

**Oral History Interview of  
Donald Haragan**

**Interviewed by: David Marshall  
August 23, 2011  
Lubbock, Texas**

**Part of the:  
*University Archives***

© Southwest Collection/  
Special Collections Library



TEXAS TECH UNIVERSITY

**Southwest Collection/  
Special Collections Library**

15th and Detroit | 806.742.3749 | <http://swco.ttu.edu>

## Copyright and Usage Information:

An oral history release form was signed by Donald Haragan on August 17, 2011. This transfers all rights of this interview to the Southwest Collection/Special Collections Library, Texas Tech University.

This oral history transcript is protected by U.S. copyright law. By viewing this document, the researcher agrees to abide by the fair use standards of U.S. Copyright Law (1976) and its amendments. This interview may be used for educational and other non-commercial purposes only. Any reproduction or transmission of this protected item beyond fair use requires the written and explicit permission of the Southwest Collection. Please contact Southwest Collection Reference staff for further information.

### Preferred Citation for this Document:

Haragan, Donald Oral History Interview, August 23, 2011. Interview by David Marshall, Online Transcription, Southwest Collection/Special Collections Library. URL of PDF, date accessed.

*The Southwest Collection/Special Collections Library houses almost 6000 oral history interviews dating back to the late 1940s. The historians who conduct these interviews seek to uncover the personal narratives of individuals living on the South Plains and beyond. These interviews should be considered a primary source document that does not implicate the final verified narrative of any event. These are recollections dependent upon an individual's memory and experiences. The views expressed in these interviews are those only of the people speaking and do not reflect the views of the Southwest Collection or Texas Tech University.*

## Technical Processing Information:

The Audio/Visual Department of the Southwest Collection is the curator of this ever-growing oral history collection and is in the process of digitizing all interviews. While all of our interviews will have an abbreviated abstract available online, we are continually transcribing and adding information for each interview. Audio recordings of these interviews can be listened to in the Reading Room of the Southwest Collection. Please contact our Reference Staff for policies and procedures. Family members may request digitized copies directly from Reference Staff.

Consult the Southwest Collection website for more information.

<http://swco.ttu.edu/Reference/policies.php>

### Recording Notes:

*Original Format:* Born Digital Audio

*Digitization Details:* N/A

*Audio Metadata:* 6 kHz/ 16 bit WAV file

*Further Access Restrictions:* N/A

*Related Interviews:* This is part two of the series. Donald Haragan was also interviewed on August 17, 2011 and October 21, 2011.

### Transcription Notes:

*Interviewer:* David Marshall

*Audio Editor:* N/A

*Transcription:* John Clements

*Editor(s):* Katelin Dixon

*Final Editor:* David Marshall

## Transcript Overview:

This interview features Donald Haragan. Haragan primarily discusses his career in administration at Texas Tech in which he served in a variety of roles, including university president beginning in 1996. Moreover, Haragan discusses the different people he worked with at Texas Tech and the developments that occurred within the university during his time in administration. To this end, Haragan notes the highs and lows in athletics, his work in strengthening the study abroad program, and establishing the Honors College.

**Length of Interview:** 01:45:52

Subject	Transcript Page	Time Stamp
Becoming interim chair of geosciences at Texas Tech	5	00:00:00
Resigning as chairman and becoming chairman again	7	00:08:02
Debate over tenure at the university and John Darling leaves	11	00:20:13
Becoming vice president for academic affairs	12	00:25:05
Gene Payne and conflict related to spending money	14	00:28:53
Tenure policy committee and changes to the policy	14	00:31:49
Being made executive vice president and provost	15	00:37:02
The Cavazos era	17	00:42:16
Weather modification projects	19	00:49:07
Cavazos leaves and Haley becomes interim president	21	00:55:20
Bob Lawless' departure	22	01:00:23
Fundraising	26	01:11:10
NCAA basketball sanctions at Texas Tech	28	01:17:55
Time spent on athletic issues as president	29	01:22:57
Strengthening study abroad and establishing the center in Sevilla	30	01:24:47
Creation of the Honors College	31	01:26:50
Hiring Gerald Myers and discussion about college athletics	32	01:29:56
Returning as interim president	33	01:35:24
Bob Knight	34	01:37:13
Serving as interim chancellor	35	01:39:43

## Keywords

college athletics, Lubbock, Texas, Texas Tech University, university administration

**David Marshall (DM):**

The date is August 23, 2011. This is Davis Marshall interviewing Don Haragan at his office at Texas Tech, Lubbock, Texas. So part two of an interview series, and last time we talked about you coming to Texas Tech in 1969, and some of those events of the first few years, but in 1972 you became chair of geosciences. Can you tell me about that?

**Donald Haragan (DH):**

Yeah, I became chair of geosciences through some really unfortunate circumstances. I think we might have mentioned before that I didn't have on my goal list to become an administrator in the university. In fact, that was about as far from my goals as it could possibly be. I was interested in teaching; I was interested in research and students; but a very unfortunate thing occurred in the summer of 1972. The chairman of the department at that time was Bill Miller. He was a groundwater geologist—a wonderful guy—and had become, in a short period of time, a very good friend of mine. Bill had funded—was funded to do some research in New Mexico that year with a number of other geologists, and he asked me if I would serve as the acting chairman of the department in his absence. Well, you know, I was still kind of wet behind the ears as a faculty member, in fact, I was promoted to associate professor that same year that I was asked to be the acting chairman, and I'm sure there were a number of people in the department—all the rest of the department at that time were geologists. They had, you know—kind of looked out of the corner of their eyes at this meteorologist who was invading their territory, anyway, and then for someone to ask the meteorologist to be in charge—there were quite a few of them, I think, that didn't really think that was a great idea, but it was okay, it just for the summer, and a lot of them were gone in the summer anyway. So I told Bill that I would do that—be acting chairman for the summer—and unfortunately, during that time in New Mexico, he was killed in a private airplane crash, in fact, there were—the plane, probably, was overloaded. The whole story of that never got out, because everyone on the plane was killed. But there were a number of geologists, plus a pilot or two, and they got down into a canyon out in western New Mexico, and apparently just couldn't pull out of it. So that was sort of how I got into administration. I was the acting chairman, and the dean at that time had to pick someone to serve as the interim chairman, then, while they went through a search process, and the obvious thing became just to let me continue. So that's how I got into administration at the departmental level.

DM:

And how did the other professors get along with—

DH:

Oh, I don't really know. No one was outwardly antagonistic, but you know, you had the feeling that you were still an outsider looking in, and it was not until the next year, I think, that we hired the next meteorologist, Richard Peterson, to come and sort of save me in that, but it was my job, then, as chairman to hire—we wanted to build meteorology—the dean wanted to build the



atmospheric science—so the following year, we hired Richard Peterson. So I became the interim chairman, and they started a search for a permanent chairman, and as I recall—I don't remember exactly the timing of this, but there was an individual by the name of Shrock—Bob Shrock, I believe, from MIT, who they called in as a consultant to sort of have a look at the department and make some recommendations, and I spent a lot of time talking with Dr. Shrock, and it turned out that when he submitted his report to the dean, he recommended that I continue as chairman. Well, I wasn't really sure what to think about that, because to be perfectly honest with you, I really—administration really wasn't something that turned me on.

DM:

How was it affecting your research and teaching?

DH:

Well, I continued to teach, in fact I taught huge sections of that basic atmospheric science, which counted for the science requirement for a lot of students, and I usually would have 200 students in a class. I maintained some research, funded mostly by the Texas Water Development Board, I guess, and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation—basically in precipitation and water. So I kept managing to publish an article occasionally. I wasn't a research dynamo, but I did continue doing some research, I continued with my teaching, and trying to be a chair of the department.

DM:

So your hours of working increased, is that what happened?

DH:

Yeah, it is. That's where I started, I guess, my habit of—I've always been an early riser, and right now I'm still an early riser, but I'm also—I also sink pretty early in the evening. Back in those days, I could last a little longer.

DM:

What is early rising, by the way?

