

An Oral History of

# MURRAY ROSENBLATT and STANLEY CHODOROW

On August 27, 1999

1 **ROSENBLATT:** —at least, relative to the math department. I don't know about other  
2 departments. Though, in one case I heard a similar representation. It seemed to me to totally  
3 wipe out the history of it.

4 **CHODOROW:** Yeah.

5 **ROSENBLATT:** Before— Now, what do you think was the object of this? To indicate that be  
6 it—?

7 **CHODOROW:** Well, I think that the author [of] [give title], Nancy Anderson, was not capable  
8 of understanding the intellectual development of this campus or what was going on in research  
9 and teaching and so on. And so, she focused on the, what might be called by academics, the  
10 external history. The politics, the financial arrangements, the gathering of the land for the  
11 campus, the struggle to make the campus, to put the campus here as opposed to down in  
12 Balboa Park where—out at Murray Lake; Lake Murray I guess it is called—all of those things  
13 which were accessible to her. Whereas, you know, what was going on in the math department  
14 or what did people have in mind when they founded the history department or whatever, was  
15 something she just couldn't understand. She had no interest in it, she had no understanding of  
16 it. That's what we're after. We are after the intellectual history of the institution [University of  
17 California, San Diego]. I will say that I think Nancy Anderson's history of the externals was not a  
18 very good one. I read it in draft a couple of times and urged Dick [Richard C. Atkinson] to quash  
19 it, but he had put too much money into it and he wanted it out. It's not a good history on any  
20 grounds.

21 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, couldn't he have suggested that she go around to a number of people?

22 **CHODOROW:** Well, he did to the degree he could, but she had a timeline and was in a  
23 hurry. It was very— She found this project, I suspect, very difficult because she seemed not  
24 able to get it right by the standards that were kept around here. She kept making—being told  
25 that she had this wrong or that wrong, and I think in the end she cut her losses.

26 **ROSENBLATT:** I see. Insofar as the math department— Well, it would be understandable, I  
27 suppose, from someone who didn't have much of a knowledge whatsoever of understanding  
28 how a department structures itself or grows. Well, she mentioned [Michael H.] Freedman, she  
29 mentioned [Shing-Tung] Yau that was the only thing.

30 **CHODOROW:** That's right.

31 **ROSENBLATT:** And there was no indication even relative to Freedman or Yau. You know,  
32 what they had done or—?

33 **CHODOROW:** That's right, exactly. Well, it wasn't exactly— I would have a difficult time  
34 explaining to a layperson—you know, understanding myself as a layperson—what both of them  
35 did. But that's what I'm struggling to do to a certain extent, but I'm not— We're really interested  
36 in something even before, much before Yau certainly got here.

37 **ROSENBLATT:** Oh. Well, that's actually what I thought I could supply. [*inaudible*]

38 **CHODOROW:** That's exactly right. Let me explain what we've been doing and what the  
39 special circumstances in the Math department are as a result of Stefan [E. Warschawski]'s  
40 death. We have been asking founding chairs questions that have to do with the vision that they  
41 had, the academic or intellectual vision they had when they came here; what was the state of  
42 the discipline, what was happening in the discipline at the time, what was their particular take on  
43 it, how did that affect what they intended to accomplish when they came to found their  
44 departments in this institution? And then, how did early recruitments of—you know, as you  
45 succeed and you fail in your recruitments—how did that affect what they started with as a vision  
46 for their department? And our period is from the beginning of the departments, which most of  
47 the time is between 1960 and 1968 depending on the department, and around 1975 by which  
48 time—well, we'll push it later in certain cases—the departments had accomplished or become  
49 corporate units, in effect. And the founding chair and his vision is submerged into a corporate,  
50 political life of the department—the life of a normal department. Now, in the case of  
51 mathematics where we do not have the testimony of the founder, we are seeking many  
52 testimonies of people who came early and who were part of that and who have a perspective on  
53 what Stefan himself was trying to accomplish. But also, of course, can comment on themselves  
54 as people who were already launched in their careers—many of them quite senior in the  
55 department—and who were coming here with their own aspirations in relation to what they had

56 experienced in their careers, what they had viewed as the state of the discipline at the time. And  
57 we're trying to seek their view. And you fit into that as an early member of the department.

58 **ROSENBLATT:** Sure. Well, actually I think I did bring along some notes or remarks on the  
59 early history of the department—

60 **CHODOROW:** Good! Wonderful.

61 **ROSENBLATT:** —on those people who were recruited at a certain time. But Warschawski  
62 actually came—Stefan Warschawski—in 1963. And I don't know what the difficulty might have  
63 been in attracting the chairman at that early point or not. I gather— Let's say— A well-known  
64 mathematician called Aberhardt Huff—who actually didn't have a background as a chairman,  
65 but actually is a very well-known mathematician—was thought of initially. And I think he must  
66 have suggested Warschawski, who had a very good reputation. He had built up a good group at  
67 the University of Minnesota. So Warschawski came, and the first year he was here alone. And  
68 the next year he began recruiting and I was one of the people.

69 **CHODOROW:** So you came in '64?

70 **ROSENBLATT:** That's right. At that time there were a number of senior people that he  
71 recruited and a number of junior people, actually, the initial list—. Do you want me to give you  
72 the initial list?

73 **CHODOROW:** Yeah. I'd love to know who they were.

74 **ROSENBLATT:** Sure. Well, the initial list—I guess this is in alphabetical order—I'll tell you a  
75 little of what happened to them. We didn't— Glenn Baxter who resigned a year after that—

76 **CHODOROW:** Was he a junior person? Was he—?

77 **ROSENBLATT:** No, he was a senior. A very young, very bright fellow. You know, probability  
78 theory. But there was a difficulty at the beginning, which you may or may not be interested in. I  
79 don't know.

80 **WESTBROOK:** Well, yeah. What do you know?

81 **CHODOROW:** That would be very interesting.

82 **ROSENBLATT:** Then Clay Perry, who I think was there the first year. Burt [Burton] Rodin,  
83 who came with Warschawski.

84 **CHODOROW:** So he was a junior person?

85 **ROSENBLATT:** At that time, he was a junior person. Helmut Röhrl was a senior person.  
86 Myself and Frank [B.] Thiess, who was a junior person. That was the first year. And the year  
87 after— Well, I'll just remark about Glenn Baxter. He was very good, actually, and thought very  
88 well of himself. But in a certain sense, at least, my interpretation of the events or whatever runs  
89 as follows. I think [Jaap] Korevaar wanted to become chairman.

90 **CHODOROW:** Had Jaap already come?

91 **ROSENBLATT:** He had already come—

92 **CHODOROW:** Okay.

