

**Margaret Huling Bonz
Affirmative Action Officer and
Dean of Freshmen**

An Interview Conducted by
Mary Donin

Hanover, New Hampshire
October 21 and 31, 2002

DOH-4

Special Collections
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: Margaret Bonz
INTERVIEWER: Mary Donin
PLACE: Hanover, New Hampshire
DATE: October 21 and 31, 2002

DONIN: Today is Monday, October 21, 2002. I'm interviewing Dr. Margaret Bonz, who was at Dartmouth starting in 1975 as the affirmative action officer, and then became dean of freshmen. What I'd like to start out by asking you today, Dr. Bonz, is what attracted you to Dartmouth and Hanover back in 1975?

BONZ: I was at the University of Maryland and had worked in the human relations office there with a woman by the name of Priscilla Newell. She was the assistant to the director of human relations at the University of Maryland, and I was a graduate assistant. I was working on my doctorate at the time. Priscilla moved to Reading, Vermont, and got a part-time job at Dartmouth College working with Errol Hill as assistant affirmative action officer.

When she learned that the college was going to be looking for its first full-time affirmative action officer, she called me and urged me to be a candidate. I was finishing up my clinical internship, was not interested at the time, and told her, "Thanks, but no thanks." This was in the fall of 1974. Actually I was in my first job after having received, after having gotten my doctorate at the University of Maryland.

Anyway, Priscilla called me a couple more times, pressing me, and I kept saying "no." Finally at one point, when I was not finding myself particularly happy in this new job that I had taken, got off the phone and said to my husband, "Pris Newell has called again about this job at Dartmouth. Maybe I just ought to throw my hat in the ring." And his response was, "Well, I've been thinking about going to law school" (this is at age 41) "and that might be something you'd want to do." So we scrambled around and discovered there were two fledgling law schools, one Franklin Pierce, one Vermont Law School in South Royalton.

I did throw my hat in the ring, was invited up for an interview in late October. I really felt as if it was an incredibly long shot, and waited and waited and waited, and then was invited back, and I was told that I was a finalist and was invited back in January, I believe, and offered the position, and started, actually, the next month, in February of 1975. So it was through this connection with Pris and our mutual work at the University of Maryland that caused that transition from, well, from Maryland to northern New England.

The other factor was that my husband and I had both grown up in small towns, and we had two young children, and we had been looking for a way to get out of the Washington suburbs and find a better place to raise our children, and so this dovetailed a lot of things that worked out very, very nicely for us all.

DONIN: Who interviewed you?

BONZ: The first person that interviewed me in this—I think back now with some sadness, given what's happened in the interim—was Michael Dorris. Michael was just a dear, wonderful first person. I think I had breakfast with him at the Hanover Inn and then I interviewed with the Black Caucus and the Women's Caucus and deans like Marilyn [Austin] Baldwin, at that time, Lu Martin [Lucretia "Lu" Sterling Martin], it was Sterling in those days.

I think the people that I remember most were... Well, because it was such a stressful occasion, both were the Women's Caucus and the Black Caucus, because they were very, very... They had huge vested interests in who this new person was going to be, at that time in Dartmouth's history. I suppose, that would have been any time. But those are the folks. The key people who represented the sort of "minority" populations, or in those days you might call them the less enfranchised populations, on the Dartmouth campus.

And then the big interview, of course, was with John Kemeny [John G. Kemeny], because I was... I directly reported to him, as you probably know. Another person that I remember, because she was so wonderfully helpful to me, was Merelyn Reeve [Jacobs], now Merelyn Jacobs. In those days she was Merelyn Reeve; she was part of the speech department. And I remember sitting with Merelyn after the Women's Caucus meeting, because she knew... I mean, I had been really sort of pounced on, and, you know, taken apart and put back together again.

So we went and had a drink at the Hanover Inn, and we talked about... We talked about my dissertation, which, as a graduate student... I defended my dissertation in June of '74, and it was now January of '75, and I hadn't really thought about it since then. And the best thing that Merelyn ever did for me was to ask me that question, because that was basically the first question that John Kemeny asked me the next day in my interview with him, and I would have been stuttering and stammering around trying to recollect what I had repressed over the past seven months. So we talked about my dissertation, and when John asked me about my dissertation the next day I was able to give a fairly cogent response. But otherwise it would have been a disaster.

DONIN: Great timing.

BONZ: Great timing, yeah.

DONIN: Now, who was the affirmative action officer at that time?

BONZ: Well, Errol Hill. Errol had been preceded by Greg Prince [Gregory "Greg" Prince, Jr. '63], and all of this was a very interim part-time kind of thing, where people were doing, not patchwork, because the work that they did was excellent, but they were doing their other faculty or administrative duties at the same time they were trying to function in a part-time fashion as affirmative action officers.

So, Errol Hill, who was a professor of drama, was the part-time or halftime affirmative action officer, and Priscilla Newell was his assistant.

DONIN: And you got the job, and what did you find when you came here?

BONZ: Well, an interesting thing about the job: I think one of the reasons that I got the job, because I'm sure that I was not a particularly flashy candidate, was, having had that experience at the University of Maryland. The University of Maryland, I always used to say, was on the doorstep of the department of health, education and welfare in those days. And so it was the first institution to come under scrutiny in terms of the development of affirmative action plans and response to executive orders and so forth and so on. And boy, did Maryland do that in massive and comprehensive detail! And that was part of my work as a graduate student in that office at Maryland. So I was very well versed in what needed to be done, and certainly, coming from an institution the size of the University of Maryland, I had been engaged in some of the details of that kind of work. I was probably, therefore, one of the few people in this country... Because Maryland was very much

one of the first institutions to have its feet held to the fire in terms of developing plans and so forth.

So when I came to Dartmouth I did have a sense of not only what had been done at Dartmouth, because I had seen the affirmative action plans and the goals and timetables that had been developed—and it was, you know, in pretty good shape, given the national landscape and where other institutions were—ambitious goals.

But I had a lot of warning, if you will, about what Dartmouth was going to be like. You know, people bleeding green, and the old boy network, and people with moss growing on their backs because they'd been around here for so long, and all that sort of thing. But I'm the type of person who, you know, hears that and sort of files it away.

And I guess what generally characterizes me is that I have an open mind and just sort of come in and, for myself, try to get the lay of the land and get to know people and find out what's going on. And find out, in this case, where I needed to make contributions in this community beyond what was clearly on the table, in terms of helping departments, divisions, across the college develop their own internal affirmative action plans and learn how to just take the steps to engage in the proper processes of implementation, which involves recruitment beyond what a given academic department has normally done. You know, reaching out to the old boys across the country and asking who their most promising graduate students are, and having those folks come in for interviews and so forth and so on; but getting much more aggressive in terms of including what we called "non-traditional candidates" in their applicant pool or in their candidate pool.

One of the things that I discovered... I don't know whether it came about by virtue of my personality and what I did when I came in or whether it came about because of a vacuum that existed in the institution at the time, but I really came to function as an informal ombudsperson, where people would come in and say, "This is happening to me, and I need your counsel on how to handle it." And I had to be very careful to make a distinction about grievances or complaints or concerns that had no element of possible discrimination related to them, and those that did. And those that didn't got referred to the personnel office. And that was another interesting relationship.

Art Lindberg [Arthur F. Lindberg] was the director of personnel at the time, and there was, I think in some cases, the sense of competition, or a sense of concern that I didn't move into their turf when it came to personnel issues. So I tried to walk a very fine line. But in walking that

line, one of the things that I think I was able to effect, either through the affirmative action review committees and review boards, or just in general, was the development of appropriate grievance ... The college did not have personnel grievance procedures at the time that just pertained to the average bear concern about something in the workplace, whether it had to do with a feeling of discrimination or otherwise. So a by-product of my work in the affirmative action office, was that a set of proper policies and procedures for handling personnel grievances at Dartmouth College were developed.

And in any event, the ombuds role became an interesting one, that led down paths that, you know, ranged from my simply being able to arrange for the employee to talk in a benign climate with the person that they had concerns with, and get that resolved, to things that may have ballooned into more serious concerns that had to do with major salary equity issues, where you sort of had to get down and dirty and look at what's going on in terms of comparative data through personnel, and find that indeed there were legitimate grievances.

Just spinning this out a little bit: one of the major things I had to do, quite formally, as part of my role, was conduct, or orchestrate the conducting, of an institution-wide salary equity review. And that led to Rhona Mirsky's... That led to confirmation of some of the things that Rhona Mirsky—since you have referred to her in these questions—was concerned about. And in turn, that salary equity review led to a number of adjustments across the institution, with respect to employee salaries and particularly salaries of women. And one of the major, major areas was the library, where women were underpaid. So that's a long response to that question, but it probably covers some of the other questions that you have on your list, as well.

DONIN: If there was no grievance policy when you got here, what did employees do if they felt they were being discriminated against?

BONZ: Well, I think they went to personnel, and there was probably some effort to informally resolve things, but there was really no way for a person who was serious, and willing to be serious about pursuing something, to have a kind of formal set of steps by which they could proceed through a grievance process which, you know, ultimately might result in some sort of mediation process. It was very "mom and pop." Personnel was very "mom and pop" in those days. When Barnum [Robert G. Barnum III] came in, . . .

DONIN: Who was Bob Barnum?

BONZ: He was the next director of personnel after Art Lindberg left. He really professionalized that office. He was wonderful to work with, and I think he knew what needed to be done and took a lot of steps to -- not that we worked arm in arm, if you will. But after Bob came in, I didn't have to push as much to try to make things happen, or find ways to put pressure, perhaps through the affirmative action review board system, to cause things to occur vis-à-vis the personnel office. Bob sort of took it and ran with it.

DONIN: Did you start the affirmative action review board as well? Had that been set up before?

BONZ: No, those review boards existed when I came in.

DONIN: Were they effective?

BONZ: Some were, some weren't. Some were at some times and not others. It just depended upon the issue. There would be occasions when things would come up, when you could bring the clout of a review board to bear, and there were other times when it was, you know, pretty pro forma in terms of the business on the table. And not that that's bad, it's just that there were phases where there weren't burning kinds of things that a review board could easily get its teeth into, and there were other times when they couldn't.

DONIN: Who decided on the makeup of the review board?

BONZ: I don't know. That was pretty much in place when I came. There was a staff and service review board, there was a faculty review board, and then there was an administrative review board, and then there was a supreme court, which was—and I forget what it was called, but it was a board that had representatives, or the chairs, of each of the other review boards, and maybe one representative on it.

It was a conglomerate, if you will, of representatives from the three other, or three major groups. Ruth Adams was the chair of that. I wish I could remember what the name of that was. Ridiculous. Maybe it was the affirmative action review board, and the other was the faculty review board, staff and service, and... But in any event, that was where, if there were big problems or big issues, those went through the channels, if you will, to the overall affirmative action review board. And that was the one that, because of the people who sat on it, that had the greatest clout.

DONIN: And in what way did they have clout? What sort of action could they take?

BONZ: Well, in support of me, with the president or with vice presidents. As a matter of fact, I think some vice presidents... The director of personnel sat on that. I mean, it wasn't as if it was a heavily unwieldy thing, but it was just, it was a group that could confirm that they felt that this was something that, if it wasn't attended to, was going to end up blowing up in the institution's face. Sort of confirming my sense of that, and conveying that information through, again, appropriate channels.