DH:

Oh, I get up, usually, by five o'clock, sometimes between four thirty and five, just depending, and sometimes as late as five thirty. And it used to be that I would get to the office—many times when it was still dark I would get to the office—I did that, too, later on when I was president. I just got more work done in the early morning. Funny story—this is a true story, I don't know why I had this on my mind, one morning, I was driving to work, and it was probably, I don't know, six o'clock a.m. at the latest, and I used to park over by the science building, and I came driving into the lot. I was the only car in the lot, as I recall, and I pulled up, and I—whether I was listening to something on the radio, or whether my daughter had been watching some kiddy

show—I guess it was Mighty Mouse, it had the song, “Here I come to save the day, me oh my oh.” Well, as we’ve talked earlier, I’m a singer, anyway. I had that song on. For some reason I jumped out of the car, and pulled out my briefcase, and sang, “Here I come to save the day.” (singing) “Here I come to save the day,” and sure enough, there was someone—the poor guy didn’t know whether to turn around and run—anyway, I managed to talk to him and we had a good laugh over that. But I—just to finish up with that part of the story, I served as chairman in geosciences until, I think, about ’76 or ’77, and I told the dean that I appreciated the opportunity to serve as chairman; it was a new experience for me, and I did enjoy it, but it was taking away from some of the things that I really wanted to do, so I resigned as chairman. And they had another search and hired an individual who was a geologist—by that time, of course we had, I think, two more meteorologists. Richard Peterson came in ’73, and I think in ’75 or ’76 maybe, we hired Jerry Jurica from Purdue University, so I guess there were three atmospheric scientists on the staff then. So you know, I just thought it—you know when it’s time to do something. So I resigned as chairman, and they had a national search, and hired a geologist by the name of David K. Davies, and David came in and really sort of rattled the cages around the department. He was—I like him, personally, but he was—I don’t know whether you call it a strong leader, he had quite an ego, and he turned a lot of people off, and was not a really popular chairman, although he was a good geologist, and he did some good things, I think, while he was here. But David was only chairman, I think, for two years—it could have been three, but I think it was only two years. And I don’t think there was pressure on him to leave, in the sense that the dean relieved him—I don’t believe that happened—but I think he realized that there was a lot of pressure from within the department, really—his leadership was just not popular among the faculty. And he started looking and found another position. So the exact circumstances, I’m not sure, but he left after two years, and lo and behold, the dean asked me if I would come back and serve as the interim department chairman again, and long story short, we went through another search, and I wound up accepting the chairmanship of the department again. It was probably a mistake, I don’t—

DM:

Maybe you’re supposed to mess up as interim? (laughter)

DH:

I don’t know, but you know, I have this—I’ve been referred to as the “Epitome of Interim-ity,” because later on, I served in many other administrative positions as an interim, but anyway, I accepted the position, and this must have been in maybe ’78 or ’79—then I—I guess that’s about right, I started serving as chairman of the department again. And at this time, Larry Graves, who was the Dean of Arts and Sciences, retired somewhere during that period, and Bill Conroy became the Dean of Arts and Sciences. I don’t know whether those names mean anything to you, but Bill Conroy became the Dean of Arts and Sciences, and Bill and I were always pretty close. We weren’t at the same department, but we came to Texas Tech at the same time; we both came

from the University of Texas. And he was brought here as chairman of the geography department. And at that time, the geography department was housed in an old X-building—one of the old wooden shacks, out behind the science building—X47 I'll never forget. Anyway, Bill and I were pretty close colleagues, even though we were in different departments, and Bill asked me if I would serve as the Associate Dean for Research in the College of Arts and Sciences. So you know, there I was, sort of set on a course that I really hadn't chosen, but for whatever reason, I decided that maybe not being chairman of the department—maybe the associate dean's job would allow me a little more time to do research. I would continue to teach a course as well. So anyway, I resigned the second time as chairman, and became associate dean. And I don't remember right now who succeeded me as chairman of the department, Richard Peterson—the other atmospheric science person—became chairman, but whether he became chairman at that point, I'm really not sure, but he served as chairman for quite a long time.

DM:

Have you always been associated with—you're still a member of the department, though, at least?

DH:

Yeah, I have double—I'm professor of geosciences and honors.

DM:

And always, you've been that, even when president, you were with the Department of Geosciences?

DH:

Not the honors part. It was when I was president that we established the Honors College, before that time, there was no Honors College.

DM:

As president, were you still a professor in geosciences?

DH:

Oh yes.

DM:

So always, you've been a professor in geosciences.

DH:

Correct, that is correct—absolutely. So I guess we could continue this line, along the



administrative thing. We can fill in some of the gaps, if you'd like, but I served as associate dean—Otto Nelson was the other associate dean, do you remember Otto?

DM:

Uh-huh, I do.

DH:

Just a wonderful guy—we had a really good collegial relationship in the dean's office at that time. Bill was a very popular dean, and Otto was very popular with the faculty, so it was just—I could—it was an easy thing to fit in to, when I got over there.

DM:

Speaking of Otto, did he tell you the story about the—being questioned after John Hinckley, Jr.? You know, John Hinckley, Jr. was in some of his classes?

DH:

Yeah, that's right. Oh yeah, I'm sure that he did tell me. I don't remember. Do you have a specific—

DM:

No, no, I was just wanting to see if you had an anecdote.

DH:

No, I don't remember it that well, but Otto was one of the great storytellers, and could tell a funny story with a straight face better than anyone that I've ever known. Wonderful guy—Otto, you know, his son died here, just a couple of years ago, actually took his own life, and Otto was obviously devastated. I think that's the last time I've seen him, although I have e-mailed with him occasionally. You know, he is—he actually lives in the town in Minnesota where, at one time, his father was the mayor. And he and Mary Jo just really—you know, I can't imagine myself retiring and moving to Minnesota. But they love it, and they left a lot of really good friends here, but apparently got into a situation where they had a lot of old family friends, and whatnot there—Otto would fit in anywhere he went. But I guess—and once again, David, I just can't remember times, and how long I was in that position, but I do remember very well what happened. Bill Conroy was the—well, Bill and I both were friends with another person by the name of Jim Halligan. Jim Halligan I think came to Texas Tech either the year that Bill and I did, or perhaps the year before. He was a chemical engineer. And he became chairman of the chemical engineering department, and at that time, when we came to the university, there used to be a newcomers faculty club. And Bill and his wife, and Jim Halligan and his wife, and me and my wife were a part of the bridge—that bridge—we played a lot of bridge together. So Jim became a very good friend, and Jim left to become dean at Rolla—University of Missouri-

Rolla—and then he became provost at University of Arkansas, and then he became the president of New Mexico State University in Las Cruces. Well, he was looking for a provost at New Mexico State, and he had Bill Conroy in his sights. So Bill was hired to become the provost at New Mexico State, and of course, had to resign his dean's position here in order to do that, obviously. And you guessed it, who would they ask to be the interim dean? I was tapped, then, to become the interim dean of the college.

DM:

I don't have—I have in my notes that you were interim dean, did you ever step into the dean's position?

DH:

No, this is another interesting part of the story. I catapulted all the way from one interim position to another interim position. I can't remember how many months I was the interim dean of arts and sciences, but it wasn't measured in years, it was measured in months, and I think even less than—it was just a few months that I had been serving as the interim dean of the college—

DM:

It seems like being interim of anything would have its own set of challenges—it's in flux.

DH:

Absolutely.

DM:

And maybe there're people fighting for the position? I don't know—or maybe they don't. Do people respect the interim position as much as they would a permanent—?

DH:

No. And they shouldn't—I don't know whether respect is the word, I don't think—I think they do respect, but—

DM:

—or recognize—

DH:

But what they expect of you, though, is to keep the waters calm. Don't shake the boat, you know, because you're not going to be here long, and we don't want to have you lead the charge, and then move along and then bring in someone else to change the direction. So it's really to try to calm the waters and keep things running until a permanent administrator is found. But I didn't even have time to think about that, and I don't even remember now whether I ever decided to

become a candidate for the permanent deanship. In fact, it was only several months, and we may not even have started the search yet, I'm just not sure about it. But at any rate, one day, Larry Cavazos, who was the president at the time, called me to his office—and I knew Larry, but was not very close with him at all. I had been close to Grover Murray, but I wasn't that close to Larry Cavazos. He was a really nice guy, and I had met him on several occasions. So I had no idea why he was calling me over, but at that time, there was a tremendous—debate is not the word, but disagreement—between the faculty and the administration and the board of regents had gotten directly involved in the tenure policy. And we had a—it wasn't called a provost then, it was vice president for academic affairs—at the time by the name of John Darling. And John Darling, in the midst of this crisis, decided he would take it upon himself to rewrite the tenure policy. Well, that didn't really please anybody. The Board of Regents, if they had had their way at that time, would really favor doing away with tenure. I think we calmed that water a little bit, but that was sort of the position they were taking, "This tenure stuff is—how can we get anything done if we promise these people lifetime positions?" And the faculty, obviously, were on the other side of the coin, that to have any academic continuity, and academic clout, one needs to feel secure in their job, and after a probation—policy-wide argument for tenure—and whether they're right or not, I'm not sure, but at least the popular arguments for tenure. And that was a huge debate, and John Darling decided to rewrite the tenure policy, and that made everybody mad. I mean, it was just a very contentious time.