93 **ROSENBLATT:** —and he wanted to become chairman. So somehow there was an issue as to  
94 a difference in salary as to whether someone had been promised he had been given the highest  
95 salary, and someone had gotten a salary slightly higher and not— In some sense I think Baxter  
96 would have had some difficulty already and he was supposedly was going to be recruited by  
97 NYU [New York University]. He would have been, except he got into a disagreement over the  
98 recruiting, let's say, of his mentor—a fellow called Dansker. And when Dansker was recruited  
99 there was a big flap about money. I don't know if I should call it a minor flap in that area. But he  
100 felt rather resentful, and I think could be revved up very easily, and he probably had a super-  
101 exalted notion of himself. And I think Korevaar may have taken advantage of this and circulated  
102 a letter about it. I luckily went on—by virtue of Warschawski—not a sabbatical since I didn't have  
103 the right for it, but on a Guggenheim [Foundation Fellowship] to England at that time, which was  
104 quite nice. I wasn't around the next year when Baxter left. But I think it was rather unfortunate,  
105 because Warschawski, I think, was very good. It had later consequences, because I stepped in  
106 a few years later on as chairman just for one year because Warschawski had what was called a  
107 "heart insufficiency", and I was willing to take on the chairmanship for one year but no longer.  
108 Anyway, this was part of the initial hecticness. Various people may have different interpretations  
109 of this. Probably Röhrl, if you can get him, would have another interpretation—perhaps similar to  
110 mine. Rodin, perhaps a little different as a junior person. I don't know. Anyway, this caused a  
111 little difficulty at the beginning. And maybe there were semi-rumblings thereafter, because it

112 actually did have an effect on a number of us as we were recruited. That is, we had a certain  
113 orientation—I did and some of the others—as to how we'll, let's say, select a chairman. Of  
114 course, you do want a good chairman to build up the group, but the notion was once you've built  
115 up the group sufficiently to have a department to have a certain representation and vote for a  
116 two year period for a chairman— Mainly, if I vote a chairman in whom I found difficult, well, I  
117 could live with it for two years, but—

118 **CHODOROW:** Two years, right.

119 **ROSENBLATT:** And if he worked out well, have another two-year term. And that's actually, I  
120 think, how it worked out.

121 **CHODOROW:** Right.

122 **ROSENBLATT:** I think we knew that Korevaar would become the chairman at some point.

123 **CHODOROW:** How long did Jaap stay here?

124 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, he did become chairman. Let me see when he was [refers to papers] —  
125 I think that's indicated here. He did become chairman in the period 1971-73, but I think shortly  
126 thereafter I guess there was the divorce and he left to go to, I think, the Vrije [?] University of  
127 Amsterdam. But there's a sort of peculiar background in a certain sense, because, you know,  
128 many years later on when I had a sort of celebration for Warschawski after a certain number of  
129 years and Jaap Korevaar came back. He comes back to visit his children. And I thought it  
130 strange: he got up there and— Well, ordinarily you would think at someone's celebration you  
131 would make pleasant, sort of positive remarks. Well, I found the remarks very strange. [laughs]  
132 But of course, maybe there was a certain amount of background or different orientation—

133 **CHODOROW:** How long did Warschawski remain as chair in those first years?

134 **ROSENBLATT:** He only— Let's see [consults papers]. He remained as chair from '63-'67;  
135 from '67-'68 I took over for him—

136 **WESTBROOK:** You took over for one year.

137 **CHODOROW:** For one year.

138 **ROSENBLATT:** —you know, as chairman. And then Helmut Röhrl thereafter, '68-'71;  
139 Korevaar '71-'73; and Don [Donald W.] Anderson '73-'77. So that's actually the sequence.

140 **WESTBROOK:** Right.

141 **ROSENBLATT:** I think Warschawski did want to build broadly in mathematics, but it is true  
142 that the department he built at Minnesota was very good at analysis and applied mathematics. I  
143 think he did try to attract a certain number of people from there—perhaps more than he was  
144 able to. He did manage to get Röhrl to come with him, and Rodin as a younger person came  
145 too. But let's see, the very next year—I guess, that was the year '65-'66—Errett [A.] Bishop  
146 came. Errett Bishop was at U [niversity of] C [alifornia,] Berkeley, and I guess there may have  
147 been— What was it? I guess there was a student movement there. And I never could get any  
148 detailed reading on what his attitude was toward that, but I gather he was uncomfortable for a  
149 variety of reasons. And so he came, and that was a very good addition. And let's see, Ted  
150 [Theodore T.] Frankel came, Hubert Halkin, someone called Eugene Lee—who left—and  
151 [Stanley G.] Williamson. Then that third year—I guess that was the last year Warschawski  
152 came—someone called Barry Eke, who resigned, Jay [P.] Fillmore who is still here, Richard  
153 Faber—someone in algebra who resigned. Then a number of people who are still here: [Adriano  
154 M.] Garsia and [Ronald K.] Geetoor, Pat [Patrick J.] Ledden—

155 **CHODOROW:** He came in '66-'67?

156 **ROSENBLATT:** Sixty-six, sixty-seven. And Don [Donald R.] Smith, who's still here. One or  
157 two people came but left— [William B.] Gragg and [John A.] Holbrook. But generally, it was a  
158 good background in, well, mainly complex variable theory with the addition of people like Garsia  
159 and Geetoor. I think that was the strong replacement of probability theory, and they're still here.  
160 So, part of the setting of the department was already indicated in some sense. It became  
161 broader later on with, let's say, recruitment under people like Anderson. I guess Freedman, I  
162 think, actually came as a young fellow **when** Anderson was chairman. And the department has  
163 broadened, not simply in analysis but, well, in areas of applied mathematics.

164 **CHODOROW:** Was there a difficulty in attracting applied mathematicians here? And was  
165 there any resistance from the campus?

166 **ROSENBLATT:** I don't think there was. Well, it depends on what you call applied  
167 mathematics.

168 **CHODOROW:** Okay.

169 **ROSENBLATT:** It's defined in different ways in different countries. But I came from an applied  
170 mathematics department at Brown [University], for example. Well, there are people, and you  
171 know, probability theory itself ranges from quite abstract to quite concrete and quite applied. I  
172 think perhaps the difficulty may have been recruiting people into algebra and topology. That was  
173 more difficult to do, but they did recruit people in that area, eventually.

174 **WESTBROOK:** And why was that more difficult?