DONIN: So you... Your remark about being sort of the ombudsperson... So you were able to see people who wanted to talk to you about their personal situation?

BONZ: Mm-hm.

DONIN: So you were sort of seeing people on both sides of the fence; I mean, you were reviewing departments and the work they were doing. On the other hand, you were hearing from people who felt that maybe they were being, that they had an issue with the department that they were in.

BONZ: Mm-hm.

DONIN: So that's a real skill, to be able to play both sides of that role. I mean, they obviously felt safe enough with you that they could share their issues with you, knowing that you were also reviewing that department as well.

BONZ: Yeah, and the review of the department was more... I would call it more bureaucratic, because it was of more quantitative stuff that you were looking at, in terms of, you know, reaching goals, or how they had comported themselves in the process of a search, and whether they had followed all the proper procedures, and so forth and so on. It was not really qualitative, and what's happening when people are coming to you has to do with qualitative stuff, and, you know, their quality of life in the workplace and what's happening to them.

One of the things, and I forget how this actually came about, but one of the things that I did very early on, maybe because I had so many people coming in my door who didn't know how to handle or sort of stand up for themselves, or -- and that sounds a little aggressive -- but who didn't know how to just go in and have a dialog with the supervisor -- was that I ran assertiveness training courses. And the majority of people in those courses were women, but there were even a few men who wanted to be a part of that. And we met in the lounge in Silsby Hall, over the lunch hour, and we'd have about six or seven sessions that we would work through to help people. You know, we would do

role playing and so forth, to help them learn how to have a conversation with a supervisor about something that was on their mind. So that they could remove some of that fear, and sense that they had the, not only the right to, but they had some of the skills to be able to make that happen.

DONIN: Were you—did you feel that you were universally accepted on campus? Were there certain departments or groups . . .

BONZ: Oh, by no means. [Laughter]

DONIN: . . . that were not necessarily delighted to have you here?

BONZ: This is a very civilized place, for the most part, at least for the adults. And I would say that, by and large, yes, there was a sense of acceptance. Because John Kemeny made it very clear, top down, that he was committed to improving the climate of this campus insofar as the representation of women and minorities, and appropriate treatment for people. I mean, without that sense that John very clearly conveyed to his vice presidents, anything that I had to do—or anybody else that was in my position, whether it was me or anybody else—would not have been successful.

But I would say that, by and large there was acceptance, but if... There were people who were annoyed that they had to spend time doing stuff that they thought was useless. There were people who were furious, on occasion, when I challenged or had reason to challenge, just based on the data they provided me, how they went about conducting a search, and the outcome.

I remember in one particular search, a very well-known individual, department chair, director -- well, it was development and alumni affairs, which was the hardest nut to crack on campus, almost -- sent in a report where they were. They had done all of the due diligence, and they had a black candidate, a woman candidate, and, I think, a couple of white male candidates. And of course a white male candidate was chosen, and the reason for... There was a column, or a place where you had to talk about the qualifications of the woman candidates and why she -- or, all of the candidates -- why they were even included in the pool. And the notation was, "pleasing personal attributes."

I don't usually—I'm usually a pretty mild-mannered person, but I saw that and I really -- It was one of my moments of going ballistic, and I knew this search was a sham from the outset. And to the extent I could fly into the president's office, which was not very often, I did fly in to John Kemeny's office, and I said, "This is it. This is the one we have

to go to the wall on." And he said, "Do it." And so that search got challenged, and they had to come around and do some different things, and they ended up with a different outcome, and they ended up hiring the black candidate actually.

DONIN: But that was the exception, rather than the rule, those sorts of . . . ?

BONZ: Yeah. But I mean, that was just so incredibly egregious. Oh, and did it cause this person to just... I had visions of my car being bombed, because he was just, he was ready to kill me. He was just outraged.

DONIN: How did that poor candidate make out, when he was eventually hired, this person?

BONZ: Well, the person was Sam Smith [Samuel W. Smith '49], and Sam was a great, well-known fixture on this campus anyway, and everybody loved him and respected him. He was in admissions and it worked out just fine, because everybody knew that he should have been hired in the first place.

DONIN: Great. Good for him. So let's talk about the students, what you found in terms of the students back in -- when you got here in '75.

BONZ: You know, my focus was... Affirmative action didn't have anything to do with students, it had to do with employment. So my focus really wasn't on the students. But because I had a student affairs background, one of the things that I wanted to do was to stay in touch with students, and so I immediately called the freshman office and asked to have advisees. So I became a freshman advisor, and that was how I had my greatest and most rewarding contact with students, was with my advisee group each year. And then I had an intern in the freshman office. And occasionally I would have students come in to talk about, or to seek my intervention in things having to do with them or their clubs or whatever, and I had to explain to them that that wasn't my bailiwick, and to try to get them connected with people who could be responsive, and responsive to their concerns. So in those days, my contact with students was minimal.

You know, the landscape was still heavily male, and I remember... Somebody tells me that I made this comment, and actually I sort of have a vague recollection of it, that women who were members of, say, the Dartmouth Class of '79, one of them would end up becoming president of the United States. I don't know why I said this stupid thing. Just because they had the strength, resilience, inner core to stand up with all that it takes to be kind of in the public arena, and have all this stuff slung at you, and be able to not only ward it off but kind of

stand up and be who you are, and make your own case. Because those women had to be, and were, many of them, very, very tough, and learned how to be tough because of the environment they were in.

But I always felt that Dartmouth—Dartmouth, just because of its being Dartmouth, and of course "Animal House" didn't help at all—I always felt that Dartmouth got an incredibly bad and inaccurate rap, because other Ivies were not any more welcoming to women. It was just as bad on any other campus, if you want to characterize it as bad. The climate was not any better. But I think, just because we're up here in the north woods, and all of the things that attach to Dartmouth and the Dartmouth animal, and the all-maleness of the institution made Dartmouth sort of a whipping boy for folks pointing a finger and saying, "Oh, it's so bad there."

Well, I didn't really find that it was as bad as folks like to make out, because I had been in other institutions, and I knew about the climate in other institutions. And in some cases I felt Dartmouth was far further along the continuum. I mean, if you just took the quantitative data, you know, how many women faculty, and how many minority faculty, and other kinds of things, Dartmouth was much further along the continuum than places like Harvard, Yale, Princeton, etc.

DONIN: Why do you think they became such a target for all the bad press they got back in, whatever it was, '79?

BONZ: Well, as I say, I think part of it was the "Animal House" influence, and just the... You know, it takes so long for images of institutions to be . . .

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

DONIN: We're still talking about your interactions with students. When you were an advisor to freshmen students, did you do things like go on the outings with them, and that sort of thing?

BONZ: I didn't start doing freshman trips until I was dean of freshmen. But I... I live out in Strafford, Vermont, which is across the river, about 16 miles from Hanover, and I had my advisees out frequently -- take them out apple-picking, scenic climbs and spaghetti dinners, and New England stuff like that.

DONIN: Now, how long was it before you started teaching?

BONZ: I didn't do any teaching until I was in the freshman office.

DONIN: And was that your idea, or the college's idea, that you start teaching?

BONZ: No, it was my idea, because I wanted to, quite frankly, enhance my resume. I wanted to have that as something that I had done, because I had no idea what was out there in terms of my future. So, because of my background in education, in the education department... And I had lots of friends in the education department, particularly good friends in the education department because of our compatibility of backgrounds. So I asked about teaching a freshman seminar, which is something that was simple enough to do, and they were very happy to have that happen. And so that's what I did. I think I did that for three years, maybe three or four years, in the spring. Spring was chosen because that was the less busy of the terms for me, and the one where I could see myself being out of the freshman office and having an extra work load.

DONIN: How did it help you in your work, being in the classroom?

BONZ: I can't say that it necessarily did, except giving me greater insights, in particular, to women students. I think it was actually... Well, it was complementary, because I saw a lot of women students in the freshman office, and heard their stories, and became, through that exposure and in my work with them in the freshman seminar, just really almost depressed about these women who were among the best and the brightest, who spent a lot of time tamping down who they were, and particularly their intellect, their intellectual prowess.

In a freshman seminar, for example, in a discussion — and my freshman seminar had to have, it turned out, a lot to do with social issues — I would have them write journals. They would write about what they were reading; they would write about discussion in class; anything that came to them, having to do with the material at hand, I would ask them to just comment on. And I would get these journal entries from women students that were very, very profound and thoughtful, and in some cases angry or assertive about what they felt. And we would have the same discussion in class, and you wouldn't hear a peep from them.

And I would say... We would not only have the journal entries but I would meet with them once every few weeks or so to talk about what was in the journal and what was going on and I would say to the women students, "We sat in class yesterday and we had this discussion about such and such, and Joe and John and da da da talked about all these things that I know cause your hair to stand on end, and really probably got under your skin, but you didn't say a word in response. Your journal tells me what you were really thinking, and if you had been able to say in class what you said, what you had written,

it would have been a much livelier and interesting discussion, and you would have challenged those guys in their idiotic notions. Why?" "Well, I've got to see these folks outside of class, or if not them, their friends, and I don't want to be known as too aggressive; I don't want to be viewed as too feminist" (even though they didn't use that word, some of them did); "but I just didn't want to be viewed as somebody who was too much."

And in variations on that theme, I heard this story over and over and over. And that's what led me, at the time when I felt it was a good point for me to be looking to do something different, that I identified as one of the things I would like to do, to be the head of an all-girls school, because I thought I might have an opportunity to intervene on some of that potential future behavior.

DONIN: And get them earlier, in high school.

BONZ: Yes, yes. Now, I would see some of these women who exhibited these kinds of behaviors in their freshman year, who, by the time they were juniors and seniors, had sort of come into their own. And at some personal expense, quite frankly. And others who never did. And then there were also women who, in their first year at Dartmouth, were feisty enough to be able to swim upstream, but it was tough. And it wasn't just Dartmouth, it was societal norms that were contributing to that. They could have been anywhere and behaving in the same way.

But I think the pressure was greater here, just because of the smallness of the institution, which was, you know, one of its great — I think, great — positive characteristics, and the tightness of the undergraduate community and the tightness of a particular class. And women learned real quickly, if they didn't bring it with them (and they usually did), how they needed to tiptoe around things in order to be accepted socially.

DONIN: For many years they were outnumbered by the men.

BONZ: Oh yeah, yeah, for many years. Which was — I'm thinking about one of your later questions here — in my view, an absolute product of the admissions office. I mean, having sat on the committee on admissions and financial aid, I knew very well that there were actually more "qualified women," in terms of numbers, than men, but yet the ratio stayed in a very particular place. Part of that was mandated by college policy, but even after the stricture of whatever it was, two-thirds/one-third — I forget — was lifted, we could have moved very rapidly to fifty-fifty. But you control that in admissions and it was controlled.

DONIN: Was admissions taking their position from a higher authority?

BONZ: I don't think so. And I don't know how many people are going to hear this, but I mean, it was how Al Quirk [Alfred T. "Al" Quirk '49] wanted to run things.

DONIN: It took a long time.

BONZ: It did.

DONIN: He must have been having tremendous pressure, though, from . . .