DM:

What did the tenure policy say?

DH:

You know, I can't remember exactly, although at the time, I could have quoted almost the entire tenure policy to you. But John had really sort of leaned—John Darling, when he redid the policy—leaned more over to the administrative side, and took out a lot of the things that are generally found in, particularly in those days—tenure policies have changed since then, but some of the things that favored the faculty were removed, or toned down, and the faculty didn't like that at all. As a result of this, Larry Cavazos, as the president, got a "no-confidence" vote from the faculty—one of the few times the faculty here have ever done that, and I think it was overwhelming; it was something—

DM:

He came out in strong favor of Darling's—

DH:

He and Darling didn't get along very well, but I think it was just the faculty response to that that sucked in the president, because he's the leader, and the idea was to put pressure on the president to get rid of the academic vice president. So anyway, there was a "no-confidence" vote in the

president, and it was something like 80 percent—I don't remember now how many faculty participated, but those numbers ought to be available somewhere. But it was an overwhelming defeat for Cavazos. John Darling saw the handwriting on the wall, and he was interviewing for positions. This is—I don't remember the exact details of this, either, but I remember myself seeing this on the news one night—the local news. John Darling—and I believe it was somewhere in Florida—he was interviewing for a job, and he made some comment, obviously not thinking that this was going to get back to Lubbock, but made some comment about the situation here, and perhaps even some comments about Larry Cavazos. I don't remember exactly. But I saw this interview and thought, Oh my gosh, whether or not the president saw it or not, I don't know, but at least the word got back to him, and he immediately fired—he fired John Darling before he ever got back to the campus. So that was the time when I was—didn't know why I was being called, because like I say, there was no reason why anyone would pick me. I hadn't ever been even a real dean, just an interim dean, and for a very short period of time. And I still don't know the answer to this question completely, even though I've asked Larry, himself, at the time, and I've asked him since then why he chose to do this, but he called me over to his office and offered me the position of interim vice president for academic affairs. He had to find another vice president, and it just absolutely blew me over. I just had no idea that this is what he wanted to talk about. Why would he ask a young whippersnapper like me, who had just been a dean for three months to come over and serve as the interim vice president? But at any rate, I was an interim dean, so I said, "Why not be an interim vice president?" So I catapulted all the way from interim dean to interim vice president without passing "Go" and collecting two hundred dollars, and never went through the deanship.

DM:

In the mind of a peon like me, it looks like a huge jump from the level of dean on up into the administration that surrounds the—

DH:

Well, as the dean, you're the chief executive officer of a college. As a vice president, you're no longer a chief executive officer, you're a staff officer; you report to the president, and you have a particular assignment. But what it does mean, in academic affairs, is that you're now—your job is now related to all of the colleges, and not simply to one. So it makes a huge difference, and you really have to have an adjusted mindset. Not that anybody thinks that necessarily you're going to be biased, and I don't think there was anyone who ever thought that in my case.

DM:

What's the relationship between an academic vice president and the provost? Is there—?



DH:

They're not—they're one and the same. It's just the academic vice president, later on, the title was changed.

DM:

Is that it?

DH:

That's all. Provost really has the same responsibility, but it generally implies—and it did here as well—generally implies that you're sort of the senior vice president, you're the provost of the university, and academic affairs should be in charge. And that happened to me later, when they changed the name of the position here. But anyway, back to the storyline, they started, then, a national search for an academic vice president, and at that time, they were still searching for a dean. It turned out that I became a candidate, was the only internal candidate, I think, in that search, and they identified three outside candidates that—we all interviewed for the position of permanent vice president. And I guess at that time, I had sort of made up my mind, that it looked like somebody's steering my ship more than I am, myself, and I'm in administration. But I was named the permanent vice president for academic affairs by Cavazos. When I became vice president for academic affairs, there was a person by the name of Gene Payne, does that name mean anything to you? Gene Payne was the vice president for fiscal affairs—vice president for financial affairs. He was—I later learned to have a great deal of respect for Gene Payne. He was really a good man, but he was sort of Cavazos' man at that time, and sort of felt that he had control of everyone. It's hard to describe, but he had this control thing, and it wasn't all ego with Gene—I mean Cavazos also really had a lot of respect for Gene, and turned a lot of things over to him and expected that he was going to run the internal ship, sort of, you know. So there were a lot of things that I didn't like about the way administration worked.

DM:

Have you seen a similar situation elsewhere, where the person kind of in control of the purse strings kind of thinks they have control over all aspects?

DH:

Oh sure.

DM:

You've seen that?

DH:

Oh yeah, that's pretty common. And you know, it's really important that if you're going to be an effective provost, that you need to have a relationship with that person. Now, it doesn't mean



that you have to always agree—in fact, you know, I had a strong feeling, I wanted to get into the administration and get along, but I didn't want the control to be in the hands of the person that has the purse strings; that can be really dangerous, when he has control, and he also decides how the money is going to be spent—I wanted to decide how it was going to be spent—he was just supposed to take care of it. So at that time, we didn't have a real good relationship. I never felt any personal animosity; I always kind of liked Gene, he was kind of a funny guy, he sort of stayed clear, was not really personable in the sense that he was a “Hail fellow, well met,” and got out into the crowd, but I never really disliked him. But I didn't like him being in charge of all this. So we had some problems, and I had some serious talks with Cavazos about the fact that I didn't really want to be in this position, unless academics was going to be able to have a bigger voice in what happens.

DM:

You felt hamstrung.

DH:

I did, and I don't know whether Larry ever—in fact, I think there was—Larry really hesitated to do anything—to say anything to Gene. I don't know, they may have had talks behind the scenes—I don't know. But we did start changing a few things, and it was really the Board [of Regents] who had been—let me go back to the tenure policy thing, when I first came over. What I did when I first became academic vice president was to appoint a committee of academic administrators and department chairmen and then just some faculty. I was very careful to include people from the faculty senate on that, who were some of the more active people, and also some academic administrators. And I appointed this committee with the idea of sitting down and talking about the tenure policy, restructuring the tenure policy in a way that was satisfactory to them—the faculty—but also to the Board of Regents, really, because it's the board that was—not Cavazos, but the board, really that was on the other side of the issue. And I can't—J. E. Birdwell was the chairman of the board at the time, and Fred Bucy was on that board—was a name that I know you must have—Fred was—had been, and I guess still was at the time—the chairman of Texas Instruments, and a very, very opinionated guy that most faculty just really disliked. They really disliked Fred Bucy. I didn't. I always got along with him, primarily because I could sit down with him and say, “Fred, that's not right. You're wrong,” and he'd be willing to sit down and talk about things, you know. But he made a speech to the United Way—the opening of the United Way—here, one time, and his last sentence in his speech was something like, “If there're any toes that I haven't stepped on in today's presentation, I apologize.” I have a copy of that speech somewhere. I mean, he just really went after everything—very opinionated guy, and he didn't mind saying what he thought—ultraconservative in all of his views. So tenure was one of the things that Fred didn't like. And anyway, as chairman of this committee that I had put together, it was my job to be the liaison between the committee and the board. And I would meet with the committee, and then I'd go to the board, and we'd talk about that. Cavazos was really

sort of not involved in the process. I just—I don't remember exactly how that relationship worked, because I didn't feel like I was doing an end-run around anybody, but anyway it was the board that wanted to be satisfied with this policy, tenure policy was going to be right. So we worked on the tenure policy, and I kept moving back to the board, and talking to the board, and one of the most outspoken people in opposition to tenure—well, J. E. Birdwell, the chairman, absolutely didn't like tenure at all. He didn't understand it, and he just didn't like this idea. Fred Bucy was the other one, and Fred Bucy was probably—he was chairman of the board twice—once maybe—he was actually on our board—served three terms on our board. He was appointed by both a Democratic and Republican governor. And he was very outspoken against tenure as well. But I told Fred one day—and I'll never forget this meeting, it was just a one-on-one meeting—and I said, "Fred, you know, you may be right about tenure. We may be making—this idea of tenure may be a concept whose time has passed, and you may be right that it's time to rethink that. But I'll tell you what, we at Texas Tech, if we're going to do that in higher education, we don't want to be the first university to do it. We won't be able to hire another decent faculty member if we do." And Fred sat there and thought about that for a minute and said, "You know, you're absolutely right," and somehow, I managed to convince him—

DM:

It made business sense—

DH:

—get him on my side. And so we talked to—they finally put together a tenure policy, but it's pretty much like the tenure policy we still have today. And we did that in 1985 or '86, and during that time period when I was first vice president. So through this process, you know, this liaison thing that I did, running back and forth, it turned out, I made some points not only with the faculty, because we put together the tenure policy, but with the board as well.