175 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, I think it's in a certain sense a reflection of the field itself. You know,  
176 various fields have notions of prestige orientation, whatever. Initially analysis, I guess,  
177 traditionally was a very strong area in mathematics. But then there was a certain period, let's  
178 say, in the '20s and '30s where fields like topology and algebra became more popular. And even  
179 to this day, even though applied mathematics has become much stronger in the country, applied  
180 mathematics some people might regard as a sort of orientation importation from Europe, in a  
181 certain sense. In fact, the department I came from at Brown originally was set up by people from  
182 Europe. But— Well, I suppose even today if you look at places like Harvard [University], Yale  
183 [University] and other places, they are very strong in topology and algebra but perhaps not so  
184 strong, in many cases, in analysis. It's a question of orientation. I think now the shift is actually  
185 beginning to go back towards analysis. But these vogues I think may play a heavier role in  
186 mathematics than they do in other fields—the notion of what's prestigious or not.

187 **CHODOROW:** And when a field rises in the estimation of mathematicians as a hot field or a  
188 prestigious field, what effect does that have on the way of recruitments in those areas? Do  
189 people associate those fields with specific departments and want to go there and not to go to  
190 other places? Or does it spread out through the field?

191 **ROSENBLATT:** I think there's a bit of that. There actually is a bit of that. Well, later on, for  
192 example, I don't know. In the case of— Of course, Freedman was quite interested in having  
193 Yau. People [*inaudible*] Yau. He's a Fields Medal winner like Freedman.

194 **CHODOROW:** Right.

195 **ROSENBLATT:** But Yau had a very strong, let's say, personality in a certain sense that one  
196 had the feeling— Of course, that's my orientation and others in the department have another  
197 one. And there was quite a bit of disagreement over it. I think he wanted to dominate. Not

198 something— Not appointments in his own area, though certainly marvelously qualified, but I  
199 think he wanted to determine appointments in all areas. And we also didn't know, you know,  
200 what commitments the administration might or might not have given him that was never clear.  
201 And so later on that caused a certain difficulty and schism in the department.

202 **CHODOROW:** And he was here for—what? —five years?

203 **ROSENBLATT:** Let me just see [consults papers]. It's— I think he came— the time that Halkin  
204 was chairman. Yes, that's right. He came in '83-'84 and resigned in '87.

205 **CHODOROW:** Yes. So I was about right.

206 **ROSENBLATT:** He went to Harvard.

207 **CHODOROW:** Yeah. Let me go back a little bit then and follow this up. You've gotten us to  
208 '66-'67. What happened after in the next—? You were then chair for a year. And did you get to  
209 recruit some people?

210 **ROSENBLATT:** Yes. Not as many. Let's see, there's Steven Andrea, someone in topology,  
211 Brooks Ferebee in geometry and probability. Those are people who didn't— That actually  
212 wasn't in my year. That was the last year of Warschawski. That may well have been. Someone  
213 called Carl [H.] FitzGerald in analysis, [Alfred] Manaster in logic; and Michael [J.] Sharpe, you  
214 know, who was chairman fairly recently. A very good chairman. I guess— Let's see, in the year I  
215 was in, someone called Allen [B.] Altman, John [?] Donald—these were people in algebraic  
216 geometry and algebra—they left. John [W.] Evans in biomathematics—he retired in 1994—and  
217 in computer science. Someone called [Francis J.] Flanigan in algebra who left. Jon Luke in  
218 applied mathematics. And then [Norman A.] "Al" Shenk in partial differential equations is still  
219 here. But then they were the arrivals. Of course, they were the people recruited in my time.

220 **CHODOROW:** Right. But they arrived the next fall.

221 **ROSENBLATT:** They came when Röhrl was chairman. And then Röhrl continued and  
222 recruited someone called [Laughlin] Campbell in complex spaces, someone in numerical  
223 analysis—they both left. Someone called [David] Golber in the groups who left, someone in  
224 topology, and [John] Wavrik who's still here in algebra. And then I think appointments were  
225 squeezed.



226 **CHODOROW:** Right. In the early '70s things—

227 **ROSENBLATT:** That's right.

228 **CHODOROW:** —almost stopped, because the university—

229 **ROSENBLATT:** That's right. In '70-'71 [Lance W.] Small was still around in algebra, and then  
230 Anderson became chairman. The next year there's no indication. In '72-'73 Audrey [A.] Terras  
231 came, in number theory, and that was the year that Korevaar left. And in '73-'74 things opened  
232 up a bit: [Edward A.] Bender was recruited in combinatorics, [Leonard] Haff in statistics and [J.  
233 William] Helton in functional analysis and operative theory—they're still here. John Rice was  
234 recruited in statistics but left unfortunately in 1991. And [Daniel E.] Wulbert in approximation  
235 theory is still here. So, I guess then things must have opened up in '73, '74—

236 **CHODOROW:** Yeah, right.

237 **ROSENBLATT:** —because there were quite a number of—

238 **CHODOROW:** Let me ask— Do you want to ask something?

239 **WESTBROOK:** Well, I have a question that maybe might circle back to the first ten years  
240 [*inaudible*]. And you may have skirted the answer to this, but I was going to ask the question  
241 anyway. You had all these new people here, starting in '64, for four years: What was the vision  
242 of the department in making those hires? Just to repeat Warschawski's experiment of  
243 [University of] Minnesota? Or was it something else?

244 **ROSENBLATT:** No, I don't— I think Warschawski's notion was to try to build as good a  
245 department as he could have, actually. And he wanted to make it a fairly, I think, broad  
246 department.

247 **WESTBROOK:** Were there models for that? Or model— Any particular models?

248 **ROSENBLATT:** Oh, I see. You mean perhaps it might be a mistake to build too broadly. But  
249 well, I think he wanted something that wouldn't be large numerically but, let's say, good people  
250 and in a number of representative fields. Certainly, there was a very good start in analysis called  
251 "ability theory". But he did probably more to build up in algebra. We all had some interest in  
252 algebra and in topology itself. I think the model— I don't— Well, I guess there were various  
253 different models, as you can see from my remarks about a few of the Ivy League schools, like

254 Harvard and Yale. There was a very strong orientation in certain areas, although Ivy League  
255 schools like Cornell [University] would have a much broader orientation, actually. And I suppose  
256 what happens at a particular school may depend on both the chairman and, let's say, strong  
257 personalities in the department as well as the opportunity. Part of the atmosphere at the time,  
258 it's hard for me to place myself. And again, I guess the aftermath of Sputnik [Soviet satellite],  
259 that might have made things more difficult. I mean, for recruiting in certain areas.

260 **CHODOROW:** Plus, the competition was much greater.

261 **ROSENBLATT:** I think competition in certain areas was much greater. And I think it is true in a  
262 variety of fields, as you said. I mean, a school is very broad and strong in a certain area, that's  
263 where they want to go rather than a place where they might be alone. Of course, they might try  
264 to encourage people to come by [*inaudible*] recruit two or three people who work together.