BONZ: Well, he obviously had tremendous pressure, because not only did he have to function within the confines of the college, the pressure was external as well. It had to do with Dartmouth athletics, and it had to do with any number of things. So none of our jobs, I mean none of anybody's jobs in this institution now, are easy ones, particularly when you're in that kind of position.

So I don't mean to be blatantly finger-pointing, but I do know, or, I do feel, very strongly that if there had been someone else at the helm who... Let's say, if Holly Sateia had been director of admissions, or Jennifer Joseph had been director of admissions, there would have been a very different outcome in terms of the complexion of the class and the gender representation. It just depends on what you want to do.

I remember when I was at the University of Maryland and the University of Maryland was under pressure, because it was a state institution, to have more black students enrolled. And there was a man I worked with by the name of John Suggs, and John Suggs was not a militant black man. He was the most mild-mannered person you would ever know, an ex-military person. I remember sitting in one meeting when this question about more blacks at the University of Maryland was being debated. And John Suggs, in this singular moment of kind of assertiveness around racial issues, said, "If the University of Maryland decided today that it wanted to admit 2,000 Indians, really decided it wanted to do that, it would do that." And he was absolutely right. I mean, it is what you decide you want to do.

And John Kemeny (speaking of Indians), decided that this institution would have a commitment to Native Americans, and that happened [tapping the table for emphasis]. But it takes that strong statement and assertion, and the kind of drawing the line and insisting that this is where we're going, you know, like it or not, and if it means dragging people kicking and screaming into that reality, then so be it. But there

were truly, as you well know, lots of political pulls and tugs at Dartmouth, and it wasn't an easy time.

But I do know, I do feel profoundly, that with regard to admissions policy, that the director of admissions could have controlled that and moved that agenda much more quickly than it was.

DONIN: Could John Kemeny have moved it faster?

BONZ: I think John Kemeny... I don't know. My sense was that John Kemeny felt that frustration himself. I don't know that he ever called anybody in and said, you know, "You're going to do this or you're going to be fired." But I think that he felt the frustration that it wasn't moving as quickly as he would have liked. I just don't. It's my sense.

DONIN: And how about the trustees?

BONZ: I don't know. I had very little interaction with the trustees.

DONIN: So did you have specific goals when you started here? I mean, did you have a picture in your mind?

BONZ: No, the institution had goals. They were already established. They had a ten-year affirmative action plan. I can't remember precisely where we were into that plan when I came in, but I remember one of the goals was at the end of "x" period of time, whether it was five years or ten years, 25 percent women faculty members, for example, ten percent minority faculty members. So those were on the table, they already had been established through a fairly inclusive process of... I mean, the affirmative action review boards were involved in helping create those.

There was a group called the COA, committee on administration, that consisted of all the vice presidents across the institution, and director of personnel, chaired by the vice president for administration Rod Morgan [Rodney A. "Rod" Morgan '44 TH '45 TU '45]. That group had input, or sort of final bestowing of the blessing, that these were acceptable. But these were worked on, had been worked on, I think starting with Greg Prince's time and into Errol Hill's. And so when I came in, I basically inherited those, when you talk about goals.

Otherwise, the interesting thing about my position was, nobody had ever done it before at Dartmouth College except Errol, part-time, and he was working on this goal stuff and, you know, increasing representation of women and minorities across the school community, college community. And the job was totally unformed otherwise. So

that's why I say, you know, I kind of drifted into becoming an informal ombudsperson, was able to do that, was able to look around and say, "Here are things that we need to do."

I mean, one of the federally-mandated things that we had to do was the salary equity review, which was a huge thing across the institution. Another thing that I did, because it became... As I did an analysis over time about attrition of junior faculty and because we were a revolving door to some degree, I saw that as an issue. My social science training kicked in, and I developed this questionnaire, and did a study, did a survey of "why" to try to get a handle on why faculty, junior faculty, were leaving. These were people who were leaving before they came up for tenure review, even before they had gotten to year six. And that was... I had, interestingly enough, a lot of compliments on that survey from other social scientists who took it and John Kemeny knew that I was doing it. But it turned up some relatively unflattering things, and Leonard [M.] Rieser ['44] was furious.

This is another... Leonard and I always had a good relationship, even when he was furious. But he was furious, and he made it very clear. I was feeling enormous pressure from him, and enormous displeasure, and I remember to the extent that I went down to Alex Fanelli [A. Alexander "Alex" Fanelli '42], who was the special assistant to the president, or executive assistant to the president, and said, "Leonard's after me." And I'm sure that Alex intervened in some way. I mean John Kemeny was happy to have that report; it got shared with the trustees . . .

DONIN: This is the report entitled, it was on the junior faculty . . .

BONZ: . . . faculty experience at Dartmouth College, mm-hm. It got shared with the trustees, and some things were put into place to try to be responsive to some of those issues that were raised. But Leonard felt that I had overstepped my bounds, even though I had John Kemeny's endorsement for doing this. But when the report came out, I think Leonard thought he had been caught by surprise. He was really furious, and as I say, the displeasure was great. I was feeling really sort of hammered by him, and my literal words to Alex Fanelli were, "Leonard is out to get me." And I think I probably was in tears at the time.

Sometime after that, maybe two or three weeks, I came back to my office one day to find one or more yellow roses in a vase, with a note that said something like, "My mother always said to me, 'Never apologize, never explain.'" But those yellow roses were meant to

signify friendship, and they [were with] that note, and it was from Leonard Rieser. So I knew we had a truce.

DONIN: Was he angry at the report, at the results of the report, or the fact that you had taken it, that it went to the trustees?

BONZ: I think it was more... I think he could deal with the findings, although the findings may have suggested that there were things that he and the folks in his office could have been attending to. I mean, they should have been on top of that. It shouldn't have taken the affirmative action officer of the college to root out some of those things, or to see that this was an issue and try to find out what was going on. So I think that that was sort of embarrassing. But I think the thing that royally ticked him off was the fact that I had done the report, and it was the affirmative action officer who had done the report, and what business did I have getting into faculty affairs of that nature? Even though the revolving door so much involved women, junior women faculty who were coming and leaving.

DONIN: Interesting. Do you remember the trustees' reaction to the report?

BONZ: They were concerned. I mean, not that they were beating their breasts or throwing their arms up in the air, but they... I remember that basically they said, "This is interesting; there are things here that we need to try to correct so that we don't..." I mean, it's an enormous waste of resources and money to spend a lot of time recruiting talented people to come here, and then lose them in three or four years. And I'm not sure that I was even aware of that aspect of the sort of tragedy or tragic piece of that at the time. I was sort of aware of the human drain and the fact that people that we'd worked so hard to get, who were a protected class and part of what we were trying to do in an affirmative action kind of way, we were losing them and we had to do it all over again. And we were spinning our wheels in some respects.

DONIN: This sort of segues into the series of questions I had about hiring faculty spouses, keeping the faculty spouses, and administrative spouses as well. Were there different rules, so to speak, pertaining to how you could offer a job to a "trailing spouse" -- as Phil Cronenwett [Philip N. Cronenwett] likes to call them -- who is a faculty person or an administrative person? Or were the rules the same?

BONZ: Well, I don't know that there were... There weren't any... Actually, I'm not going to respond to your question. I'm going to tell you how it was and I'll digress a little bit. The two hugely burning issues on the agenda of the Women's Caucus, in my days in the affirmative action

office, in the early days, were maternity leave policy and faculty spouses. And through lots of back and forth, and back and forth, and hammering out and hammering out, and also the integration of federal regulations and expectations and so forth, maternity leave policy, in an agonizing process, finally got adopted.

The issue with faculty spouses got to the point... I don't know why it was such a problem, but it was like the institution — particularly in the realm of faculty — was on a high horse about faculty spouses. "Don't even talk to us about that, because there cannot be the expectation. If we start thinking about faculty spouses then standards come into play, and we just, we cannot expect that a spouse of a faculty member who is our primary hire is going to measure up, and therefore we just don't want to... We don't want to mess around with this faculty spouse stuff." That was sort of it at the beginning. I may be making this more dramatic than it was.

But there was real resistance to hiring faculty spouses. Once we got over the hump that a) this is a reality, b) this is not an affirmative action issue *per se*, it is an issue in attracting the best faculty, whether it's a male faculty member, a female faculty member, it was genderless. So we began to creep toward an understanding that a faculty spouse — if there was a position available — could and should, could submit credentials. But by God! it was as if they had to be time and a half again better than the average bear candidate who came in, or who might be considered. And to have somebody considered off a standard timeline was just, you know... It would freak people out.

So we had to, we had to really meld this into the whole process of recruitment and hiring, but the bottom line was, the faculty spouse always had to be more than better, because there was this narrow-minded perspective that, "if we get into this hiring of faculty spouses then there's going to be this diminution of standards." It was just almost a knee-jerk thing, in my mind.

I remember, and again, as I referred to Michael Dorris, this is a very sad thing to recall. But Half Zantop was hired, and there was Suzanne and there was some back and forth and back and forth. And finally the—was it the German department? —I don't think it was comp lit. It might have been both, I can't remember exactly. But I do remember Suzanne coming to see me in the affirmative action office, saying that she was interested in a position at Dartmouth. And, fortunately for Suzanne at that time, she was half again as good as your next candidate, and she was one of the first faculty spouses hired, you know, in a timeframe that was relatively consistent with when her

husband had been hired here. So that was seen as a great breakthrough.

I'm trying to think about Ron and Mary Jean Green, and I can't... I just don't... They're fuzzy in my mind in terms of... I mean, Ron was clearly here, and I can't remember whether they came in together or whether she was trailing. But that was another pair.

But it took a while for the institution to come to grips — particularly the people in the dean of the faculty office — with the fact that this was something that Dartmouth was going to have to pay attention to, big time, in order to... This was an era where you're moving into dual-career families, and for Dartmouth to continue to attract the finest quality regardless of gender, there had to be some accommodations made, and it wasn't... It didn't have to do with accommodations that caused a reduction in standards, but some willingness to be flexible and to try to find opportunities for truly talented spouses somewhere in this institution.

Eventually there was much more of that attempt to accommodate, to be flexible, to look around, to say, "There may not be a position in Jennifer's department for the next two years, but we could do something like adjunct or have some kind of term-by-term appointment," I mean, to do something that would allow these people not to be engaged in long-distance commuting marriages, that would give them some hope for stability in terms of both careers being able to move along a normative track in the future.

DONIN: Were the most pressing cases within the faculty as opposed to the administration?

BONZ: Yes.

DONIN: And when you say . . .

BONZ: Because in administration there are so many places where you can have sort of throw-away jobs or positions could potentially be created, depending on how much you wanted an individual. But there were... We were in times of budget constraint, too, so there wasn't a lot of flexibility there. True, in some respects, but then again I go back to John Suggs: "If you want to bring in 2,000 Indians, you can do that."

I mean, if Dartmouth had wanted to make some concessions . . . But to be fair, the institution was also very, very conscious of not stepping out of line and taking an action that would set a precedent that would set it up for some kind of complaint: current complaint or future complaint or

something of that sort. So it was delicate. And in a lot of these situations it was delicate, not to establish precedents that would get a college in trouble in the future.

DONIN: In terms of the trailing spouses, was it more women or more men that you were trying to accommodate at that point, do you remember?

BONZ: I think it was... I don't know. My recollection is that at first it was more women and then it became more balanced as the institution was trying to attract greater numbers of women faculty.