DM:

It seems like in the position of liaison, it could make you or break you.

DH:

That's probably true, although I wasn't thinking of that at the time, but that's probably a good point. But the net result of that was—and I don't know—I know that Cavazos, at the time, made a statement to me one time and said that he wanted to be in control of his administration, and that the board shouldn't be in control, and I think he must have had some conversation with the board after that, and it had to do with the relationship between the vice president for academic affairs and the vice president for fiscal affairs, because everyone realized that Gene really ran the show, and that I didn't like it. Well, I think it was Fred Bucy that—in fact, I'm sure it was Fred Bucy—that did this, and I think he did it without the president really liking it, but the president didn't have much choice. He made me the executive vice president and provost, that's when the title

changed, and I was not just provost, but he wanted to be sure that academics was going to be in control, so I also had the title of executive vice president. That made Cavazos unhappy, he didn't—and I can understand that. If I were the president, I'd be unhappy, too, if a board member came in and started making changes like that—but the relationship between Cavazos and the board, I really don't know, I don't know what happened—whether he said, “Yeah, I'll accept that and I'll do it,” or—but I know that he didn't like that idea, because he had trusted in Gene for so long, and so obviously the other person who didn't like it was Gene. And it was—I don't remember how much longer Gene stayed—

DM:

Did you feel any animosity from him after that, or did he just remain quiet?

DH:

I don't think there was any real animosity. We changed some things—changed some committees that he chaired that were sort of in control of things, so we did make some changes. But it was really after that, and the way that Gene handled that, although a year later, I guess—could have been longer than that, I don't remember exactly—he left the university and went out into the private sector with an insurance company, as a matter of fact.

DM:

How many deans answered to you at this time, when you were in this new position?

DH:

Six or seven colleges—might be seven or eight—there wasn't much different, we've got the University College now that we didn't have then. We didn't have the College of Visual and Performing Arts; it was part of Arts and Sciences. That may be the only difference—the only new college. All the other colleges were in place, human sciences and ag and engineering, business, arts and sciences—

DM:

I've heard that one of the greatest challenges of being in a position where the deans answer to you, or report to you—and one of my sources on that is Bill Marcy—that dealing with deans can be difficult. Any comments on that relationship?

DH:

I think it depends upon the individuals that are in the positions. In my case, the deans and I had a pretty close relationship because we worked together on this tenure policy thing, and there was sort of mutual respect between myself and—in fact, I think that's the most important thing in administration. You not only have to have the respect of those who report to you, you have to respect them as well. And if that respect is not there, if that trust is not there, then it's very

difficult, I think, to be an effective administrator. So I guess maybe I didn't have some of the difficulties that others might have had, because we started out, at least, on very solid ground. We both—we all had respected—we trusted one another, and we thought that we had made a major accomplishment, and I think we had. And I'm very careful to say "we," because it wasn't me that did that, we had a good group of people who I think truly did have the best interest of the university in mind, and some of them were faculty, some of them were people who had the policy responsibilities of the university, and we got together. And it's sort of a good feeling, you know, for all of us, that—

DM:

After a low, you got to experience the high.

DH:

That's exactly right. So the—I guess, I don't know how long after that it was that Cavazos left to become secretary of education.

DM:

Can I ask you a few more questions about that era—?

DH:

Sure.

DM:

—about the Cavazos era—I know that there were some other issues during that time period—the Crosbyton Solar Power Project—were you involved with that at all?

DH:

Not directly, and that was before—that was mostly before the time that I was in the central administration, but I was—when I was in arts and sciences—very aware of that. The—what's his name—well, Stan Liberty and the guy—the genius behind all of it, this fellow is no longer here—lives in Albuquerque now, really is a genius, but a weird guy if there ever was, and he'd be the first one to admit it to you. What is his name? He was just in town a few weeks ago.

DM:

Yeah, it was John—I should know it. I heard it not long ago.

DH:

Well Stan Liberty was sort of the—they were partners in this project, and there was National Science Foundation, I believe, and there might have been some other federal money involved in it, but Stan Liberty was the guy. He left eventually and became Dean of Engineering at



University of Nebraska, then just sort of disappeared. John Reichert is the other one, and John Reichert was an electrical engineer, but he's really a physicist. He was the guy that put all the numbers together and whatnot, but was a guy that rubbed a lot of people the wrong way. He was just not an administrative-type guy. He just wanted to do his thing, and leave him alone. So Liberty had sort of the responsibility of this. All the ins and outs of the project, I don't know because I was not a part of it. But it came down to a competition between the Crosbyton project and another group, I believe out of California, who was developing a different model—it was an entirely different model than we had here. One was a fixed model, and another was a tracking model. In one case, the mirrors themselves actually—the instrument didn't track the sun, but the mirrors did—the angles with the sunlight, and the other one they actually had the whole movement of a track. That's the best I can remember. Anyway, there was a lot of controversy in the project here. Even in Crosbyton, there were people who really supported the project, and there were others who didn't like the project. And I don't know the ins and outs of this, but the net result was we lost that competition, and that caused a lot of problems and gnashing of teeth.

DM:

I know there was some blame of—there has been some blame of Cavazos on that. I don't know if that's justified or not, but the loss of funding for that project—do you know any—?

DH:

I really can't comment on that. I don't have any insight on that. Let me tell you, you know, Cavazos, in spite of all of this, Cavazos and I had a pretty good relationship. He's really a decent guy. I really thought very highly of him—nice guy. He probably didn't press as hard on some things, and make some positive moves in some areas that I would have liked for him to, but he was just a really decent human being, and someone that—he loved Texas Tech; he loved to go out and meet alumni of Tech, and in fact would travel with Jim Douglas from the alumni association all the time, just—and I enjoyed doing that, too, but not the extent that he liked to do. But he was really a person who loved the university, and wanted to do right by the university, and did the best that he could, and did a lot of good things, until the end when he sort of got into problems with the board, and primarily over—I mean, I was a part of that, and I don't really—you know, I really didn't instigate anything, but I became a part of—the person, the guy who was going to step into a position that he had really sort of designated for his man, Gene Payne. And since that time, too, I've developed, really, a lot of respect for Gene. In retrospect, when I look back, some of the things he did weren't nearly as bad as maybe I thought they were at the time. Maybe I was fighting for control of things, and overlooked some of the really good things that he could do. But he was a good man, and he did a lot of good things for Texas Tech, as well. I don't regret the net result of what finally happened, but perhaps we could have done it a little differently, I don't know, and saved some of the problems that—



DM:

Something else that was a current project at that time was Water, Inc. I know that in the late seventies or so, there was talk about different ways of getting water to the South Plains, and one of them was the idea of pumping from the Mississippi River. Do you have any—?

DH:

I remember that—I was never involved in any of that. That was—I think that probably was in the late seventies, and I probably was still chairman of geosciences. We talked a lot about that. The whole idea of pumping water from the mouth of the Mississippi is just ridiculous if you think about it today, but at that time, you know, we didn't have any other water resources in mind, and it sounded like a pretty good idea. Energy was not as expensive as it is today. Today, if you talk about pumping water uphill thirty-three hundred feet from a delta bank and going that distance, it doesn't make any sense at all. It's almost going to break us pumping it from Lake Alan Henry. But anyway, yeah, that was a big deal at the time. I know ICASALS [International Center for Arid and Semi-arid Land Studies], I think, was involved, I think Frank Conselman and ICASALS was involved in all the water stuff. I was never directly involved in that, but I certainly do remember that.