265 **CHODOROW:** And in that relation what—? Was the strategy to give one of each? Or was it  
266 to get two or three of each in the different areas?

267 **ROSENBLATT:** I think the notion would have been to get two or three of each. But you know,  
268 it's also— You have this argument even to this day; I mean, different people have different  
269 orientations. There's the following sort of attitude occasionally, but not infrequently. You go out  
270 and say you want to get the best person in the field of mathematics: my own feeling is that's an  
271 ill-defined question, because mathematics is a fairly broad area. And you can argue about who  
272 is the best person in the field. I think that depends on what they think is the most interesting  
273 field. There can be a wide range of judgments there. But that's actually— I'd say even in the last  
274 few years when I was acting in the department, I'd have lots of people saying you want to get  
275 the best person in mathematics.

276 **CHODOROW:** Which is one reason why you get five hundred applications for every position.  
277 Because you don't define what field you're interested in; you're just advertising "mathematics".

278 **ROSENBLATT:** That's right. After a while one does— People were willing to say, yes, we'd  
279 like to get people in certain areas. But quite often you have that sort of argument. It would  
280 occupy an incredible amount of time. I mean— Well, even if you had preferences, I would  
281 imagine you'd choose two or three areas and say I'd like to get a very good person in any of  
282 these areas. I don't know what typically happens in history, for example.

283 **CHODOROW:** They're much more closely defined. It will say something like we want a  
284 Twentieth-century American historian. Often we'll go one step further and say we want a social  
285 historian, we want an economic historian and that narrows the field quite a lot.

286 **WESTBROOK:** We— Well, I'll mention now that we just hired a new university librarian and  
287 went through that same sort of dilemma: Well, do we go for the best librarian out there or try to  
288 find one that meets our needs? The best position-player, if you will, to tap into that artful  
289 metaphor.

290 **CHODOROW:** Right.

291 **WESTBROOK:** We opted for the latter strategy in looking for sort of what the needs are of the  
292 library.

293 **ROSENBLATT:** Well I would think, for example, in history— I have some mild interest in  
294 history—or sometimes ancient history and archaeology. I feel it would be rather silly to say  
295 who's the best person—

296 **CHODOROW:** Exactly. And in fact, one of the things I want to follow up with you was that  
297 whether it is the case in mathematics as it is in physics, for example, and in some other field  
298 where people in the field actually think there is such a thing as a "best" mathematician. Because  
299 no historian could ever think that way. Or a literary scholar or— You know, there [is] a cadre of  
300 important people.

301 **WESTBROOK:** Well, I think that goes on in all disciplines—

302 **CHODOROW:** Do you?

303 **WESTBROOK:** —this notion of— I mean, I think everybody will finally see that there is no  
304 "best" [*inaudible*] person. I totally also think that you can probably find someone who has  
305 tremendous expertise in some area, but also a great deal of breadth to go with it. You know, so  
306 maybe—

307 **ROSENBLATT:** There are occasionally such people, but they're quite remarkable. But  
308 occasionally. And of course, on such occasions I'd say yes, we'd like to get a person like that.  
309 Usually it's quite difficult. But I mean, these are cases of people who might be regarded, I would  
310 say, as the "greatest mathematician of the century" or— Well, one of the stellar people of the

311 century. And usually quite often it may be a person with some breadth. Sometimes it may be a  
312 rather narrow person who has introduced, let's say, remarkable new insights in the particular  
313 area. But I think usually even— Well, I don't know. Even with respect to Fields Medal winners.  
314 Okay, there are three or four Fields Medal winners every four years, let's say, so there's some  
315 notion that there's a spread there. Even with respect to Nobel prize winners: you know, they say  
316 that. There's a certain aspect of what you might call the excitement of the local time, notoriety.  
317 Sometimes it lasts, sometimes it doesn't last.

318 **CHODOROW:** Well, good. Did you want to ask another—any other questions about this?

319 **WESTBROOK:** Well, following up on that notion of what was the vision that was driving that  
320 early development, what were some of the impediments to that vision to realizing it. Were there  
321 any problems other than when you—?

322 **ROSENBLATT:** I think one of the impediments—this is my guess, I'm not sure—would be  
323 what I've already referred to, for example. I did try to recruit some people in statistics— Well, I  
324 did succeed at some point, but some drifted away. There was an attitude there. Many of these  
325 people get their degrees in a statistics department rather than a mathematics department, so  
326 some of them are— I don't know whether they're insecure or whatever, they feel happy in a  
327 statistics department. On the other hand, if you're in a statistics department—now things may be  
328 a bit broader—things get to be very narrowly defined, so much so that some of the interesting  
329 statistical problems are not in the standard classical domains. So you'll find statisticians don't  
330 look at it; people in engineering and other areas—applied mathematics—look at these  
331 problems.

332 **WESTBROOK:** Right.

333 **ROSENBLATT:** And some of them may turn out to be the most interesting problems to  
334 people. So this—

335 **CHODOROW:** When we had that continuing difficulty at Penn [University of Pennsylvania]—  
336 Wharton [School] had a department of statistics that was consistently regarded as narrow, and  
337 because of its narrowness and its aversion to classical issues, somewhat pedestrian. Well, it's—

338 **ROSENBLATT:** I think if you limit yourself to certain, very fixed areas, yes, you have a  
339 tendency to reject new ideas.

340 **CHODOROW:** Right.

341 **ROSENBLATT:** I mean, I don't know who was in the department at that time. Let's see,  
342 when—

343 **CHODOROW:** I was there from '94 to '97.

344 **ROSENBLATT:** I see. I see. Yeah, so you probably had a pretty good idea of, let's say, the  
345 feeling some people had about it. Yeah, I think that's been— I think there's been an effort to  
346 broaden the scope in a number of statistics departments, but I think there's still a bit of that  
347 orientation. And I think that can happen with respect to other fields too, if they're too narrowly  
348 defined. That can be a difficulty.

349 **CHODOROW:** Let me ask a question about in your record of who came and who left and so  
350 on, in a way your faculty—relative to other departments we've talked to about this early history  
351 of this early period—was more in flux. You were recruiting more people and you were losing  
352 more people, right? And there was another example in philosophy which recruited a group: they  
353 stayed together for a few years, and then it broke up in the '70s and they couldn't replace them  
354 in those fields. So they started to— The nature of the department began to change. In your case  
355 there seems to have been a lot more flux continually, from the beginning.

356 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, I think there's a reason for that. Actually, I don't think there's that much  
357 flux at the senior level aside from this initial local upset, which I think was—

358 **CHODOROW:** Right.