DONIN: But these women that were hired as the second, as the spouse, could, did they ever help you meet affirmative action numbers?

BONZ: Well, don't get me wrong. We're not talking about great numbers. I mean, in my time in the affirmative action office that might have amounted to a total of three or four. Not much.

DONIN: OK. Now, you came in '75, and almost immediately you were the affirmative action officer.

BONZ: Well, that was what I was hired to do.

DONIN: Um, right. Did you have any time to . . .

BONZ: Well actually, I overlapped with Errol until the end of that year, as his deputy.

DONIN: Uh-huh. That was my question, how much time did you get to spend with Errol Hill?

BONZ: I came in February. I think I started February 15 or something like that, and then overlapped with Errol until June.

DONIN: So you were the first full-time affirmative action officer, and as you said, you really created the job, because it was a part-time job until you came.

BONZ: Yes.

DONIN: Who were your mentors and your supporters when you came?

BONZ: Ruth Adams was a good friend, and someone that I would turn to. Lu Sterling, to some degree; Marilyn Baldwin; Michael Dorris. These are people that were, that I could sort of count on, particularly Michael was somebody that I could talk to, and he to me, because he had a lot of things that he needed to talk to someone about.

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

DONIN: OK, so you were talking about your mentors and your supporters.

BONZ: Yes. Well, various and sundry women, I suppose. The thing about being in the affirmative action office was you had to be extremely discreet and extremely objective, and not... I mean, you just couldn't get tied to any particular group or identified with any particular group. I mean, I was not a member of the Women's Caucus. That would have been inappropriate.

DONIN: Ah.

BONZ: I mean, they were an advocacy group, and I had to sit in a different place where I had to evaluate things, you know. And it would have been just politically inappropriate for me to be a member of a group when I was sitting in a different chair and had to be more objective about agenda, people's political agenda. And I couldn't be a part of driving any individual's or group's agenda. I mean, those kinds of things had to go through the right kind of channels, and I had to stay literally sort of above it all, and in a way there's a great metaphor to that, because I was sitting... I mean, I'm literally in the crow's nest of Parkhurst, in the attic of Parkhurst, which means... We found that symbolic in many ways, you know, that affirmative action was up in the attic. But I was truly above it all!

DONIN: Now, were you able to come down from your nest? When you became the dean of freshmen were you able...

BONZ: Oh, then I went to the basement! [Laughter] Which again was a great metaphor, because you've got these first-year students that are starting at the bottom, and we were in the basement!

DONIN: Were you able to become more sort of politically active if you chose to, once you stopped being the affirmative action officer?

BONZ: I just don't think that it's appropriate for administrators to be politically active in a public way. I mean, if you do things, you... You can't, because you've got your reporting relationships, and you have to do things in your own quiet way through proper channels. And it wasn't as if I was neutral, by any means, about some of the things I felt strongly about, but you don't go out on the Green and stand with a bullhorn and broadcast your views. You handle those things in more discreet and appropriate ways.

DONIN: Back to the work of the Women's Caucus, though. You said coming up with maternity leave was difficult, a policy. Why was that?

BONZ: Well, you know, sitting here in 2002 you would wonder. I mean, this is like a no-brainer. But in 1975-76 you're talking about Dartmouth College, an institution that just hadn't had much to do with women's things, and they just didn't quite know how to deal with that, and how are you going to handle a pregnant faculty member who's going to be up for tenure the next year, and should you give her time off? I mean, "It's not fair to the male faculty member who's not going to get time off, and, you know. So what I mean is it's her choice to have a baby, and if she wants to, you know, screw around and have a baby in the middle of her tenure track, then she's just going to have to suck it up and live with it!" It was Byzantine!

Finally, slowly but surely, after beating people about the head and shoulders, from a philosophical standpoint, practical standpoint, human rights, you know, da da da, folks began to see the light. And the good thing about the federal regulations and the various civil rights acts, was, even though you may not have gotten people over the bridge to understanding, emotionally and intellectually, why they needed to do the right thing, they had to do it whether they liked it or not.

So sometimes that came first, and the dawning and understanding came, you know, trailed along and eventually caught up to the fact that it had to be done because it was required. But it was just mentality.

DONIN: And I assume the same held true for childcare?

BONZ: Yes. Actually, that's interesting, because I had forgotten. Vicki Winters [Virginia E. Winters] was a member of my staff, like quarter time, and she was the first Dartmouth childcare coordinator. And what she did at the outset was to help Dartmouth families (and this was basically faculty and not staff) find child care placement in the Upper Valley. She was sort of like a clearinghouse. And then eventually Dartmouth opened its own child care center. I mean, it didn't quite go "poom" and end up in that place out on Storrs Pond Road, whatever that road is. It was little bits and pieces.

I remember that there were a certain number of places reserved in a daycare center across the river, right up the hill from the Montshire [Museum]. I don't know whether it's still a childcare center or not, but there were a number of Dartmouth places reserved there, and that's sort of how it started, and then ended up with the building, new building, new childcare center being built.

DONIN: And this was just for faculty?

BONZ: Well, my recollection is that in the very, very early days of the childcare services that were provided, I think it was. I think faculty had first priority, because there was a limited number of spaces.

DONIN: When we interviewed Errol Hill he talked about the “old boy network,” and how hard it was to break out of that in terms of hiring and recruiting. Was that still in force when you came in '75?

BONZ: Yeah, I think I've already spoken to that with some of the examples that I gave. I mean, people just had to re-learn how to, relearn ways of doing things. Because there was a very comfortable way, as I said before, of calling up your colleagues at other schools and saying, "I'm looking for your brightest male"—I mean, "I'm looking for your brightest graduate student," and de facto, that was male.

They had to learn through... Again, even though they didn't want to do it and they didn't agree with it, they had to advertise broadly; they had to show that they had made bona fide efforts to bring women and minorities into their candidate pool, or demonstrate why that was not possible; and slowly but surely... And this is where I had to do a lot of coaching with department chairs and a lot of training.

I guess what I wanted to be able to help them do was to show them that this could be done and it wasn't hard, maybe another extra step or two. But what it was doing for them was increasing their universe of possibilities, of wonderful possibilities, including white male possibilities, for that matter. [It] is [possible] to go beyond your normal network and reach out to a wider universe of prospective candidates. But I wanted it to be easy for them in order to diminish the resistance to it, and so I tried to devise ways, you know, simple instructions, simple methods to provide them with all the information they would need about sources that they could go to to engage in these recruitment efforts. So it was, it was teaching them a new way of doing things.

DONIN: Did it involve more record keeping?

BONZ: Yeah. And again, that was federally mandated. But that was really important, because you had to have accountability, and the only way you could ensure accountability was to require that record keeping. Otherwise it would have been a sham.

I mean, in some respects it was a sham anyway, but it would have been truly a sham if people had not been required to keep records and to account for their actions, and to be able to say to me, “We did this

and this and this and this, and we only came up with two women. I mean, there are only two prominent women graduate students in the field of astrophysics that are, you know, on the market today, and one of them's going to MIT and the other one's going to Cal Tech."

DONIN: I looked at the junior faculty report that you did for Kemeny and the trustees. In addition to the record-keeping it seems there was an enormous amount of statistics involved as well. Is that right? Percentages and charts and . . . ?

BONZ: Yes, that was really... That was not something that departments had to get involved in, it was something that I had to do in the affirmative action office, because we had data about the, you know, percentage of black doctorates in sociology, and we would use that as sort of a baseline to figure out how well we were tapping into that particular field, or that particular set of potential candidates. It was really to help guide us so that we weren't setting unrealistic expectations for a department in terms of what it ought to expect to reap as a result of appropriate recruitment activity.

On the other side of the coin, if you had a field, say, in English, where forty percent of the women receiving doctorates in "x" year were women, and the English department trots over with their report and shows me that they recruited ten candidates and only one is a woman, then I go, you know, "This doesn't measure up in terms of who we know is out there in that universe of possibilities."

DONIN: So the departments didn't have to do all the statistical work, they just had to keep their records and . . .

BONZ: They had to tell me where they had recruited, and they had to show me their candidate pools by race and gender, and then they had to show me the short list, and they had to justify who they hired. Also if there were women or minorities on the short list, they had to have a rationale for why those people were not chosen.

DONIN: So, how often did you have to challenge these hires?

BONZ: When I think about all of the hiring that's done on campus, I would say relatively few times, but there were enough. And, you know, it would be when you... The most profound challenge was the one that I described before, where I literally levitated into the president's office. Because this had been a problem spot for a long time, and they just kept getting away with crap, and kept doing the same thing over and over and over again, and it was just lip service. And that was the straw that broke the camel's back.

With academic departments, it was—you would have a situation, say, the one that I just described, where you maybe had ten and one candidates. Or ten, and nine of whom were men, and one that they had interviewed, and they had hired the man or something of that sort. Or maybe they had a short list of five and two were women and they didn't hire the women.

Typically, that would pass because you never wanted to go head to head with a department chair; it wasn't politic and it was a no-win situation, a total no-win situation. But where something like that would happen would be... Let's continue to use the English department as an example. I would go in and sit down with, say, Fred Berthold [Fred Berthold, Jr. '45], who was the associate dean for the humanities, one of the ones in my day. Hans Penner... Well, actually Hans was when I was in the freshman office. But I remember Fred in particular. And I would say, "Fred, this can't happen again. Here's the data, here's the information" and I would take all of my little arsenal of data and information, and say, "They can do better, and you've gotta be the guy that holds their feet to the fire."

And that had to be the case, because I had... I mean, I wasn't a faculty member. I had no credibility in that sense, but Fred did, he was one of them, and the department chairs reported to him, and he was the one who would say, down the line, who would get the chair of the English department in to sit with the two of us: Fred, Margaret, the chair of the English department: "This has got to go down better the next time around, and here's how I can help. Here's how you might have done things different," blah blah blah.

So again, my role was not punitive or pushing people against the wall, but just trying to persuade [them] to use the right channels and to, again, find ways to help people see that they can make a difference. "We have these goals, you're part of that, these are institutional goals, these have been endorsed institution-wide, you're part of that, the president is behind it, and the English department has to make some contributions here, because this is the one department, in terms of the number of doctoral students coming through the pipeline, that has the greatest number of women. And you just can't continue year after year after year to find male candidates, and you cannot tell me, or justify legitimately to your colleagues across the institution or across the faculty, that there aren't any well-qualified women that you can bring in to Dartmouth College." So it was working in that fashion.

DONIN: This is a long, long education process you had to undertake. So it was less sort of policing than it was teaching.

BONZ: Oh, it was educating, yeah.

DONIN: Were there certain departments that were harder to bring around than others?

BONZ: Mm-hm. Oh, and some of them had to do... In some of them, where even... English was one. And I use that because it was a field where there were ample numbers of women. Now, I could say economics was another. They just sort of were recalcitrant and stubborn but they did have some legitimate statistical data on their side. Even beyond the statistical data, they were not about to be moved. But, you know, we began to make some inroads there too. I think Nancy Marion [Nancy P. Marion] was one of the first people hired, women hired, in the economics department who actually stayed and, you know, got tenure.

DONIN: What was her last name?

BONZ: Marion, M-a-r-i-o-n.

DONIN: OK. So you get these people on campus, these women, minorities. How involved were you in making sure they were happy here, that they felt welcome and that this was the kind of place that they could find, you know, a meaningful life, in addition to their, not just their life at Dartmouth, but their personal life.