DM:

Were there still any projects going on regarding cloud seeding?

DH:

Yeah, there still were. Not here, but I was involved for a number of years with a research project in Big Spring on cloud seeding. I think '79 might have been the—the *Journal of Weather Modification*, 1979, and I think this is the one where I'm in a couple of papers. Yeah, here's the one on the effect of hail suppression on rainfall in the Texas high plains—and then I had another paper in this thing—clouds and precipitation in the southern HIPLEX region—and HIPLEX was the project in Big Spring, named—that's an acronym. I don't—the High Plains something experiment. Anyway, it was a weather modification experiment.

DM:

These are two articles of yours in the *Journal of Weather Modification*, volume eleven, number one, April, 1979. Just if someone is listening to this and wants to look it up.

DH:

So this was—hail suppression, I think in 1979, was over, but I had done some work on trying to look at some of the data and see if perhaps there was some indication that the hail suppression had affected the precipitation patterns. That's difficult to do, given the little amount of data we had, and the conclusion—as I point out here—was not a very firm conclusion, but it looked like, suspiciously, in fact, there was a rain shadow effect, and that the hail suppression for the years

that they did that—several years—might well have impacted the precipitation downstream. So there's no final jury on that. Now, the other had to do with that HIPLEX experiment, and it went on a path that this was really sort of a favorite at the beginning of the HIPLEX experiment, where I talked about the types of clouds and precipitation that occurred naturally, in this paper. The project in Big Spring went on for more than twenty years, and I think the longest time of any weather modification experiment that had taken place, and they were actually trying to—well, they had a lot of different people from different universities involved in that, looking at different ways to try to randomly pick some clouds to seed, and some clouds you wouldn't seed, and then with radar, look at the results. The work that I did was primarily looking at the climatology—looking from year to year and comparing it to not only the surrounding area to see if there really was an increase—change in pattern in the target area versus the surrounding area—and then looking at it historically, the precipitation. But that experiment went on, and I think there's still some cloud seeding going on there today. It started out with, actually, a private project, the Colorado River Municipal Water District, and it started at Big Spring. There was a fellow by the name of Owen Ivy, and Owen Ivy, actually, was paying to start up a project in operational cloud seeding; he wanted to try to increase rain. And he'd been doing that for a number of years, as I recall, before the government, the feds, shut down—and we made this a part of the Bureau of Reclamation—started this research project at HIPLEX. It was an interesting project. I think—you know, even today, I'm a believer in the fact that we can impact what happens in the clouds—easily—and we can probably cause certain clouds that will almost reach the stage—we can encourage them to produce either some precipitation or more than they might have produced naturally. But the question that still comes up is whether you're robbing Peter to pay Paul, you know, that question hasn't been answered yet. I may be successful here, but what about those people downstream that might have gotten the rain, had I not tinkered with the cloud? So the whole idea of weather modification is sort of on hold now. There's not a lot of that going on.

DM:

And that's funny, because it's the same thing—issues you look at with surface water, you dam a reservoir, and you're robbing people downstream from the flow.

DH:

Absolutely. That's absolutely true. You know, we talked for a long time, too, about modification of hurricanes. They never got to the point where they thought that they could make any difference at all, I mean there's a lot of things—that was Project Stormfury, I think—I was not involved in that, but it was a federal project, and they never decided that—but if they had been able to have an effect, once again, there are a lot of places that get a lot of their rainfall from tropical storms, and if you're going to cut that out somehow—or reduce it somehow—there're going to be a lot of people who are going to be opposed to that. Anything you do, you know, there's going to be the “haves” and the “have-nots.”

DM:

Well let's go back to the Cavazos era. Now, he left office—or how did his leaving affect your position?

DH:

Didn't affect my position at all. We talked about an interim, and it wound up that Bess Haley was selected to be the interim president, and Bess and I used to joke about that all the time, because as provost, of course, I was her boss. She was the dean, but then, when she was appointed to become interim president, she became my boss, so we kidded a lot about that at the time.

DM:

Now what year was this?

DH:

'87, maybe? '87.

DM:

So now you have a new interim president, and your relationship was workable?

DH:

Oh, good relationship—we never—Bess, herself, was just not a person to rock the boat. She just—I don't think there was anybody opposed to Bess. She's nice, friendly, has treated everyone right, so there's—everybody knew she was the interim, and—

DM:

There's the golden rule of the interim: don't rock the boat.

DH:

That's right, don't rock the boat. I'm not sure that Bess ever—I don't know, I guess she'd have to tell you that—I can't even remember right now whether she wanted to be a candidate for the president's position, or whether she applied for the president's position—I really don't remember. She was only president for a year, or maybe a little less than a year. They had a national search, and of course brought in Bob Lawless. And this—I think Bob came, maybe in '87—he came in '87 or '88, I'm pretty sure it was '87, so it might have been '86 when Bess was—but those numbers are somewhere. I had known Bob Lawless before he came here. Bob was, of course, the vice president for operations, I guess, or fiscal affairs for Southwest Airlines, and he was on the coordinating board committee—higher education coordinating board committee that I was on, because Bob, in his previous life, before he went to Southwest, had been at the University of Houston—vice president, I think, for fiscal affairs, University of

Houston. And so he was known in the higher education community before he ever went to Southwest Airlines. Anyway, he became a candidate for president here, and when he was named president, he was someone that I knew, because I'd served on a committee with him in Austin—coordinating committee—I can't remember what committee that was—I don't remember. But anyway, he was the outside member on that committee. So we had a—soon after he was named president, we had a talk, and decided that he wasn't going to make any changes—wait, look and see how things went, and Bob and I always got along very well. I don't know how well you know Bob Lawless, do you know him at all?

DM:

No.

DH:

He has a really dry sense of humor, very reserved, but he is a numbers man—I mean he's a numbers man. So he always knew the details about every budget, I think, on the campus. But Bob and I got along real well because he was perfectly comfortable with letting me do my thing—give me some guidelines, but once I've got those guidelines, know how far I can go in one direction or another, to let me do it. And that's the way I think anyone likes to operate—given the rules, and the longitude and the latitude within which you need to stay, and then go do your job. So we got along very well. Lawless years lasted—well, he was president—I was named president in '96, if he came in '87, he was here almost ten years—pretty close to ten years—or eight to ten years. And I think the longest serving president is still Grover Murray. He was here for ten years, and I don't think Bob made it quite that long. Are you aware of the controversy that led to Bob Lawless's departure?

DM:

If I've heard it; I don't remember it right now. Can you tell us?

DH:

It had to do with alcohol on campus. Bob was very, very firmly against alcohol in general. He is a teetotaler. He doesn't drink. He'd—he never pressured me in any way. If I wanted to have a glass of wine or a cocktail, he never had a problem with that, but the idea of liquor on campus was just something he obviously just didn't want at all. It was when we were building the Market Center, and the alumni association obviously wanted to be able to have functions in the Market Center and be able to serve alcoholic beverages, and Lawless was absolutely opposed to that—that was on campus, and he didn't want any alcohol on the campus. So he was firmly opposed to that—let the regents know that he was firmly opposed to that, and at a board meeting in El Paso—I was in that board meeting—and one of the items on the agenda was alcohol in Market Center, and the alumni association brought an entourage of former students who had some clout who were in favor of—the fact that they needed to be able to do that to make money at functions



where they rent out the building, that they had to have that. It was on the corner of the campus, and they were not—I didn't notice any—they were not anti-Bob Lawless at all—in fact people still liked Bob, he was a good president, but they didn't want him to win this battle. And I think to this day, maybe sometime you can interview Bob—find out his side—I think when the state voted, he thought he had the support of the board when we went into this board meeting—or at least the majority of the board, and long story short, it turned out, he did not. When they voted, they voted to have alcohol, and I think he made up his mind right then at the meeting—that he was going to leave.

DM:

Do you think someone was making calls to the board members, right before the event, or something like that?