359 **ROSENBLATT:** But I think it's very definitely a flux with respect to the younger people  
360 because there was the notion, well, here are these people coming as assistant prof[essor]s, and  
361 in the transition to associate prof we're really going to look at them quite carefully. And so most  
362 of the people, I think, left—

363 **CHODOROW:** In that— So you were—?

364 **ROSENBLATT:** In that— Well, we can just try to—

365 **CHODOROW:** They tried to be tough-minded to—

366 **ROSENBLATT:** I think there was a tendency initially to be tough-minded. I think later on it  
367 lapsed. I'm trying to just see [refers to notes]. Let's see: well, Eugene Lee, a junior person;  
368 George Senge, a junior person—that was in '65, '66; no, these were junior persons—Barry Eke,  
369 a junior person; Richard Faber, a junior person; [William B.] Gragg [Jr.] in numerical analysis—  
370 he was a senior person and actually quite good—[John] Holbrook, a junior person. Then  
371 [Steven] Andrea and [Brooks] Ferabee, these were junior people; [inaudible] Waltzman and  
372 [inaudible] Donald, these were junior people who left; [Francis] Flanigan—

373 **CHODOROW:** I remember Donald, actually.

374 **ROSENBLATT:** Jon Luke. I think also [Philip] Erdelsky, [David] Golber— I think these were  
375 all—practically all junior people. [Glen E.] Baxter, of course, was a—you know, who left after a  
376 year—senior person and very good. But you know, Baxter— You see, Baxter was a very sad  
377 case in a certain sense. I think really— I don't know what would have happened otherwise. I  
378 think he was revved up over, I don't know, whether it was a difference of a hundred dollars or  
379 two hundred dollars in salary. But I think there was— I think perhaps he was offended. His  
380 mentor was taken into NYU and he could have gone too, but he had this exclusive notion he  
381 should have gone, his mentor shouldn't have gone. There was a bit of fuss in the limited part of  
382 the mathematical community over this thing. But I think he was probably revved up emotionally,  
383 and he may have had a super-exalted notion of himself. He was very good, but— I remember  
384 he once came to me—and I thought something was a little off at that point—and he had said—  
385 Well, he had proven something that Norberg really had proven in a much neater and more  
386 elegant way, and therefore he assumed that he was at least as good as ——— [inaudible]  
387 Norberg ——— [inaudible]. Well, I thought this was a bit overdone. And you know, he did  
388 have very high aspirations; he wanted to solve the four color problem. But, you know, he left. He  
389 went for a position with a very high salary at Purdue [University]. But his wife [name?], who was  
390 very supportive—a very bright lady herself—I guess after a few years they split, and he stayed  
391 on at Purdue. I think there must have been quite an emotional drain on him. I think eventually  
392 the claim is after many years he committed suicide.

393 **CHODOROW:** Yeah.

394 **ROSENBLATT:** So it's a tragic story. And you know, it might have gone that way anyway,  
395 but—

396 **CHODOROW:** Well, he sounds like a man with a personality disorder of some kind.

397 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, some sort of difficulty, anyway. Sometimes people want super-  
398 exclusivity and, let's say, absolute say-so in all things.

399 **CHODOROW:** Right. That's right. Is this—would you think, from your observations—more  
400 characteristic of mathematics and mathematicians than it is in most others?

401 **ROSENBLATT:** I don't know. I mean, mathematicians can make rather extreme statements.  
402 Well, one field relative to another there can be strong biases that arise at times. What happens  
403 in history? Well, of course history is a more discursive area, perhaps.

404 **CHODOROW:** Yes, that's correct. And it's also— And also you come to history, typically,  
405 much later in life.

406 **ROSENBLATT:** I think that's true.

407 **CHODOROW:** Because many mathematicians—not all, but many—are child prodigies, in  
408 effect.

409 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, that's true. I mean, it generally may be true that mathematicians do their  
410 best work when they're younger, but it's not always true.

411 **CHODOROW:** No. No, it isn't.

412 **ROSENBLATT:** But there is that sort of fiction. In fact, that's one of the unfortunate, I think,  
413 hilarious things about the conditions for the field. [*inaudible*] single notion is that this will only be  
414 awarded to someone below the age of—

415 **CHODOROW:** Right, the age of thirty. Thirty-five?

416 **ROSENBLATT:** Forty, I thought it was.

417 **CHODOROW:** Forty.

418 **WESTBROOK:** That's a stipulation of the medal?

419 **CHODOROW:** Yes.

420 **ROSENBLATT:** That's right, yes.

421 **WESTBROOK:** I had no idea. [*inaudible*]

422 **ROSENBLATT:** It's a very hilarious affair because— It's hilarious in terms of this, you know,  
423 rather notorious affair. Let's say that probably one of the most startling affairs was this solution  
424 of Fermat's problem, actually—the proof of Fermat's theorem. Now this was done by someone  
425 who I think—what was he when he did that?—forty-one or forty-two. Now, I mean it's such a  
426 remarkable affair—

427 **CHODOROW:** Right.

428 **ROSENBLATT:** It's a three-hundred-year-old problem, and to set a condition like that— Of  
429 course, one tries to make it up in other ways, but I mean, it's part of the silliness of it.

430 **CHODOROW:** As a matter of fact, I will tell you that I picked up the first volume of the  
431 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* yesterday, and one of the very first  
432 notices in it was of the death of Fermat—1665—which had been recorded from Paris to  
433 correspondence in London. And it brought this back to me. You really are talking about more  
434 than three-hundred years ago.

435 **ROSENBLATT:** Oh, yeah. I mean, it's a historical fact of mathematics.

436 **CHODOROW:** Right. That's right.

437 **ROSENBLATT:** And it's— Yeah, it was truly a startling affair that one would say ordinarily this  
438 was somewhat beyond the usual level of the Fields Medal winner.

439 **CHODOROW:** Right. Let me ask a question about the relations with other departments. It  
440 was obvious that you had to have— Even before they decided they would be a general campus  
441 they had to have mathematics in some way.

442 **ROSENBLATT:** Sure.

443 **CHODOROW:** Certainly, the physicists were interested in mathematics, at least for the  
444 training of their students if not for collaboration of any kind. What other—? What were the  
445 relationships between the existing departments which, in the early '60s or mid-'60s, included  
446 virtually all of the science departments and the two departments of applied science that would  
447 become engineering eventually?



448 **ROSENBLATT:** I don't know the full details, but it was quite clear there were hassles of the  
449 usual things like number of appointments or space—space became—[*inaudible*]. And in the  
450 case of some departments, I don't know, lots of space would be claimed and you would have  
451 the feeling they weren't using the space. And well, you can always use the space by expanding  
452 certain aspects of your operations. But there would be unfortunate things of that sort. They  
453 might occupy a certain amount of time..