BONZ: Well, that wasn't really part of my job. But I think that the whole atmosphere that was being created around these kinds of concerns was one whereby people in the department, the women, the Women's Caucus, would try to reach out and take those folks under their wing, to the extent that the individuals wanted to have that kind of support. There was an understanding that support was needed, but it generally came through departmental colleagues or through Women's Caucus or Black Caucus kinds of things.

DONIN: Were there certain departments that were more welcoming than others to women and minorities?

BONZ: I'm sure there were, but I couldn't put a fine point on that.

DONIN: I'd like to just go back to some of these hiring questions about the lesser-qualified applicant, because he or she is a spouse. Did you ever have to deal with that?

BONZ: No, that was not part of... I mean, there were occasions when, I would say, plenty of times, because it was a center of debate for a period of

time. Because the automatic assumption was that the person was not going to be qualified, and Dartmouth was going to have to... It was the whole resistance to the notion of affirmative action, that, "we're going to have to hire people who are less qualified than what we would want to hire."

That was a totally illegitimate and inaccurate premise, because that's not what affirmative action was about. It was about expanding the candidate pool and having a more representative group of candidates, so that out of that greater pool of candidates you can hire the best qualified; and all things being equal, when you've got an institution that's trying to increase its number of women and minorities, if you have a woman and a man who you feel equally strong about, then you're going to give the nod to the woman, because that's value added for Dartmouth College.

So a lot of the early education was to help people understand that affirmative action wasn't about hiring lesser-qualified people in order to meet goals. But then when you get into the spouse issue, people would kick into that old set of erroneous assumptions, and you'd have to go around the barn again and make them understand that's not what we're talking about.

DONIN: Since you weren't directly involved in the hiring you may not be able to speak to this, but did Dartmouth's reputation, deserved or not, play into the decisions of minorities and women in choosing whether or not to come here? You know, would departments be turned down . . . ?

BONZ: I don't think it... By the time a candidate gets to that level, they're serious. I think where Dartmouth's reputation, if you will, comes into play [is] with people who wouldn't have applied in the first place.

DONIN: So you never see them at all.

BONZ: You never see them at all. And understand, too, that in that time period there was an incredibly tight job market. I remember — and this was the period of time when you'd hear about English Ph.D.'s driving taxis in New York City, you know, doing all kinds of oddball things — where there was a glut on the market in many disciplines, and so anybody who got a job interview at a place like Dartmouth College, if they had chosen to do that, was pretty happy about the opportunity.

So we had the factor of, if people didn't want to live in northern New England, or had this notion that they would be moving into this lily-white institution and community, they wouldn't have thrown their hat in the ring in the first place. And then you had the factor of—for a period

of time in the '70s, after they were hired — the climate of the institution, in terms of its welcoming of, and its embracing of those folks, which caused that attrition issue that we dealt with for several years.

And, you know, part of that had to do with critical mass as well. But it also had to do with that mentality of the institution and the understanding, just being clueless that these newcomers, these people who looked different from most of the folks around here, you need to reach out to, to a greater degree, and take care of, and make sure they get themselves rooted in this community. Otherwise you're going to lose them because they feel so isolated.

DONIN: So you were really facing a lot of the same issues that the students were. I mean, the faculty was facing some of the same issues that the students were facing, in terms of feeling comfortable, you know, whether it's in the Upper Valley, or you know, on a campus like this.

BONZ: It was especially difficult for single women, as I recall. One of the findings of the survey was that it was very, very tough for single women. I mean, this is, and probably still is, an institution that is so tightly socialized around departments: departments do things together. And if you've got a single woman in an all-male department, there is... And even though the person may be invited to all the kinds of things, there is that isolation of not having the opportunity to even meet other people around the college.

I remember one of the things that we began to do, I think (maybe I'm making this up), but we began to do some social events just for new faculty, or the dean of faculty office began to do social events for new faculty over the course of their first year here, you know, across the college, so that they could begin to break out of the departmental sort of confines, and begin to have an opportunity to interact with colleagues of their same cohort that were in other departments.

DONIN: Was that one of the findings in your junior faculty report? That it was the, that it was also social issues that caused people to not stay?

BONZ: Right.

DONIN: Can you talk about the review process that would go on? The federal government had to come here and review your reports and your statistics from time to time?

BONZ: No, they didn't. They didn't. We had to submit reports on a periodic basis, and it would be only if they... And this went to the EEOC [Equal Employment Opportunity Commission] office in Boston, I think.

Well, you're actually right. They did come to campus, but it wasn't necessarily because the college had done anything wrong, it was just to have an opportunity to see how well we had done with respect to meeting our goals. And we had reports and so forth, and they would be here for a day, and they'd go around and talk to people. It was pretty pro forma and non-threatening at this point. I know that everybody's anxiety level was raised because the feds were coming to visit in part. We always were in pretty good shape.

DONIN: I'm probably mis-speaking, but — and I think you alluded to this before. Dartmouth's, I don't think "goals" is the right word, but Dartmouth's hiring goals were higher than what was mandated by the government in the first place, weren't they? I mean, the plan that was in place.

BONZ: The government didn't mandate — or, you used them in your questionnaire or your set of questions, you used "quotas." Affirmative action doesn't have anything to do with quotas, at least in my work with affirmative action.

Where affirmative action had anything to do with quotas was when there was a court order around a particular case, like in Philadelphia in the police force, and the court mandated that the Philadelphia police force hire "x" number of black, I don't remember the details, but "x" number of black police over a period of such-and-such years, such-and-such number of years. The court ordered a quota system. That's the only time, it's only when court orders are in place that quotas get in play.

Otherwise, affirmative action had to do with institutions (in our case we're talking about institutions of higher education) setting reasonable and appropriate goals for increasing the number of minorities and women in its work force. And Dartmouth's goals were... I mean, if Dartmouth's goals had been two percent and two percent, then there would have been some yelling and screaming on the part of the EEOC, because that would have been totally inappropriate.

But Dartmouth's goals were institution-developed, and were goals that the institution felt it... Let me just stop here and say, one of the things that John Kemeny always said was, "What we're doing here is improving the quality of this institution by bringing in a more representative — a representative group of people that is more representative of society." I mean, it would be anathema for our students, who are going out in the wide world, to have to interact with .

. .

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

DONIN: Okay. So you were saying, yes, they didn't want to go out into the world...

BONZ: Well, John Kemeny's point was, what we are trying to do here is to increase the quality of education of our undergraduates, [inaudible] by having a more diverse faculty. Because this is what the world that they're going to live in is going to be like, and we cannot be a white ivory tower.

So that was the logic. So Dartmouth developed its goals driven by that particular philosophy. And they may have been more ambitious than they might have needed to be, given some federal guidelines. There weren't requirements; there may have been guidelines. But it was what Dartmouth felt was appropriate for — and attainable for — itself at that time.

DONIN: Jim Wright [James "Jim" Wright] is still working at it, it would seem.

BONZ: Yes, yes. Jim Wright's still working at a lot of things we were working on in 1975 and 1984 and 1988 having to do with residential life and fraternities and such.

DONIN: We touched on a lot of these questions already, so I'm jumping over some of them. Can you talk specifically about the two cases, I guess, that are most well-known: Joan Smith and Rhona Mirsky?

BONZ: A little bit. One of the things that I think has been an advantage to me in my work is that — because it's been important — once something's past, I sort of forget about it. Again because it would be indiscreet to talk about it. And so it just sort of goes into some kind of mental wastebasket. But I do recall some edges of the details.

Rhona Mirsky came to see me because of a perceived salary inequity. And I can't remember the precise details as to whether her concern precisely coincided with our salary equity review, or whether I ended up doing — and I think actually the latter is the case — a specific salary equity review in her department, which was biochemistry, if I recall.

Henry Harbury [Henry A. Harbury] was chairman of the department. And Jim Strickler [James C. "Jim" Stricker '50 DMS '51], who was the dean of the medical school at the time, knew that I was going to

do this. He was also one of the members of the committee on administration. All of the associated school deans were part of that group, too. So he knew that I was going to do this. I told him what the issues were.

Actually I had looked into it just enough to give me a hint that by George, there might be something going on here. So I did a full and complete review of the department. And as a matter of fact not only discovered that Rhona Mirsky was then being, using objective data, underpaid compared to her white male colleagues of similar experience and tenure, but that Miguel Marin-Padilla [Juan Miguel Marin-Padilla], a man whose origins were Spanish, Hispanic....

DONIN: Can you spell his last name?

BONZ: M-A-R-I-N hyphen, I believe it's P-A-D-I-L-L-A. But anyway, we're talking about Rhona Mirsky.

I had all of this data, and I'd sent it down to Henry Harbury. I can't believe that I did some of the things that I did when I talk about it [Laughter] because these guys down at the medical school were very intimidating.

I went down and sat down with Henry Harbury and said, "Here it is. It's just blatant." I didn't say that, but.... Well, Henry Harbury was another one of those people who... He didn't quite explode like Mike McGean [J. Michael "Mike" McGean '49], who was the guy in alumni affairs and development. But he was not a happy camper, and he told me that I was, that this was like *Alice in Wonderland* and basically that I was out of my mind. And I said, you know, "I don't understand the *Alice in Wonderland* reference. All I know is what these figures are telling me."

Well, anyway, to make a long story short, because I don't remember the other details, I'm sure they involved back and forth with Jim Strickler and more round and abouts with Henry Harbury, and working with personnel, and on and on and on. We got it corrected. I'm not sure to the extent that I would have thought was totally fair. But then again, I wasn't really expert in medical school and research peoples' salaries. And so, you know, you can only push so far. But it did get corrected.

But the other interesting thing was that the other non-white person in the department was also being underpaid. And so they ended up

adjusting Miguel's, Dr. Marin-Padilla's salary as well. Because, I said, "We can't turn our backs on this." I don't know whether Miguel came to see me because Rhona had, or whether I just discovered that on my own. I'm very fuzzy about that. But I do know that he was incredibly grateful for that having happened. I had been at their house at some point after all that occurred, but he was incredibly, incredibly grateful.

So that was Rhona Mirsky. And that was pretty easy because it was just data, just numbers, just numbers. And I never could understand how somebody as smart as Henry Harbury was in this tizzy about *Alice in Wonderland* and my, you know, making things out of whole cloth when... Maybe I was missing the boat, but there were a lot of other people who finally agreed that I wasn't missing the boat because it did get corrected.

Joan's was much more sticky because it was a tenure decision, and she was up for tenure, and she was not recommended for tenure by her department. No, let's see. How did it go? You know, I don't remember the details of this because it went through two or three iterations, as I recall. I'm very fuzzy. I remember — I think I remember — that the department was divided, and may have the first time around not recommended her for tenure. And then there was a hoola, and they went back and huddled, and they did recommend her for tenure. I mean the sociology department was sort of a mess in those days. Then it went to the committee. I think the faculty committee that ruled on tenure cases was the committee on academic policy or something like that. CAP or CLP.

DONIN: Advisory to the president.

BONZ: Yes, that's right. Committee advisory to the president, CAP. And the committee advisory to the president overturned the recommendation to offer tenure. I mean there were a whole bunch of sort of iterations, as I recall. So Joan therefore was sitting with a fair amount of ammunition in terms of having a department that was split, and some people feeling strongly that she deserved tenure, and other people who were lukewarm about that. And a department that finally came around but then was overruled by the CAP.