DH:

I really don't—I don't. I'm sure there were calls, yeah, I'm sure there were, because it got to be a pretty strong issue. The alumni and the people who ran the alumni association felt very strongly—including Bill Dean, and Bill's not a drinker either—they felt very strongly that to make it a success—to make it go over, they had to be able to have the events where they could serve alcohol. And I thought they were right, that that was correct, because the people would have their event somewhere else if they—so I'm sure there was a lot of pressure on the Board of Regents, and they were getting calls to allow that to happen, but I'm equally sure that Bob Lawless was also talking to the board, and that he thought, when he walked into the board meeting, that he was going to get the vote—that he had won over the board. I really think he was shocked when they voted. But anyway, that's what transpired, and I think at that time, he made up his mind, he was going to leave. He really felt strongly about that, and I respect him for that. I think that the right decision was made—I think they would have needed to have that there—but I respect Bob Lawless for sticking to his guns, and he still today is a good friend. I think I have learned a lot from Bob Lawless. The opportunity to work under him, I think, was a good opportunity—he was really a sharp guy, understood higher education, he understood finance, which was one of my weaknesses. I was never an accountant or never—I like mathematics as a thing, but not arithmetic. I didn't keep his books. I really needed to surround myself with somebody who was strong in that, and Bob understood all that, and of course, he brought in Joe Brunjes to work for him, and gosh, I would have hated to have had that job because he was working for a guy that really wanted to control all that himself, and could have, but they were together at Southwest Airlines. He had a lot of respect for him, and brought him in as his vice president. But anyway—

DM:

I seem to recall that this alcohol issue was around well before this time—I remember a bumper



sticker, maybe from the late seventies, "Take a region out for a beer." Do you remember that? There was some issue over maybe having a watering hole or two on campus.

DH:

Yeah, that was having beer in the student union. Yeah, that was even prior to Bob Lawless, I think, and Cavazos—yeah, that never got to be a serious proposal. There weren't any board members that would have signed onto that at that time, but I do remember that.

DM:

At least a good bumper sticker came out of it.

DH:

Yeah. (laughter) Well Bob, then, it was probably less than a year—he started looking right then— and it was, I think, less than a year later that he left to become president at University of Tulsa, and was at Tulsa for a long time, too, maybe eight years or so there when he retired.

DM:

Where is he now, by the way?

DH:

He lives here in Lubbock.

DM:

He does?

DH:

He lives here in Lubbock, he and Marcy [his wife]. I see them occasionally at functions. He still never has a drink in his hand, though. (laughter) No, he's—they're good people. They moved back here, I think, because Marcy's daughter was here, but he works now for a—for lack of a better word—a headhunter firm in higher education that goes and looks for presidents for universities and vice presidents, and apparently he's been very successful at that. The last time I phoned him, Marcy was complaining about the fact that he was working too hard, and he was taking on too many cases, and he had agreed that he would lower his case load. I can't remember, now, the name of the firm that he works with, but it's one of the big national headhunter firms in education. So yeah, I still see him occasionally. In fact, he's been on several of the searches here at Texas Tech. In fact, I think Bailey—presidential search—he might have been one of the ones that did find Bailey.

DM:

I just wasn't even aware of that. That's really interesting. So you were still in the same position when he left?

DH:

Yeah, when Bob Lawless left?

DM:

When Lawless left.

DH:

Well, yeah, I was executive vice president and provost, and that was my next interim position—was to come interim president. (laughter) When Lawless left, I guess that's right around when he left—

DM:

How long were you interim that time? I believe in '96 you became president.

DH:

I became president in '96, and I was interim president—let's see, I don't remember what month—I was actually president, I think, for four and a half years, and interim president for a few months in addition. I was close to five years as interim president or president at that time.

DM:

Well, was this a whole new ballgame for you, or was your position as executive vice president close enough to the presidency so that—

DH:

You know, I'd have to be honest and say that I enjoyed being president, but it was probably not the job that I enjoyed the most. When I look back on administrative positions—you know I was provost, I think, for almost eleven years—and I think I'd have to say that if I had to do it all over again, that'd be the job that—that's the job I think that I enjoyed the most, because it still involved faculty—working with faculty and working with students, and that's the thing that I really enjoyed. With president, I had some really good people to work with, and that's—there's not a whole lot of diversity that you could—up there—but I knew everybody. There's an advantage to being at a place for as long as I was. The people that I brought aboard to work with me were people that I knew, and I knew their strengths and I knew their weaknesses, so being president was not a chore, but I can tell you that the things I enjoyed the least were working with the legislature. You know, begging and groveling was just not something that appealed to me. I didn't mind making the presentations, but almost getting down on your knees and begging for

this and that—that didn't appeal to me. And although we had some success in fundraising—fundraising was not something that I really enjoyed doing that much, you do it because it's expected, and at that time, of course, you didn't have the—well, I take it back, the primary fundraising job really fell to the chancellor, because when I became president, John Montford became chancellor.

DM:

Oh, at the exact same time?

DH:

Same time. So the fundraising was sort of shifted to the chancellor's office, but at the same time, it was still part of the president's duty to be a part of that process. And John and I went on a lot of calls together, but I just—asking someone for dollars was just something that—it wasn't fun for me to do, even though I enjoyed making the case for it, because we really had some needs—and I had a lot of interesting experiences there. I remember one time, in Midland we went—and Bill Wayner was the vice president for development at that time—was a really good friend of mine and a good fundraiser, we really lost a good man—he died of a heart attack some years back, gosh a lot of years back. So we went to meet a lady in Midland, and we met her at the country club, and it was—no—I'm getting old, and can't remember names. She's still around, and she's been fairly generous with the university. But we went and met her at the country club. We'd done a lot of research as to—and that's always the most important thing in fund raising—you never want to ask someone for more than you think they are able to give, but on the other hand, you also never want to ask for less, because you may get less than what you—so it's all doing research—development calls is probably the most important part. Well, we had decided—we had a consultant also at that time that was working with us and working with the development office—they decided that she would be able to make a ten-million-dollar gift to the university. I had never asked anyone for that much money, and I think five million is probably the most that I'd ever asked someone for. So we—driving down there, we're talking about how—they convinced me that we should make the ten-million-dollar ask. So I did, and I'll tell you, David, I thought we were going to lose her right there at the table. Her eyes kind of glazed over, and she kind of slid down in her chair—

DM:

All your fears came— (laughter)

DH:

—that that had been a big mistake. But anyhow, Joe Pevehouse was—we have a Pevehouse chair in the Department of Geosciences, he was a geologist of some renown, and a very big supporter, and she—her name is Beverly Pevehouse—wonderful lady, and since that time, she hasn't given ten million, but she has given quite a bit of money and supported the university. That was a—and

I think I told you the story about the California call, when they told us—they sent us home. Didn't I tell you that story? Bill Wayner and I went out—there were two twin brothers who had made a—I don't think they ever graduated from Tech, actually, they went to school here. One of them might have graduated. They were both in chemistry, and they started up—this was back in the dot-com business in California—they were very, very successful. They had lots of money, and we knew it—I didn't tell you this story?

DM:

No, I don't remember this.

DH:

Well, this is one of the things—Bill and I flew out to California, made an appointment to—and they were in a town right outside of San Francisco—it started with a “B.” So we flew in to San Francisco and drove out to their offices—had an appointment with this guy, I can't remember his name. He met us at the door when we first—they had their own building—and he met us at the door when we came in. And from the time I walked in that door, I knew this was not going to work. He started talking about the bad experience that he had at Texas Tech, and that there were a couple of professors of chemistry that he hopes have gone by now—it was a hate speech. And we got in his office, finally, and sat down, and he said, “And of course I know why you're here. I want you to know right now, I'm not giving a penny to that university, and I never will give a penny to that university. My experience with the chemistry department was the worst experience I'd ever had.” Anyway, on and on and on and just—so we got up from our chairs, finally, and headed back to the airport. Anyway, we walked out of the building, Bill Wayner took out his little tablet, and he says, “I think I'm going to have to put this one down as a maybe.” (laughter) I thought I was going to fall—I had never had a lecture like that—how bad things were—in most cases, you know, people love the university. They may not be able to give money, but they love the place, but here was a guy that said it was the worst experience he'd ever had in his life, and not a penny were we going to get out of him, and Bill said, “Well that has to be a maybe.” That's an optimist.

DM:

Well how do you extract yourself from a situation like with Ms. Pevehouse, where she's kind of crestfallen, and you—what do you say after—?

DH:

You know, I don't remember. I think we probably changed the topic of the conversation and started talking about something else. I don't think she said absolutely no, she kind of knew—it was just kind of her face, her emotions, I knew that we were not going to get any further than that at that time.

DM:

She was more than happy for you to change the subject.

DH:

That's right. We got off of money, we may have talked a little—I don't even remember what we were asking for the money for now.

