t know this. I’m not Jewish. In order to get married, I became Jewish, but I’m not really Jewish. It was sort of a shock. I went to one of the faculty members at one of the meetings and they were talking about admissions, and somebody came up and he said, “Well, that name sounds awfully Jewish, but he doesn’t look Jewish.” Needless to say, blacks weren’t even considered.

I don’t remember exactly when it was, probably in about ’55 or ’56, something of that
sort, I had hired a black technician. I didn’t really realize it was going to cause trouble, but as soon as I hired her, people began to say, “That’s a terrible thing you’ve done. Where is she going to go to the bathroom?” And I said, “I presume where all the ladies—” “But then all the secretaries will quit.” Well, I stuck by my guns, and she went to the bathroom and nobody quit. But it still was a very bad thing to have done.

She had been with me for several years and was leaving, and I was going to have a lunch for her. When you have lunches, you always take your people to the faculty club. I was saying, “Let’s go to the faculty club and have lunch,” and Ella said, “You can’t take me to that. I can’t go to the faculty club.” I said, “Why not?” “They won’t let me in.” I knew that I’d never seen any over there, but I didn’t realize that the club itself had those rules. I said, “That can’t be true.” She said, “Yes, it is.” She said, “I’m not going to go until you find out that it’s all right.”

So I called up and I was told, “I’m so sorry we can’t serve Negroes because the waitresses wouldn’t serve them.” The waitresses, of course, were all black. At any rate, that’s the way it was. Again, it was Bob Strider who opened that up.

Warren: Who was he?

Gryder: He ended up dean of students. He was an accountant, professor of accounting. I don’t think he had a Ph.D. But a very good man, other than being an alcoholic, which did him in finally. He did lots of good things.

Warren: I’m just realizing that you were here for another big time. You have been here a while.

Gryder: Yes, I’ve been here a while.

Warren: Why didn’t I realize as I prepared for this, all these things that you’ve been witness to. Did you know Owen Lattimore?
Gryder: I said hello to him on campus, yes. That was just before I came.

Warren: Wasn’t it ongoing when--

Gryder: Yes, it was ongoing.

Warren: What was it like to be on the faculty? What was talked about at meetings?

Gryder: Depends on which faculty member.

Warren: Exactly. Talk to me about it.

Gryder: Malcolm Moos was a very reasonable person, even though he was a--do you know Malcolm Moos?

Warren: No.

Gryder: He was a professor. I’m not sure what department he was in. Either--political science, probably. At any rate, he’s the one who became a speech writer for Dwight Eisenhower at one point, and he is the person who actually put in that statement about the military-industrial complex. That was Malcolm Moos’ statement when he went off to be president of a college in the Midwest someplace, a university in the Midwest. Well, he was on Lattimore’s side, in a sense.

On the other hand, if you were around [George] Carter, who was the one who accused him at that party--

Warren: Who’s Carter?

Gryder: He was a faculty member. What department was he in? He might have been--I’m not sure what department he was in. I want to say Near Eastern studies, but I don’t think it was. He was sort of--George Carter was his name. There was a party at Lattimore’s house that Carter said he saw some classified documents in the bedroom, and he thought Lattimore was a Communist, so he denounced him. Then [Joseph] McCarthy did, and so on. It’s almost certain that he wasn’t.
But it certainly depended upon who you were talking to as to Lattimore’s status.

The university isn’t really as clean as it sounds that way, because Lattimore had a very strange position. He didn’t have a Ph.D. and he didn’t have a professorial position with tenure. I’ve forgotten what they called him, but he was director of the—what was the name of that institute that later became the SAIS [School of Advanced International Studies]? Walter Hines Page School of something or other. He was director of it. And he had a letter from a colleague saying that although he did not have the title of professor, he had all of the tenure rights of that title. It was really because of that letter that he was allowed to stay. There were lots of people, particularly on the board of trustees, who wanted to get rid of him, but because of that letter they were afraid the stink would be more than keeping him, so that’s the reason he stayed. He rode his bicycle onto campus. They continued paying him, but they didn’t allow him to do anything.

It was not a good time. Actually, I guess Hopkins behaved better than many universities at that time, but not as well as it should have, behaved.

Warren: It was a really tough time.

Gryder: Yes. Actually, it was because of that that I changed my research endeavors. I was a nuclear chemist and did my—while, it was officially Columbia, I was actually working at Brookhaven National Laboratories, and I decided I didn’t want to do that because of the secrecy involved, and changed my field of work.