454 **CHODOROW:** Is it the case, though, that departments like physics regard the mathematics  
455 department as a necessary educational enterprise for their students but otherwise pay no  
456 attention? [Rosenblatt laughs] Or is there actual consultation and collaboration?

457 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, I think there was actually, I thought, for a while—I may be wrong—the  
458 joint teaching of a course. There were courses actually taught, basically, for people in physics. I  
459 mean, for example there was a course in mathematical methods in physics, you know, and it  
460 was taught by a variety of people. I think [Frank] Thiess taught it quite often, [Jaap] Korevaar  
461 taught it quite often, Audrey [A.] Terras taught it a number of times. And I don't know, it may still  
462 exist. So I think physics was interested from that point of view. And physics would be concerned  
463 about, let's say, what sort of topics students who were going into physics were taking their initial  
464 calculus courses—what would be the sequence? There would always be discussions, I gather, I  
465 think even at an early point but certainly now, I gather, discussions with various departments  
466 about a sequence of topics: what you were going to have and [*inaudible*].

467 **CHODOROW:** Right.

468 **ROSENBLATT:** One thing that did arise after a while—and I think that I was against, but it  
469 happened—that various other departments, like engineering departments, would begin to  
470 develop their own essentially mathematics courses. And of course, this can sort of be a threat to  
471 a mathematics department. Ordinarily, I think, initially one tried to keep the courses in the math  
472 department. I think during—

**[END OF PART ONE, BEGIN PART TWO]**

473 **CHODOROW:** —what about the split-off of some people into computing? When did that  
474 start? And had that already—? Was that already an issue in mathematics by the time you got  
475 there?

476 **ROSENBLATT:** That was an issue, and I don't know the full background of that. For that it  
477 would have been good to have [Stefan E.] Warschawski. Maybe [Helmut] Röhrl would have a  
478 much better feeling. You see, [Errett A.] Bishop— Bishop's initial reputation was in complex  
479 analysis and he had a very, very strong reputation. But he got interested in foundations and I  
480 guess in some— That's one of the unfortunate aspects of it. Bishop was very good. Actually, he  
481 did very good work in the foundations. He felt he wasn't appreciated in that particular area in the  
482 field at large, actually. Well, it's— I think it's a characteristic of any discussion of foundations;  
483 there are always arguments and no one agrees. But I guess he couldn't accommodate himself  
484 to that, so— I think he withdrew after a while, but he did good work there. I suspect he had  
485 rather strong feelings relative to computing. I don't know what they were, but apparently he  
486 was— The impression I had was he was using some advisory committees, and I think possibly  
487 due to his attitude method in, let's say, computing, some aspect of it was taken out of the  
488 department. I personally think it was a mistake, but I don't know the full details of what went on.  
489 And I don't know, it was rather hard to get into a discussion with Bishop on these things. I mean,  
490 it may have been a sensitive area. Eventually, I guess computing I think developed to a greater  
491 extent in one of the engineering departments and then split off.

492 **CHODOROW:** Well, I remember instances from the '80s when there was discussion about  
493 moving people from mathematics into one of the computing engineering departments—such as  
494 [Michael L.] Fredman—because their work was more germane to those fields and the math  
495 department was less interested in that. And what I was wondering about was, how old was that  
496 problem?

497 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, I don't think— Well, there are people with— Well, areas in computer  
498 sciences—some of them are quite close to mathematics or are mathematical. But there are still  
499 people in the department who have interests that perhaps relate to computing in the sense of  
500 combinatorial things. I mean, that would be true of—what? —[Edward A.] Bender and [Adriano  
501 M.] Garsia. And then we had a very strong person at one time also, who was here for a few  
502 years, [Janós] Komlós.

503 **CHODOROW:** I knew him.

504 **ROSENBLATT:** And he left to go to Rutgers [University]. But he was here for a few years. But  
505 you see, with [Michael L.] Fredman— The situation with Fredman was initially he was unhappy  
506 in computer science, so he went from computer science to mathematics. Then later on maybe

507 he felt the situation was slightly different in computer science, so he went back. And it was so.  
508 Look, I mean I think a thing which was unfortunate about what happened—the differential in  
509 salaries. I think that was a big mistake, you know, to—

510 **CHODOROW:** Well, most of us did but—

511 **ROSENBLATT:** True. And I think it was done on fallacious grounds, see, because the claim  
512 was that salaries were higher in engineering. They weren't. They varied tremendously. But I  
513 think some people were very active politically—

514 **CHODOROW:** Right.

515 **ROSENBLATT:** —and were able to push it through. So, sure. I mean— Well, someone called  
516 [Stanley G.] "Gill" Williamson also in— Well, he went in there. I think partly he may have had—  
517 But I think partly it was the salary too. And when they were having their difficulty, he was willing  
518 to serve as chair. So yeah, that's sort of the boundary, right.

519 **CHODOROW:** Talk a little bit about students—graduate students. Were you able early on to  
520 attract good students and what is—? And what's happened to those students? Math graduates  
521 had good academic careers. Have they gone into industry or what have they done?

522 **ROSENBLATT:** I think— Let's see, the students I've had most recently— Let's see, they've—  
523 A few of them have gone into industry. The very last student I had I guess is actually— Oh, what  
524 do they—? What's the sort of position one has in the medical school? An adjunct.

525 **CHODOROW:** An adjunct position.

526 **ROSENBLATT:** Yeah. He's got his degree in statistics. I think a very bright guy, but—

527 **CHODOROW:** Doing bioinformatics?

528 **ROSENBLATT:** Yeah. I mean, I think that's— I think the medical school claims to want  
529 biostatisticians, but I think they're not willing— Maybe they have a shortage, but they're not  
530 willing to come through with tenure positions.

531 **CHODOROW:** No, they do not.

532 **ROSENBLATT:** But I think it was a mistake. I actually think it was— I think it's good for the  
533 fellow to go into this position as an adjunct assistant professor for a few years. But you know, I  
534 think if it just keeps on that way I think he should leave because I think it would be  
535 disadvantageous for him, you know. Because that will—

536 **CHODOROW:** What about the early students?

537 **ROSENBLATT:** Oh, let's see. I guess one of my early— I guess the first graduate student I  
538 had may have been in '69 or '70 here. I had graduate students at Brown [University].

539 **CHODOROW:** Right.

540 **ROSENBLATT:** I think he actually went into industry. But I think most of the others have gone  
541 to academic positions.

542 **CHODOROW:** How many students at a time do faculty in mathematics handle?