Again, some of these details may be just totally tangled. But she decided to file a complaint with the EEOC. This was another place where my role was very interesting. Because the college hired an attorney, an attorney in Boston by the name of Jerry Weinstein,

who worked with the college in responding to the mile-long list of questions and requests for data that the EEOC had asked for.

What I did, sort of in the middle of things because we wanted more tenured women on the faculty, was I took every piece of data that I had my hands on, and some of which Joan had provided, and wrote a report that didn't go to Joan, but it went to the college's attorney, that was, as I recall, basically affirming the fact that Joan had a legitimate beef here.

But again, that was something that was handled in bounds. And Cary Clark [Cary P. Clark '62] was the college's attorney at that time, and he and Jerry and I worked together. When I talk about "worked together," it wasn't, in my case it wasn't defending against the EEOC complaint. I don't know how I defined it as my role, it was just maybe how things turned out. But what I had done was to... It was a fairly long report that I had written up, and actually it was a report that responded to the challenge by the EEOC, that in essence, from my perspective, supported Joan's position.

I think that what ultimately happened... They had people from the EEOC here interviewing folks and blah blah blah. It was very long and involved. I can't remember, quite frankly, how it was resolved. I do know that Joan took a job at SUNY-Binghamton, and that may have been the end of that. I don't think there was... Actually, I think there was some kind of settlement with her, but it didn't involve granting her tenure. I just don't remember. I mean it really has been probably one of those things that was repressed.

DONIN: Yes.

BONZ: Because it was a tough call.

DONIN: What sort of effect does a situation like that have on your office, on the sociology department, on the administration, when something like that is going on?

BONZ: Well, I think anytime there's a contested tenure review, even if it's a white male, it divides a department because you've got colleagues who are lined up one side of a colleague and others who are not. And it depends on the capacity for people to hold grudges and animosities and in academia there seems to be a proclivity for that to occur. [Laughter] So it can leave a department divided for some time.

In some cases I imagine that those wounds and perceived slights or inappropriate behaviors are just sort of lying fallow until there's some other thing to fight about later on. I don't know. But it can create unfortunate divisiveness within a department. I mean the way it affects the affirmative action officer or me personally is that when you have people who think you're not advocating enough and other people who think your nose is in it too much. So you're always in a no-win situation.

DONIN: Is there a place for the president to step in and steer it in one way or the other? Or can he overrule?

BONZ: Well, I think for a president with the committee advisory to the president, the president can overrule that group, but it is at his folly. That's not something that I think any president has ever done very often. Because what it is is it's saying: "I know better than you, my collective, distinguished colleagues."

DONIN: And he was one of them at one point.

BONZ: "I'm going to make this different decision, be damned, because I think it's in the best interest of the institution." If I were in that position, you'd certainly try to persuade your colleagues to your point of view. But there are folks who have that "standards" stance forever. Even though we're talking about angels dancing on the head of a pin for the most part when you're at that level.

DONIN: So you alluded to the associated schools, the graduate schools. You also had to get them in line as well. Were they a tough sell? Harder than some of the...?

BONZ: Not necessarily. I mean it depended on who the dean was. Carl Long [Carl F. Long] was wonderful to work with. He tried hard. And Jim Strickler tried hard. Oh, let's see. Oh, John Hennessey [John W. Hennessey, Jr.] was great.

DONIN: So they didn't necessarily offer more resistance or less resistance than arts & sciences.

BONZ: No. There were some unique issues, you know, in engineering, business, and medicine. But, no, those guys were good people to work with.

DONIN: What were the unique issues?

BONZ: Well, just in terms of the numbers of women in engineering.

DONIN: Oh, I see.

BONZ: Women in business. You know, trying to increase the number of blacks who have Ph.D.'s in economics or something like that. Economics is not a good one. But organizational behavior, somebody that the business school or that Tuck might be looking to hire. Just that there were particular numbers challenges in those fields.

DONIN: In those days.

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: You talked about the sort of training sessions that you offered to the higher managers of all the departments. How much interaction did you have time to have with all these department heads and the people that were in charge of hiring?

BONZ: What would happen would be that when we met — we did this pretty systematically — is that, say, the associate dean for the social sciences would have, once every two weeks or once every month or once every week or whatever, a meeting with the department chairs; a meeting that would be reserved for me to come in and spend an hour doing this training overview. And I'd do that for all of the divisions.

Then if a particular department was involved in hiring activity, I would generally go at the outset of that, when we knew that a position was going to be posted, and sit down with the department chair and just walk through the steps of what needed to be done. We provided lots of material, information, about where to advertise, and how to do the outreach, and how to get information out. Even more comprehensively through the old channels that were being used, the more traditional channels. So I would help them get prepared for that search. Then they would... From time to time I would get calls to ask questions about one thing or another along the process. So I was sort of the institution's consultant in that regard.

- DONIN: This must have been very intense because this was all new territory.
- BONZ: Well, it was new territory for Dartmouth. But I'd done some of that stuff at Maryland.
- DONIN: No, that's what I meant was the people here at Dartmouth. I mean I assume you don't have to do this anymore. I mean the affirmative action people don't. It's not necessary.
- BONZ: Well, I imagine now it's well integrated into personnel procedures, you know, institutional personnel procedures.
- DONIN: Did you find that the education piece of it diminished as the years went by because you were teaching...
- BONZ: Yes. Although if there was a new department chair or somebody who hadn't been exposed to this, I'd have to spend some one-on-one time with that individual.
- DONIN: Now, this may seem like a simplistic question, but in terms of the type of groups that you were targeting, it was mostly minorities and mostly women. But were there other types of groups that you were hoping to be included in the groups that you were... I'm not saying this very well. Were there other under-represented groups that you were targeting to bring into the Dartmouth community, besides minorities and women?
- BONZ: Not according to affirmative action or executive order mandates, no. We've spent a lot of time talking about faculty and the faculty goals and administrative goals.

There also were goals for staff and service which were very, very different because of the nature of the population in the Upper Valley. Because administrators and faculty were recruited on a national scale. Staff and service were recruited on a local and, to a tiny, tiny degree, regional scale, particularly in some of the upper-level staff positions. So those goals were very small in terms of numbers, particularly minorities. And because of the representation of women in general in the workforce, staff and service workforce, that was sort of... I mean, we really didn't need to have any goals there. There were other issues there in terms of pay and place and advancement opportunities within the institution.

DONIN: Do I understand it correctly that in that group that you're hiring for, you simply have to reflect what the population is here locally?

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: So since New Hampshire has virtually no blacks, there's no "requirement--"

BONZ: No expectation.

DONIN: That you hire blacks.

BONZ: I think it was .2 percent or something like that was the goal.

DONIN: Hasn't changed much probably. Okay. Now, and again I don't know if this is an appropriate question, but, for instance, Title VI and Title IX, which people think of as... You know, when I think of Title IX, I think of women in athletics, which I know is inaccurate. But did these affect the job you did?

BONZ: I can't even remember Title VI anymore, but certainly I remember Title IX. And, yes, when Title IX was passed, I did get involved in working with the athletic department with regard to the kind of review that needed to be done to assure that we were in compliance. And we've got...

It was interesting because when I was at the University of Maryland, I was basically responsible for what, in effect, became a de facto Title IX review. So I'm trying to think of the timetable. It seems like Dartmouth should have been doing more on Title IX in the early days that I was in the affirmative action office. But that was not happening until later days in affirmative action. I may be missing the dates. Is Title IX in 1979? I can't remember when Title IX legislation came out.

Well, it's just so typical. It's probably still going on now. I remember the men's gymnastic team got cut. And it always... All of the complaints were always framed in loss of men's something, as opposed to look at what we've done to provide equal access and opportunity for our women students. And that's still... I mean it's still happening in the world at large today with these arguments occurring on campuses about Title IX. But it was a matter of here having to redistribute resources so that there became a more clear-

cut sense of equity. I think Dartmouth actually has done quite well with Title IX.

DONIN: Well, it was Aggie Kurtz [Agnes Bixler Kurtz] who was the first--

BONZ: Assistant director.

DONIN: Assistant director of athletics, who really got the women's teams up and running. Did you work closely with her?

BONZ: I worked with Aggie. Aggie was somebody who was on one of the review boards, the administrative review board. And then Louise O'Neal was a person who, I think, moved — really moved — things forward. She was the associate director of athletics, then became the senior associate director of athletics, and then left to be the director of athletics at Wellesley [College]. And then Josie [Jo Ann "Josie" Harper] came in, I think replacing Louise in that associate role.

DONIN: Of course their area had obviously more to do with students as opposed to what you were dealing with.

BONZ: Yes.

DONIN: Right. Okay. You talked about your report on the junior faculty experience.

So these are sort of some of the bigger-picture questions, and we touched on some of this already. But what did you see as Dartmouth's strengths in terms of trying to recruit minorities and women to faculty positions? We know what their weaknesses were. But what were some of the strengths?

BONZ: Well, I think some of the... The major strength was the unwavering commitment and position of John Kemeny with regard to where he wanted to take the institution in this particular realm. And I think another strength was Dartmouth's record. Because even with all the bad-mouthing that went on about Dartmouth, when you stacked up Dartmouth's record in hiring women and minorities and eventually retaining them, Dartmouth was right at the top of the Ivies, and had one of the best records. Women's Studies, for example. Dartmouth was the first Ivy League institutions to have a bona fide, supportive Women's Studies program. So I think those are some of the strengths. Because you could really make not only a case orally to

a candidate and say, you know, this institution really cares about these things, but you could also point to data that shows that you could put your money where your mouth is.

DONIN: Too bad the press didn't write about that instead of the stuff it chose to write about. Now, you were also, at one point during this period, you were also an advisor to the gay students association.

BONZ: I probably was. I don't know. If I was in the affirmative action office and the freshman office, I never really got myself into any formal, as I said before, connection with politically-charged situations. If I was an advisor to the gay students association (I may well have been because they were so in need of support and people whose ear they could have) I certainly was an informal advisor.

DONIN: And at that point they weren't federally protected, were they?

BONZ: No, not at all.

DONIN: In terms of discrimination.

BONZ: Not at all.

DONIN: So what recourse did they have here on campus?

BONZ: Just an appeal to fairness and human rights and human dignity sorts of things.

DONIN: What sort of a place was this for gay students in the 70's and 80's?

BONZ: Well, it had to be an awful place. I wonder what it is like now. And this was an era when, still, it was the most brave of the brave person who was out of the closet. Lord knows how many gay students there were on campus in those days who were closeted. But for those few who were out, it had to be brutally difficult.

DONIN: Well, like the women, they were pioneers.

BONZ: Yes, yes. In a very different way.

DONIN: On that same note, I pulled up some awful instances of the *Dartmouth Review* attacking... Well, they attacked everybody.

BONZ: They were comprehensive in their attacks.

DONIN: They were what?

BONZ: Well, they were comprehensive. They left no attackee unattacked.

DONIN: Right. Did you ever have dealings yourself with the *Review*?

BONZ: Don't even talk about it. Be more specific.

DONIN: Did you ever get interviewed yourself?