DM:

Do you know if anyone ever approached John Denver—former student here, but not graduate.

DH:

No, he was only here—maybe just a year, a year or a couple of years. I don't know, never have heard of that.

DM:

So there was fundraising, there was dealing with the legislature while president—what were some of the other major responsibilities, and some of the highs and lows that occur to you, during that time?

DH:

I guess the lows—the low was really the time that we had the NCAA sanctions. We were at a tournament in Kansas City, and I was—John Montford and I were sitting together at the game, and at halftime, someone came down and told us that the talk was upstairs that we were playing with an ineligible player. And so we immediately talked to—I think it was Gerald [Myers]—and told him that, and so he asked the player, and—he was one of the guards, I forget his name—and took him out of the game. He didn't play second half. Of course, we'd already—I think we'd been playing with him all through—we had been playing with him all through—and apparently he was ineligible, and it was academically ineligible. And we immediately went back to the records and started looking at other players and trying to find out what went wrong, because apparently we were just misinterpreting some of the rules.

DM:

It was an honest mistake on everybody's part?

DH:

I think it was an honest mistake, but it was not an excusable mistake. We didn't—the person in charge of compliance didn't know the rules like he should have known the rules, so we didn't have an excuse, but it was an honest mistake in the sense that had he known that we were breaking the rules—but he should have known, so we couldn't excuse ourselves from that. And it turned out, after we did all this, we had a fellow here that we brought in, I guess really after



that, Bob Burton, who was the new compliance director, because we dismissed the person who had been in charge—brought in Bob Burton, and he's the one that got busy. I think Bob's still at Nebraska; that was his home school. I hated to lose Bob. Anyway, we did all of the figuring, and we found out, David, that we were actually playing with four ineligible players. And then, when we went through all of the sports, and found that we had problems across the board with the athletic department, so we were dealing with this charge, and we put some sanctions on our self. We lost a lot of scholarships across the board, a lot of sports, but we took our medicine and—it was a really difficult time. Being at that hearing was one of the worst experiences of my life.

DM:

Who all was at the hearing?

DH:

Well, we had—John Montford and I were both there; we had an attorney who had defended Baylor when they had their problems with—he later became the mayor of Austin. You know, you get old and you forget names. But he was the primary spokesman before the board, and of course myself and John Montford. Bob Swayze was our representative to the NCAA, our athletic representative, and he was there as well. As far as our presentation, we told them about the sanctions that we had self-imposed, and it turns out, I think, in hindsight, we were treated very well. They took, mostly our sanctions, and did very little more.

DM:

They appreciated the self-sanctions?

DH:

I think they appreciated the self-sanctions, and I think they finally appreciated the fact that we—there was really nothing—we were not aware of the fact that—we could never convince anybody, because we should have been aware, you know, we didn't have an excuse, but it was not something that was planned or something we were trying to get away with. We didn't know.

DM:

As president, how much of your time was drawn toward athletic issues.

DH:

A lot. A lot.

DM:

More than you would have liked, or acceptable?

DH:

Well, I don't know. I'm a big fan—college athletics, I enjoy. But I don't like the fact that they sort of dominate the university, and it's worse today than it was then. It's all about the money, and it's all about television, and you have very little control over your—we're still fighting that battle right now with this Texas A&M thing, University. Texas A&M was mad because UT got a TV contract that they don't have—I think it's that simple. I don't know, it's gotten to be such big business, and you know, the message I always used to preach was that the president shouldn't be the highest-paid person on the campus. Distinguished faculty should be the highest-paid people, and I still believe that with a passion; I think that's right. That's what we're here for, and a president, really, is there to provide an environment in which these distinguished professors can excel. So that doesn't—it wouldn't bother me at all if a number of professors made more than me as president. But it does bug you a little bit when the football coach makes more than anybody—by a bunch. So as much as I'm in favor of athletics, I think that we still have a situation where the tail is wagging the dog, and I wish it wasn't—but I don't know that there's anything that can be done about that, because its big business and money.

DM:

Public opinion has it that the university is the football team.

DH:

Yeah, that's right. Well, at the other end of the spectrum, the things that I'm really proudest of, I guess is—well there were a lot of things that we were able to do, and I say "we" again, because not me. We established the—I've always been very big on international studies and study abroad, and also bringing international students here, but primarily getting our students who, many of them probably haven't been out of Texas. You have to understand that the world is more than just West Texas. Other cultures are a little bit different than you are. So our study abroad is a big thing, and we were able to establish the Texas Tech Center in Spain—that to me, was one of the things I'm proudest of, and that's still going strong.

DM:

At Sevilla?

DH:

At Sevilla.

DM:

Did Quedlinburg come later?

DH:

Yeah, it did, and it's never been as successful, in fact, I think probably, they're going to shut that

down because it just doesn't attract enough students, primarily because not that many students take German. Everybody that goes to Sevilla takes Spanish, that's the idea. We'd like for them all to come back fluent—they all don't, of course, but they live with Spanish families, they live in the culture, that's what education is all about. So I was really proud of the fact that we were able to do that. I wish that we could have done even more, because we signed an agreement with all of the Andalusian universities—University of Grenada, University of Córdoba, and we could have done a lot more. But anyway, I'm really proud of the program and of the—and the other thing, I guess, that stands out is the creation of the Honors College. That's really allowed us to recruit some students that we never could have recruited before. And once again, the Honors College belongs to everyone. The objection to the Honors College that we had to fight through was the fact that—why do we need a separate college? Some of the other deans would say, "Why do I need to compete with another—?" But the Honors College is here—we have very few students—there are two majors that are offered in the Honors College, and they don't have that many students in either one of them—just arts and letters and there's a natural history program—but other than that, our students come from all the other colleges, and when we give a scholarship to a student—raise money for a scholarship for a student, that student is an engineer or business or something, so we finally, I think, convinced people that the Honors College was here, and it was going to allow us to recruit the top students in all the disciplines, and it's done just that. I think the average SAT score for entering freshmen in the Honors College last year was 1357, that's a couple hundred points above the average—so we finally, now, got some high school counselors that are not saying, "If you can't go to UT or A&M, you can always go to Tech." That used to be the story. It's not happening anymore, they're saying, "You probably ought to go to Texas Tech." So, you know, it's just a good thing, and it's still continuing to get better. So those are probably two of the things that I would be proudest of—the smaller thing I think starting out intern program in Washington, D.C. That's been a really successful program, too. We actually have a building there, where our interns live, and we got that started.

DM:

When did the satellite campuses come into being—Fredericksburg, Marble Falls, Junction—?

DH:

Well Junction came in early on. Junction's been around long before I was ever even—maybe while I was provost or something. We started a program in Junction—it used to belong to Texas A&M, but we took that campus over, and primarily, we had people down there in the summer doing research. So there were a few faculty members that really developed the Junction campus. When we got into Fredericksburg, a lot of that was nursing—had to do with the Health Sciences Center, not just us. And then the Marble Falls—those campuses were there—I can't even remember—most of the development of that, though, was done, I think, when David Schmidly was president, after I was president. He was really interested in developing those Central Texas campuses, and I think the one who really promoted.

DM:

One other question I had for you in regard to athletics, can you assign a percentage of the time you needed to spend on athletics as opposed to academics?

DH:

Well it came in spurts. If it was problems, well then you spent a hundred percent of your time on that for a while. I don't know what the average would be; I tried to keep it as low as possible. One of the things that I did early on when I was president was to hire Gerald Myers, and that was—there were a lot of people who really objected—Gerald had been around here for a long time, and they thought we needed someone from outside to come in, more of a business person. And that was really—I did that soon after I became president.

DM:

In hindsight, how do you look at that?

DH:

I look at it as a good appointment. And there may still be some people that don't because there at the end, he stayed too long. Gerald shouldn't have stayed as long as he did, although we got a lot of—if you look at the things that we were able to accomplish, a lot of the credit has to go to him. And a lot of the things that recently—that I might not have picked had I still been president, I might not have been really excited about spending as much money as we do on facilities and athletics. I can tell you this: there are a lot of people whose— Aren't you a little bit early?  
[spoken to an unknown arrival at DH's office]

**Unknown:**

Yes sir.

DH:

Okay, fine. I told him we'd go to eleven.