543 **ROSENBLATT:** I don't know, it depends on the area. For example, people in combinatorics  
544 may have a large number of students. They may be the complaint of one area relative to  
545 another.

546 **CHODOROW:** Right.

547 **ROSENBLATT:** Not so much on my part, but I've heard complaints that somehow, it's made  
548 easier for them. And also, there's the attraction of saying well, this is very close to computer  
549 science, and you can get a job in computer science.

550 **CHODOROW:** Right.

551 **ROSENBLATT:** So, they would have a greater number of students while people in other areas  
552 most recently had had a number of students, but not that many. For example, probability theory  
553 is probably a recently strong group. I guess, let's say the— So that's my most recent student  
554 [Anthony Collins] Gamst who just got out of here. He's in—what is it called? —

555 **CHODOROW:** Family and community medicine?

556 **ROSENBLATT:** Community medicine, right.

557 **CHODOROW:** That's where most of the epidemiology is done.

558 **ROSENBLATT:** That's right, that's right.

559 **CHODOROW:** Typically, mathematicians are made part of a team on these large,  
560 complicated grants that they get in this field where they'll have, you know, half-a-dozen faculty  
561 and they'll have these adjuncts. And each one has a particular role to play. And they need the  
562 mathematician and don't want to make that person a tenured member of the faculty because  
563 persons in that position are not contributing in a direct way to the academic enterprise.

564 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, I don't think that's—

565 **CHODOROW:** But that's what happens.

566 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, I don't think that's true. I think— Well, for example— I have an example  
567 in someone called Ian [S.] Abramson, I think a rather bright fellow. He hasn't advanced that far. I  
568 think part of it is his personality. He's done a lot of work for the people in the medical school, but  
569 I think they've never given him enough credit because he's always at the tail.

570 **CHODOROW:** Right. That's right.

571 **ROSENBLATT:** And you know, he should have tried to write up, let's say, some of the stuff  
572 separately. But that's a difficulty with the medical school. They need biostatisticians.

573 **CHODOROW:** Right.

574 **ROSENBLATT:** In fact, they may have difficulty with some of these visiting groups because  
575 they don't have them. But somehow, in spite of all claims they're not willing to invest enough in  
576 them.

577 **CHODOROW:** Well, at [University of] Penn[sylvania] they had this difficulty and we  
578 eventually pushed the dean to create a department. And he pulled— As a result, there were  
579 people like this around the medical school attached to various departments as adjuncts, and  
580 they pulled them together—the better ones; the ones who were not just sort of hacks—into a  
581 department of bioinformatics and biostatistics.

582 **ROSENBLATT:** Sure.

583 **CHODOROW:** And the notion was that in that context you would get better appointments  
584 and you would get theoretical work that was important to them.

585 **ROSENBLATT:** I think that's— I think that's true, and it's— Well, it would even be reasonable  
586 possibly to have it in a mathematics group if it was sufficiently broad enough, but you have to  
587 have— We do have a few people but, I mean, there has to be, let's say, reasonably decent  
588 relations. You have to give people credit too.

589 **CHODOROW:** Right.

590 **ROSENBLATT:** I think at University of Washington they have a bio— Well, they have a  
591 biostatistics department, an epidemiology department and I think they have a fairly good  
592 reputation.

593 **CHODOROW:** [To Westbrook] Are there other things? Do you think that we've forgotten  
594 anything? Very good. Would you be willing to allow us to have copies of this data that you have  
595 put together?

596 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, I— Let's see, this is— I had a copy of— This was the year I was  
597 chairman. I don't know if it's of any value, but—

598 **CHODOROW:** Oh, sure. This is always of value. And we can cull the material that is of no—  
599 You know, that is no longer— That we have duplicates of and so on.

600 **ROSENBLATT:** Right.

601 **CHODOROW:** But you never know until you look.

602 **ROSENBLATT:** Then there's something here where they give the field, but somehow they've  
603 left me only as a statistician. But I have had interests in probability, so in my scrawling way I'll  
604 put it in. Yeah, actually this is part of a history they compiled. I just— You know, the day before I  
605 thought I'd look at the website of the math department.

606 **CHODOROW:** And this comes off of that site?

607 **ROSENBLATT:** Okay. So I thought this would remind me. Maybe it's of interest to you—

608 **CHODOROW:** Oh, yes. It is definitely.

609 **ROSENBLATT:** Okay. And well, it's— I'm sure it hasn't been— I'm sure there's no objection to  
610 it. After all, if it's on a website it's available to everyone. So—

611 **CHODOROW:** Yeah. There's no problem. Well, good. Thank you. It's a very interesting thing  
612 to do that no other department that I know of has done.

613 **ROSENBLATT:** Oh, really?

614 **CHODOROW:** Yeah. And we didn't know to go look—

615 **ROSENBLATT:** I see.

616 **CHODOROW:** —for this because no other department that we know of has done it. It's a  
617 wonderful thing, it really is.

618 **ROSENBLATT:** Yeah. Let's see, I may also have a listing of other people. Then it depends on  
619 whether the person himself is interested in having a website or not of greater detail or lesser  
620 detail.

621 **CHODOROW:** Right.

622 **ROSENBLATT:** But— Let's see. I don't know that I've given that impression, but really the  
623 math department was a good, strong department. And the notion which I got—and which this  
624 lady appeared to have gotten [Nancy Anderson, author of UCSD's historiography]- -was that  
625 there were two figures in the entire history of the math department.

626 **CHODOROW:** Right.

627 **ROSENBLATT:** I thought that was totally absurd.

628 **CHODOROW:** Yeah, it is.

629 **ROSENBLATT:** And I'd— By the way, I don't know if it's of interest to you, one of the persons  
630 from whom I've heard a similar representation [name?]- -which I found rather astonishing,  
631 because she's a person who served quite often as the historian for Scripps [Research  
632 Institute]- -she said it was an utterly distorted history.

633 **WESTBROOK:** Is she at Scripps?

634 **CHODOROW:** Yeah. We'll talk to her.

635 **ROSENBLATT:** I see you're not surprised at all.

636 **CHODOROW:** I'm not surprised at all. Not at all. She— Nancy Anderson's judgment about  
637 who was important was based on a—well, what I'll call a haphazard and accidental notion of  
638 fame. So the two Field prize winners that you knew, that was by definition fame. And the Nobel  
639 prize winners in the other departments and so on, these are the people who were, by definition,  
640 "important" and all the other people were not.

641 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, it looked as if possibly in some departments she might have gotten  
642 slightly better information. I didn't read it. What was your impression about history?

643 **CHODOROW:** She had no understanding of it.