BONZ: I never allowed myself to be interviewed. I just got attacked. Actually, I was surprised that I wasn't... The *Review* came into play much more when I was in the freshman office than the affirmative action office. That was sort of moving into....

[End of Tape 2, Side B--Beginning of Tape 3, Side A]

DONIN: Okay, we were talking about the *Review*. They didn't get going until about 1980, so I guess you wouldn't have had to deal with them except probably at the end of your....

BONZ: Yes, not too much in the affirmative action office, although I know that they were certainly up and running during the latter part of my days there. But I'm sure you've heard this from every person you've spoken to about the *Review*, is that we used to consider it a point of pride if we were attacked by the *Review*. [Laughter]

DONIN: It was an elite club. [Laughter]

BONZ: Right, it definitely was. Well, I don't know. It wasn't that elite. There were many members. But the thing that was so terrible about the *Review* is that it wasn't so bad when folks like me got attacked or other administrators or people in positions of relative power, if you will. But it was when they attacked the folks that were defenseless and powerless that was the most reprehensible of all.

DONIN: Well, this instance of them allegedly breaking into the gay students association and publishing the names of totally defenseless students who did not want to be out of the closet.

BONZ: Precisely.

- DONIN: I just don't understand how they maintained any credibility on campus.
- BONZ: One wonders.
- DONIN: Yes, truly. Not just among students. But I gather they had their supporters among faculty as well.
- BONZ: Oh, heavens, yes! Heavens, yes!
- DONIN: Guest columnists, etc.
- BONZ: Jeffrey Hart ['51] being the most prominent.
- DONIN: Right. This is maybe digging too much in detail back into history, but I gather there was an incident in front of the or at the KKK Fraternity. This was when you were dean of freshmen. And there was a panel, I guess, after this attack on these gay students, sponsored by the Tucker Foundation, and you were on this panel. Do you remember that at all? Yes, it's a detail.
- BONZ: I mean I probably remember vaguely being on the panel, but I have no idea what started it. It was probably one of these occasions when everybody was there venting, as they needed to do.
- DONIN: Venting against the outrage.
- BONZ: About the outrage, yes.
- DONIN: About the *Review*. Well, about the fraternity, as well. So we're coming near the end of the affirmative action work. I just wondered if you could talk a little bit about the search for your successor, Ngina Lythcott.
- BONZ: Ngina was not my successor.
- DONIN: Oh, I had that detail wrong. Sorry.
- BONZ: I can't remember her name, but there was a woman who was between Ngina, Ngina's time, and mine. Ngina actually was my assistant affirmative action officer for a number of years. Then she took a position I think down in the medical school. And then after X person, whose name I cannot remember... She had a house beyond Lyme towards Orford on the right-hand side of the road,

and was hauled into court or cited for malnutrition of her animals at one point. I remember that. But I can't remember her name. But you should look that up because she succeeded me. And then Ngina came after that.

DONIN: I see. Okay. Sorry, I got that progression wrong. Is there anything else you want to say before we close out the affirmative action chapter? I mean how did you feel about what you had accomplished when you left the office?

BONZ: Well, it wasn't so much what I accomplished. It was what the institution accomplished because there were a lot of willing and supportive people out there who were making things happen. As I say, I was a consultant, and I pushed and nudged. But unless there were people who were willing to respond to those pushes and nudges and sometimes shrieks, we wouldn't have gotten anywhere. So it was an institution that was ready and willing, for the most part, to move forward. There were pockets of greater resistance. But there was also a great wealth of willingness to try to make a positive difference in those numbers and in those representations and in what the institution was about educationally.

DONIN: Did you feel that there was any sort of large piece of unfinished business when you left the office?

BONZ: Not unfinished, not large unfinished. But, you know, when I left the affirmative action office, Reagan was president, I think. And it was clear that you... I mean there was an aspect of stick-and-carrot in this work. And it was clear that whoever was my successor was not going to have the stick anymore. And so it was going to have to be carrot and persuasion. But that's where the goodwill and the interest and the desire for Dartmouth to be a better place with regard to not only representation, different ethnic groups and cultures and gender representation across the student population as well as the employee population. It was that goodwill and people willing to make a difference that would continue to drive this.

DONIN: Did you feel that that goodwill generated from John Kemeny?

BONZ: Oh, for sure. Sure. And, you know, the deans. I mean Donald McNemar was wonderful, Fred Berthold [Fred Berthold Jr. '45] cared a great deal. I'm trying to think of who was... Ag Pytte [Agnar "Ag" Pytte]. There were folks there who were either already enlightened or who were amenable to enlightenment.

DONIN: Why did you move from affirmative action to the freshman office?

BONZ: Well, I always felt that the affirmative action job was a detour in my career because, I guess, my work had been in student affairs by and large, and I wanted... I mean I'd been in affirmative action long enough, and "the times they were a-changing." The job was going to be real different, and the institution was in a different place. It was sort of like you've done about all you can do, instead of doing it over and over again. And a climate where successes were less immediately obvious. So when the freshman dean position became open, that seemed to be a wonderful opportunity for me to get back on track, if you will.

DONIN: Who was in the office? Who was the dean before you?

BONZ: Well, Karen Blank [Karen J. Blank] was dean. And interestingly enough, Karen and I both came out of the Syracuse graduate program, and I had known of her. You might call Karen an affirmative action appointment. She was the first woman to hold the position as dean of freshmen. So I feel a little bit responsible for, you know, pushing Ralph [Manuel] on to make that appointment. Then she left, and Al Ives [Almon W. "Al" '64], who was the head of the Dartmouth speech department at the time it was still a department, was, I think, retiring from his faculty job, and he was brought in to be interim dean for a year.

DONIN: So when you came into the job, then you picked it up from him.

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: How much overlap did you have with him?

BONZ: Well, I was upstairs, and he was downstairs. So I mean it wasn't as if there was a lot of overlap. But I would come down in the spring and just spend time in the office, and talking with him, and seeing what the systems were, and so forth. But it wasn't like somebody coming in from the outside who didn't know the school.

The wonderful thing about being in the affirmative action position was that I knew every soul in this place, from the janitors up to the president. I knew their names, their salary equity reviews, and on and on and on. And I interacted with every layer of personnel in the place. So it was a great, great opportunity to be engaged with an

institution. And of course that was a huge advantage being in the freshman office, too, because I had friends in all kinds of places.

DONIN: Very helpful. Were there pressing issues that you knew were awaiting to be resolved in the dean's office when you started there?

BONZ: Not that I recall, pressing issues. Nothing comes to mind.

DONIN: Did you work closely with Ralph Manuel ['58]?

BONZ: Ralph and I overlapped for a year, so I reported to him for a year. I worked closely with him only to the extent that you work closely with the person you immediately report to. He and I met probably met once every couple of weeks or something like that.

But Ralph left me alone, and I don't mean that negatively. He was good in that he... See, he had been dean of freshmen, and there could have been a great temptation for Ralph to press me to do it the way he did it, and he didn't do that. He let me run the shop, and he was very complimentary about how I stepped in and took on that job. So he was wonderful to work with, but he wasn't looking over my shoulder.

DONIN: If this is accurate, and I may not be accurate, but you made a couple of hires when you started there: a grad assistant named Lee Levison, and Kris Clarkson was the assistant dean.

BONZ: Yes, I hired Kris Clarkson. You say he was from Hobart William Smith [College]. He was a dean there since the institution was coed. It wasn't all-male. It had been all-male. He was someone who came in with some experience. Wonderful hire as it turned out. We're still the closest of friends, the families. Kris and Sarah had just gotten married, basically arrived first day on this job coming off of his honeymoon.

And Lee and I are still great friends. Lee's heading an independent school in the Hartford area, Kingswood-Oxford. He came in a few years after I was at Ethel Walker. But Lee's sort of a funny situation because Lee was an Amherst grad, one of these brainy guys but brawny guys who played football for Amherst. And he had landed this internship with the Dartmouth football team to work with the football team. And was working in some god-awful hole in the top of Davis Field, Davis what? Davis Arena? What's the old hockey rink?

DONIN: Oh, I don't know.

BONZ: It was like a rat's nest. So he came knocking on my door one day, saying, "I'm here, and I'd like to get some experience in this work, and you can have me for a pittance." I said, "We always would love to have new hands." Because he's a very engaging person. New hands, and especially somebody who is fairly enlightened and has a connection to that athletic world so that we could use that. I said, "But I don't have any money in my budget." But I said, "I'll talk to Ralph --" (and I think probably John Bryant) " -- and see."

So anyway, to make a long story short, we did find, I think, a thousand dollars for fall semester for Lee, and he came in and spent some time with us. And ended up then, I think, for the rest of the year -- I don't know how it started out this way -- where he spent some time in the freshman office and also time upstairs in the upper-class dean's office. And then he ended up I think the next year being hired as assistant dean upstairs.

DONIN: Great.

BONZ: He was sort of this neat off-the-street guy, and he's good. And then he went on. He left Dartmouth and got a doctorate from Harvard Graduate School of Education, worked for Noble & Greenough for several years. And then was tapped for the headship at Kingswood-Oxford.

DONIN: What's become of Kris Clarkson?

BONZ: Kris is now, essentially, the vice president for student affairs at Juniata College in Huntingdon, Pennsylvania.

DONIN: The drinking age, that went from 18 to 21 in, let's see, 1979. Did that have a big impact on the life of freshmen here?

BONZ: Probably not. [Laughter] Maybe if they got caught. But I don't think it measurably affected the intake of alcohol.

DONIN: But alcohol must have been, and continues to be, an ongoing issue here, especially for freshmen.

BONZ: Well, here and everywhere. Again, I wish *Animal House* had never been made. But Dartmouth continues to take it on the chin from time to time about this alcohol thing. But I, again, was always proud

of all of the efforts that Dartmouth made in that regard. We were probably among the first institutions to hire people full time as alcohol counselors and alcohol program folks who worked out of Dick's House, and who were hired to do alcohol education and research, and to be in fraternities, and to work with kids.

A person who very much was an expert, more by profession than by acquisition -- knowledge acquisition on the side -- was a guy by the name of Phil Meilman [Philip W. Meilman], who was at Dick's House, who was a very strong... I think he was director of counseling, but he also had a strong background in alcohol education. And then Steve Nelson [Stephen J. Nelson], who preceded Phil Meilman, at Collis, did not have training per se in this area. But he was one of those who acquired knowledge just because it was the thing of the times for college campuses to begin to pay attention and because he was the director of Collis. He was someone who spent time learning more about that, and was one of the early alcohol educator people on this campus.

DONIN: Freshmen orientation week. That's a big point of pride here, it seems, at Dartmouth.

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: Can you talk about the planning for it, the different programs that are--?

BONZ: Yes, the planning was huge, and I think that's a place where the freshman office staff and I really ratcheted up the quality of that program.

Hans Penner came in as dean of faculty, and Hans is this consummate intellectual -- he probably wouldn't even mind me saying this about him -- couch potato. [Laughter] I mean he just didn't get freshman trips.

DONIN: Not everybody can be an outdoor person. [Laughter]

BONZ: He just did not get freshman trips and thought they were the most awful introduction to Dartmouth College that could be. And Hans would have been happy if there had been a freshman trip that spent three days in the stacks of Baker Library. That would've been cool.