DH:

There are a lot of people who support this university, primarily through their attachment to athletics—and they support academics as well. I've never been critical of supporting athletics, because it brings in a lot of people who—they identify with the university through athletics—football, basketball—but they also give to scholarships for academics as well. So it's hard; you can't really separate the two. But you know, you have to keep in mind that we are a university, after all, and when we get to the point where we're putting so much more money into athletics—it gets all the attention—but I've thought, over all, that Gerald did a good job. Bob Bockrath—does that name ring a bell with you? He was athletic director before Gerald. He left here to become athletic director at the University of Alabama, and Gerald worked for Bob when he was



here, and Bob Bockrath was a strong supporter of Gerald. He came to my office several times supporting Gerald, and another guy who was a strong supporter of Gerald was Dan Law—Dan Law Field is named after Dan. Dan was just an alumnus, but very high on Gerald. The people that were opposed to Gerald were, for the most part, people that didn't think that he could handle the business end of it. He was a Texas Tech guy, everybody knew he loved Texas Tech, he was an athlete, he was a jock. Maybe, in these days, you know, we need a businessperson there—and there's a certain amount of truth to that, but that only means to me that you have to surround yourself with people who can fill in your areas of ignorance. That's true of any leadership position—you can't know everything about everything, so you find people who fill in the gaps in your own ignorance, so he learned a lot about the business end, but he had some good people supporting him. So I think, over all, I'm really proud of that appointment. It caused a lot of gnashing of teeth among a lot of people when it happened, but he did a good job, and he did a good job for a long time—probably stayed a little longer than he should have. I always figured that if you do your job the way it needs to be done, you're obviously going to make some decisions to displease some people. You're going to step on some toes, and eventually, you've stepped on all the toes—it's time to move on. And I—both the times that I resigned from administration—the time that I resigned as department chairman, and then later on, when I resigned as president—you know, I'd only been there for five years, but these days I think the average time of a president of a university is no more than six years. So you just get to the point where you know that you've been successful, endured some of the things that you wanted to do, and it's time to let somebody else come in and do the things that they need to do. So I always felt very comfortable in moving into a position, and also getting out of that position.

DM:

That's interesting. It makes you wonder if there are some people who just have a hard time giving up a position—easy enough to move in, hard to move out.

DH:

Yeah. Well, I don't know. Everybody identifies with a position differently. There's—it's a prestigious thing, you know, to be president of a university—hard in that regard, maybe, to give it up. When you have an opportunity to have done that, and then get to go back and do the thing you really love, and do more teaching, and you're pretty well left out of the research game after that, spent that time in administration. But then, of course, the next part of my story is that two years after I resigned as president, David Schmidly resigned as president, and I came back as interim president before they hired Jon [Whitmore], and was interim president for about a year then. So very few people are president before they're interim president—(laughter) I was like bookends, I was an interim president, then a president, then an interim president again. And then—

DM:

Had things changed dramatically in that two-year period under David Schmidly, that—were you able to pick up the pieces—?

DH:

You know the biggest change? Probably—no—not many things had changed at all. David had done some really good things. David was big on research, and he was also very interested in developing the Central Texas campuses, Fredericksburg, but the biggest change was he hired Bob Knight. (laughter) So when I came back in, I had Bob to deal with—and I don't know whether I told you this before, but Bob is one of the easiest guys I ever had to deal with.

DM:

Really?

DH:

Absolutely. He is the most transparently honest person that I've ever known. I mean, you may not like what he says or what he does, but he doesn't try to pull anything off. He's honest—integrity—and besides that, he was a big supporter of the library, and you know, we had some—I remember sitting in the office one day and telling him, "You're your own worst enemy, Bob," and he said, "Well I've known that for a long time." (laughter) But we never had any real problems with Bob. He never threw any chairs here—he threw very few tantrums, and he never got in trouble with the NCAA or with the conference. As far as I'm concerned, he was a big plus for Texas Tech. Now, he never built a winning basketball team for Texas Tech, which was the reason we brought him here, but no, I never had any problems with Bob Knight. We talked a lot about things, and we had some disagreements on some things, but as far as problems, you know, you have problems with people that try to pull the wool over your eyes—when you sit down in a meeting with someone, and when you walk out of the room, you don't know really where they stand—well he never had that problem. He just let you know up front exactly what he thought and why he thought it, so I think transparently honest is about the best description I would have for Bob Knight.

DM:

Were you interim president at the time of the controversy between Bobby Knight and David Smith?

DH:

Let's see—I remember it—

DM:

You remember it, it happened over at Market Street—culminated there, I think.

DH:

—I remember it very well. Was I interim president? I know that that never became—that that never got on my agenda to do anything about, so I may not have been interim president then. I don't know what I would have done about it anyway, but yeah, that was an unfortunate situation. But I'll tell you, I don't—well, we probably shouldn't pursue that any further. (laughter)

DM:

So you were interim president, and then what was immediately after that, because you became—you came in as interim chancellor—

DH:

That was after David Smith resigned. After I was interim president, I just went back again to the faculty and the Honors College, that's where I—when I left the presidency in 2000, I went to the Honors College, and then, after I was interim president, I did the same thing, came back to the Honors College. And I don't remember how many years it was after that that David Smith resigned, and that's when they asked me to come in as interim chancellor.

DM:

And what was your responsibility as interim chancellor? Did you do fundraising during that time period?

DH:

Oh yeah.

DM:

Principally a fundraiser, or the glue that binds TTU to TTUHSC or—?

DH:

I did, and I of course took over the legislative duties. We didn't have a session during that that I had to go testify, and I don't believe I—I testified several times, but I think it was in the interim, it wasn't during the legislative session. I think that's right, but I spent a lot of time in Austin, anyway, dealing with legislators, and going on fundraising visits, you know, chancellor's thing. That would not be a job that I would want permanently.

DM:

You've already mentioned that you didn't care for that aspect of it.

DH:

Being chancellor, that's really—the way we're organized here, that's one of the primary—well, that's not true of a lot of systems. In the University of Texas system, where they have nine

universities, the chancellor really doesn't have any fundraising responsibility. The presidents of the various universities raise money for the college. But here, in our small system, that's the principle job—that and dealing with the legislature and dealing with the board of regents and setting policy for the system. Yeah, I did all of that, and had the Health Sciences Center for the first time as part of—well, that's not really true. When I was interim president, before we had a chancellor, I was also in charge of Health Sciences.

DM:

You had a taste of that. You were really ahead of the system as interim president, and when you became president, [John] Montford came in as chancellor. What did you think about that when it first happened—in the entire chancellor—you know, the chancellor system, the use of the chancellor, and the relationship between chancellor and president?

DH:

I thought we made a good selection for chancellor. I wasn't necessarily one that thought that we needed a system at that time, but the regents wanted to have a system, and I'm sure there were some good reasons for it other than that, but one, I think—probably principle reason, was that UT had a system and A&M had a system. We were moving up, and we wanted to be a system. We really didn't—we had one university—general education university, and then we had one Health Sciences Center. So, you know, we could have operated that very effectively without becoming a system, but the regents wanted us to become a system, so I think the selection of John at the time for the chancellor was a good selection, although I still think today that John probably helped Texas Tech about as much when he was chairman of the senate finance committee in Austin as he did when he was chancellor. But he really did bring a—I don't know—an enthusiasm—he just sort of raised the level of thinking of a lot of folks around Texas Tech—that by golly, we really could become a major—have a major impact in the state and compete with UT. And so, it was really during John's—although we had a capital campaign when Cavazos was president—it was the Horizon Campaign under John that really started bringing it—people started loosening their wallets and really giving to the university. That's a habit that not many Texas Tech people had—A&M and UT people did, you know, and it was something extremely important—much more important today. We never would have thought then that they were going to deregulate tuition and that the percentage of money we were going to get appropriated was going to go down and down so that we had to depend more on tuition and private funding to support the university. So whether we needed a system or not—I'm not sure we did—but given the fact that our regents decided we would have a system—I think we made a good choice in John Montford to be the first chancellor. And I had a good relationship with John; we worked together very well. I resigned a year before he did. He stayed around for another year after I left. He had a little more capacity (laughter) for it than I do, but I enjoyed every minute of what I was doing. When the time came, I realized that the time came. I wanted to go do something else.



DM:

I think this is a good point to wrap this up, unless you have anything else to add to the topics we've been discussing.

DH:

I'll think about it a little bit. No, I think this is fine to wrap this up now.

*End of interview*