644 **ROSENBLATT:** No understanding of it. So your impression is that pretty uniformly throughout  
645 the whole—

646 **CHODOROW:** She moved through—

647 **WESTBROOK:** She did that almost with every department. [*inaudible*] track people that have  
648 little awards attached to their name, like Fields, but even in literature she went more with two or  
649 three people who just seemed to have the greatest fame. I mean, you know—

650 **CHODOROW:** Right. Notoriety or fame.

651 **WESTBROOK:** Yeah.

652 **ROSENBLATT:** Yeah, but how could she even determine—? Well, yes Fields is looked at as  
653 a—

654 **CHODOROW:** It was on her— She is quite ignorant of these things, and she— So she was  
655 easily swayed by either hearing about something or reading something.

656 **WESTBROOK:** Right.

657 **CHODOROW:** So if she went and found some article that dealt with the work of somebody in  
658 literature, that person obviously was a famous person.

659 **ROSENBLATT:** I see.

660 **CHODOROW:** Whether that person, in fact, did work that was important or had an effect—an  
661 important kind of effect on the department was something she could not [—————?].



662 **ROSENBLATT:** What was her background, actually?

663 **CHODOROW:** She had actually written what was regarded as a reasonably good history of  
664 [Ulysses S.] Grant and [Robert E.] Lee and had done the research to do that. She was kind of  
665 an independent historian and had done journalism as well. Now, David McCulloch is an  
666 independent historian and has done some very interesting work.

667 **ROSENBLATT:** Yes, but he— He's done— Well, I don't know. I haven't read her. But he's  
668 done a rather decent— I read this work of his on [Harry S] Truman, which is—

669 **CHODOROW:** Right. Well, the first thing I came across was probably his best as a historian,  
670 which was *The Great Bridge* which was about the building of the Brooklyn Bridge.

671 **ROSENBLATT:** Oh, I see.

672 **CHODOROW:** And it's really a remarkable piece of work. It was both a technological history,  
673 an economic history, a history of the city—

674 **ROSENBLATT:** Sure.

675 **CHODOROW:** —a history of the social structures which supported the building of the  
676 bridge—what happened as a result of it. It was quite a terrific piece of work. And she was in that  
677 genre of a person who was independent of any academic institution and had written a well-  
678 regarded history.

679 **ROSENBLATT:** Sure. By the way, I didn't mean to give the impression that the math  
680 department was riven by dissension only.

681 **WESTBROOK:** No, no. Not at all.

682 **ROSENBLATT:** But I imagine these sorts of difficulties arise in all departments.

683 **CHODOROW:** That's right. Absolutely. And very often— What's interesting and that here  
684 that you have revealed about Stefan [E. Warschawski]'s role in being [*inaudible*]?

685 **ROSENBLATT:** I think he was, by the way, very important because— I tell you that because I  
686 think he and his wife [Ilse Warschawski née Kayser] — It would be worthwhile even speaking to  
687 his wife.

688 **CHODOROW:** Ilse [Warschawski].

689 **ROSENBLATT:** Ilse [Warschawski]. They played a very strong role in the atmosphere of the  
690 department. I mean, some aspects of it—in spite of it—a bit like a family in the beginning. And  
691 it's a large department today. Yeah, it gets together but there's not the same sort of feeling one  
692 had initially in spite of, you know, this—

693 **CHODOROW:** So his role— One thing that was interesting was that he was chair, really, for  
694 four years.

695 **ROSENBLATT:** Yes.

696 **CHODOROW:** And one has the image of his role in the department having lasted for years  
697 and years and years.

698 **ROSENBLATT:** But it did.

699 **CHODOROW:** And it did, in effect, in an unofficial way.

700 **ROSENBLATT:** In an unofficial way. Because I felt his opinion and his experience did play a  
701 role for a long time. And as I say, heavy aspects of it that are—

702 **CHODOROW:** Was he regarded as a very good judge of mathematicians in a variety of  
703 fields?

704 **ROSENBLATT:** I think— Well, I think he was certainly in areas of analysis. And even in other  
705 fields he would I think— Well, he would not take just anyone's say-so. He would really try to  
706 investigate on his own and rely on people with whom he had some confidence in. So really, his  
707 role was really much, much stronger than you would imagine.

708 **CHODOROW:** From the fact that he was chair for just a few years.

709 **ROSENBLATT:** That's right. That's right. I'd say it has extended in a certain sense, even well  
710 through the '70s.

711 **CHODOROW:** In the '80s he was a very elderly man who came to the campus, I think, every  
712 single day—

713 **ROSENBLATT:** Right.

714 **CHODOROW:** —and was working I think with Burt [Burton Rodin].

715 **ROSENBLATT:** And he was working with him. Their areas were similar. And I gather he was  
716 quite the mathematician in his specialized area, and I think a very sober person. Well, I liked it.  
717 It was great for me. I was able to get away that second year—well, we went to England.  
718 Because— Well, given the first year, I can imagine— I really think that probably he had had a  
719 past history of—

720 **CHODOROW:** Some heart problems.

721 **ROSENBLATT:** —heart problems, but I think it must have had an effect on him I would say,  
722 this maneuvering.

723 **CHODOROW:** With [Glen E.] Baxter?

724 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, with [Korevaar] probably.

725 **CHODOROW:** Yeah, with [Korevaar].

726 **ROSENBLATT:** I mean, I think Baxter had his own difficulties, but may have been some  
727 innocent tool in that.

728 **CHODOROW:** Right.

729 **ROSENBLATT:** In a way it was— What I thought was funny— Well, he at this great urge of  
730 Jaap Korevaar —you know, who is a mathematician—to become chairman. But he became  
731 chairman when [Paul D.] Saltman was vice-chancellor.

732 **CHODOROW:** Yes, the first few years in.

733 **ROSENBLATT:** And he just wasn't the type to get along with Saltman at all. So you know, I  
734 think his time as chairman was—

735 **CHODOROW:** It was quite miserable after all.

736 **ROSENBLATT:** Well, yeah. It wasn't— Possibly with— You know, maybe with another vice-  
737 chancellor. But you know, here was this apparently a fellow who conceived of himself as the  
738 suave, European type. And with Saltman, I think it—

739 **CHODOROW:** Saltman was not exactly of that type. Very interesting. Well, thank you.

740 **ROSENBLATT:** Sure.

741 **CHODOROW:** We appreciate it, and it's more information about a very central department  
742 that we will keep pursuing.

743 **ROSENBLATT:** Yeah. And I hope, you know, you get reflections of other people which I'm  
744 sure may be different. You know, my interpretation of what took place may not be the  
745 interpretation of others. So—

746 **CHODOROW:** Well, thank you.

747 **ROSENBLATT:** Sure.

**[END OF PART TWO, END OF INTERVIEW]**