Warren: You didn’t want to be another Owen Lattimore?

Gryder: I didn’t want to worry about what I could and couldn’t say, and I didn’t think that the best research was done under conditions that you couldn’t talk to people about what you were doing. Indeed, I also feel that the secrets were never really kept, because only the good people
didn’t get them. You hired people who were funnels back. You were only keeping it from people
who—the people you didn’t want to know already knew, whereas the people who might have
helped you if they had known didn’t know.

I guess the thing that really got me was when I went off to—while a graduate student, I
discovered that you couldn’t really live in New York City on $100 a month, even in 1947. So
after trying that for a short while, the man I was working for, who had been on the atom bomb
project at Los Alamos, and a friend of his who had started a company, Tracer Lab, that was one
of the first people to make counting equipment. And Tracer Lab had been called in at the very last
minute on one of the Eniwetok test experiments, because the Air Force was originally going to do
the chemistry involved itself and suddenly decided they couldn’t, and hired Tracer Lab to do it for
them. The president of Tracer Lab, whose name slips my mind, called his friends who had gone
into academic life and said, “Hey, don’t you have some graduate students who’d like to earn some
money.”

I decided that $500 a month with a $6 a day per diem, because at that time Hawaii was a
territory and gave $6 instead of $5 a day per diem, and you could live for about $2, I decided that
was a good thing to do. So I went out on that Eniwetok experiment and spent six months in
Hawaii. Then also said I didn’t want to do anything that was classified, because it was so stupid.

It’s long enough ago I can tell you the foolish way we were checking to see whether or
not the Russians had dropped an atom bomb in those days. There were Air Force air weather
planes flying all over the world, and the idea was to put the big piece of filter paper on an air
intake as they were flying around, and that big piece of filter paper would collect dust and what
have you, and you would be able to determine what radioactive materials were there, and you’d
detect when somebody had exploded an atom bomb. Its big test was to be when we actually did explode an atom bomb in Eniwetok in ’47.

Our job—it shows how good the planning was. [Laughter] We were hired right around January, and they didn’t have the slightest idea how they were going to test it. We had to devise a complete analytical scheme for taking this filter paper and extracting various things and counting them and what have you. I’ve forgotten the date that the bomb was going to go off, but we only had a couple of months design what we were going to do, to set it up in a barracks in Hickham Field in Hawaii, and so we had to order all the equipment, plan what we were going to do, and we were sent in the plane along with the equipment. We got there and discovered that we had Bunsen burners but we didn’t have any gas. So they had to fly in tanks of gas for our Bunsen burners.

At any rate, the stupidity of the classification came out almost at once, because one piece of filter paper was only secret, but two pieces of filter paper—the filter paper that had come in the planes—two pieces were top secret. Now, you could send secret things by registered mail, but top secret things had to be sent by courier. And every once in a while they would get upset because some analyses would look wrong when they were sticking pins in the maps in the Pentagon, because our scheme was—well, the reasons don’t make any difference. But we had to ship off filter papers, and they didn’t want to send them by courier because that was a big pain. So we were told to send them by registered mail, one piece in each envelope. So you did that. You took it over to the post office and they all went in one mail bag. [Laughter] I just couldn’t put up with that sort of nonsense.

Warren: No, that would test anybody’s patience. Isn’t that amazing.

Gryder: Also we were told that Time magazine was a terrible publication because they had used
the word “radioactivity” in one of their articles, and we couldn’t say “radioactivity” because nobody was supposed to know what we were doing. Nobody had really explained to the person who was in charge of seeing that we behaved ourselves, that that was only a local prohibition. I think you can see why I didn’t want to have anything more to do with that after six months.

Warren: I think there are many thousands of students who are grateful that you chose to do what you chose to do.

Gryder: I think there’s some who are.

Warren: I’ve heard rumors there’s a lot of them. I really want to thank you.

Gryder: You’re entirely welcome. Actually, you’ve reminded me of the good times that I liked here.

Warren: Well, good. You’ve taught me a lot about things I needed to know.

Gryder: Mostly now, when I come in three days a week and see people, I get told about the terrible things that are happening, and I’ve forgotten the good things.

Warren: Well, I hope that that will be part of what comes out of this book, but also a lot of thinking about how to make it better for the future.

Gryder: Good.

Warren: Thank you.

[End of interview]