So, you know, Hans and I have to work together to think about freshman orientation, and there's no way, of course, the freshman trip's going to go anywhere except where they've always been. But that was another challenge in the freshman office was to civilize freshman trips.

DONIN: How so?

BONZ: Well, to make them less masculine-oriented, to make them more women and minority friendly, and to tone down some of the stuff that went on at the Ravine Lodge, so that it was a little less risqué; again, a little less utterly and completely anti-intellectual. Not that it needed to be intellectual. I mean these are just kids having fun. And that was the other thing that Hans just didn't get, you know. Just kids having fun. Fortunately, I have two sons, and they were growing up at the time.

Anyway, Hans wanted to, he really wanted to ratchet up the intellectual content of orientation week. And that's okay with me. I mean I thought, "Why not?" Because you've got freshman trips on the one hand, and let's do something that has some substance to it in orientation week that we can really be proud of in terms of how we're introducing kids to Dartmouth and the concept of Dartmouth as an institution of higher learning, and there's a reason why you're here, and it's not all about freshman trips and having fun.

So we started a summer reading program. We started a... As part of orientation week, we started a tradition or trend -- I don't know whether they're still doing it or not -- whereby we asked the freshman incoming class to read one book in common, or a book in common that was assigned reading. And the committee on the freshman year would sit around and consider what that reading should be. I think Hans contributed several possibilities to the list. But I think the first year we did *One Hundred Years of Solitude*.

So we would then have discussion with our incoming students divided up into discussion groups to talk about that book with faculty leaders. And we would do things during the week that, to the extent that we could, picked up on that theme. For example, we might have an exhibit in the Hop that... Or better still, let me back up.

We would have the kids see the Orozco murals and have some opportunity for them to learn about the Orozco murals in a way to

try to connect it to that particular reading. And other things where we would try to bring in the various divisions of the institution, to the extent that we could, to help have an integrated sense of how that reading could apply to an overall theme.

We also began to do -- and this was fun -- programs that had to do with campus issues. And the way that we introduced these -- because we knew that kids were not going to, they're not going to buy sitting in a lecture hearing somebody talk to them about date rape or alcohol or whatever, racial issues -- we devised this method of presentation where we used skits. We'd have our undergraduates or upper-class students, a group that would create the... I remember sitting around working with these kids in a group of people with several administrators, including myself, and the students, and we would brainstorm the script for these skits. Then they would do some improvising, and we'd work on them until we felt that they had the right tone and so forth.

Then they'd be on the stage in Spaulding. And they would come out, and they'd do one of these scenarios. And they had wonderful, I mean just wonderful students. And one of the guys from the scenario would take the microphone and say, "Okay..." You know, talking to the class. "What's going on here?" So they would engage in a dialogue back and forth. "What did you see? What did you feel? How did that make you react?" And then there would be a modicum of didacticism at the end.

But the skit captured the imagination. It represented sometimes, in pretty raw form, what some of the issues were. It was really designed to get them thinking, to get the class thinking about these things, to help them understand that these were matters that they would likely be confronted with. Part of the dialogue was how you deal with this, and who are the resources that you can turn to if you find yourself in this kind of situation? So that became a part of orientation week when I was here.

And then I think the other thing that we always tried to do was to have some major event, again that was captivating and interesting and engaging, that dealt with issues having to do with race because that happened to be kind of a hot item at the time.

We began to expect more of our advisors, and tried to become... It was driven by numbers, and I had to take advisors that I really knew weren't great advisors. But you couldn't have one advisor having 20 kids. And so you just had to have the numbers. But we were able -- again working through the committee on the freshman year, which had faculty on it -- to begin to have higher standards for advisors.

One of the things we did was to offer stipends, and we were able to get the budget for that. Also we were able to increase the budget that they had for entertainment of their advisees. So I think the advisor program was considerably improved as a result of some of those incentives that we were able to provide. But with incentive was also accountability, greater accountability.

DONIN: So you could really ask them to meet a certain minimum level.

BONZ: Yes, that they hadn't done before.

DONIN: Who had input in terms of developing the program? Who did you work with in the college developing this, you know, working to sort of upgrade the quality of the freshmen orientation week? For instance, on these skits, did you have input from Dick's House?

BONZ: Oh, yes. There would be a group of people. I mean Steve Nelson I remember was involved as director of Collis Center and the alcohol coordinator at the time, because some of that had to do with alcohol education. There were people who were drawn... There were people from Dick's House so that we had all of the areas of education that we were trying to address through these skits. There was always somebody there from the relevant area to help be a part of guiding and shaping the decisions that were made and the outcome.

When it came to the advising program or orientation week, it was the freshman office staff and the committee on the freshman year, which, as I say, was a faculty committee. I sat on that, and the director of intensive academic support, who was a member of my staff, sat on that. But otherwise there were no other freshman office staff members. The rest of the folks there were faculty. And it was chaired by a faculty member.

DONIN: Are students required to go, to participate in the orientation week activities?

BONZ: Most of them, yes.

DONIN: Do you offer alternatives to urban kids who don't feel like they want to climb a mountain?

BONZ: Well, that was part of our work with freshman trips, and it did get to be a little ludicrous. But the problem with freshman trips was if you didn't participate... The percentage of participation was so high that if you didn't participate or didn't have that experience, you sort of were kind of hanging out here like an addendum on the side as an entering student.

So, yes, we had urban freshman trips. Did the Freedom Trail in Boston and a few things like that. Some of the proposals, as I say, got a little over the top. But we did try to be responsive to folks who might be reluctant to be out in the wilderness.

I think there's value for urban kids having an opportunity to experience the out-of-doors. As I reflect back on it, I think maybe our efforts might have been better deployed by having more persuasive literature or methods of talking directly to those kids to help them decrease their anxiety and fear factor. And making equipment and stuff available to them, and saying, "You can do this, and you'll have a good time. You'll have a great time doing it." Rather than trying to come up with these weirdo alternatives that really weren't what freshman trips were about.

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

DONIN: ...intimidated by the sort of outdoorsy Dartmouth fellow and not wanting to mix it up with him nor climb a mountain.

BONZ: I know that we did. We tried all kinds of things and any idea was a good idea if we felt that it might have an impact on helping include those students who were likely to be marginalized at Dartmouth, in any event, in freshman trips.

I do remember that the kids in the outing club and part of the freshman trip's crew did get on the phone in the summer and make some of those calls, trying to help students overcome any concerns that they might have. And that was successful to some degree. But then, using the same philosophy of try everything, you know, we went to some of these unusual notions of alternative freshman trips.

And participation wasn't huge, but it reached more than we might have otherwise.

Some things we did on campus, too. I can't remember. Seems like there were... I'm just remembering proposals like arts freshman trips which is to come in and spend three days in a metalworking shop or something like that. There was a lot of stretching and reaching for concepts, new concepts.

DONIN: I guess we're into the [David] McLaughlin era at this point. Did he participate? Did he come up to the Ravine?

BONZ: Oh, yes. David always was up there.

DONIN: For the dinner or the singing or whatever it was?

BONZ: Yes, we would go up generally... Well, sometimes it was different, but generally we would be there the same night or I don't know, maybe I'm remembering it differently. One night the president would be there, and another night the freshman dean was there. Although I know that I was there every night. Actually I don't know that the president was there every night, depending on his schedule. But I know that David tried to get there whenever he could.

Well, I was going to say I remember the first time that President [Jim] Freedman went. My husband went along that night, too, which was, I think, his first experience there because Mrs. Freedman was going. And I was not quite sweating bullets but I was very interested in what that was going to be like for them because, no matter what you say, it's crazy. It's a crazy time. You know, the kids, the lodge crew are dressed in all these weird outfits, and they have all their little routines, and just strange things happen. And it's all in good fun.

Again, one of the inroads that we made and really put a foot down on was no drinking on the part of the lodge crew. Because when I came into the freshman office, by the time you got up, when you went up for dinner, they'd had plenty of beers in preparing the dinner, and they were really, truly beyond the pale and bad news. And we put a stop to that fast. That was, again, working through Earl Jette [Earl R. Jette] and other folks in outdoor programs and the freshman trips kids. And it was basically, "Is this how you want the new class to see Dartmouth represented?" I mean just, you

know, get with it. And it took a little while. I mean it tapered off and they were much better.

Certainly by the time Jim Freedman came in, there was none of that. But nevertheless it was still a colorful evening. They didn't have much to say about it on the ride back. But I think it was... I mean for anybody who experiences that for the first time, it's just pure adolescent goofiness. And both President Freedman and Bathsheba were such intellectual folks that I'm sure their reaction was similar to that of [inaudible]. [Laughter]

DONIN: But they have children.

BONZ: Yeah, they have children, they have children. I mean there was never any sense of disapproval. But I also didn't have the sense that there was a high level of comfort.

DONIN: I wonder if he did in subsequent years.

BONZ: I don't know. I don't know. [Laughter]

DONIN: Maybe once was enough. [Laughter]

BONZ: Maybe. I'll have to ask Peter [Goldsmith].

DONIN: You began to talk about your overhaul of the whole freshman advising program. You touched on that quite a bit. Can you tell me some more about the changes that you made? Because they were quite extensive.

BONZ: Well, I don't know. I can't remember in detail. I know that we provided a lot more information to advisors.

Yes, I can remember more now that I'm thinking about it. We did training programs for... We had two separate training programs. We had training programs for older, experienced advisors because there was new information that they needed to have. And we had training programs for brand-new advisors which were longer, or maybe a two-session one, because they not only had to know the basics, they had knowledge that had been accumulated by the old folks that they had to learn firsthand. So we established this series of training programs in the spring for the next class. We provided them with enormous amounts of information that they hadn't had before to help them do their jobs better.

DONIN: What's the content? I mean what are you training them to do?

BONZ: You're training them... I mean some of them didn't know graduation requirements.

DONIN: Oh, real basics.

BONZ: Yes. It's not rocket science, but it's just saying that if you're going to be an advisor, you have to pay attention to some of this stuff that as a faculty member just walking around day to day you might not pay attention to. But you need to know what the graduation requirements are. You need to know what the typical load in the freshman year is. You need to know that if a kid presents with this profile or you've got this information about him or her, you know, that there are issues of intensive academic support. That these are the two courses that they're definitely going to be taking in fall term, and these are the kinds of courses that are probably the most appropriate to mix with in order to have a load that that kid can handle in his or her first term. So it was a lot of refinement of information to help advisors help their students create the most appropriate freshman year schedule.

But we also worked with them to help them see how to chart out first- and second-year scenarios. Because during fall term -- I don't know whether this was right during entering freshmen week or not - - we really asked them to help a student look at a total picture rather than just freshman year. But look into sophomore year and see how all these sequences fit together. So that you didn't have a kid end up all of a sudden wanting to take X, and they couldn't take X because they had to have Y before they took X. And Y wasn't offered until the next term. So it was logistical and practical kinds of things. But it was to help them see there's more to this than just picking through courses for freshman year fall.

DONIN: Was their advising limited to the academic side of life?

BONZ: Pretty much so. Although your good advisors picked up on social and other issues, and they would call me and say, "Margaret, Sally Jane is going through a rough patch, and I'm not sure what's going on. I think it may be this. But you may want to call her in or alert...." or whatever.

So we would get those calls. They would by and large come to me, and I might farm them out to my staff. Or if they had a relationship with another member of the staff, they would call that person as well. But it was getting in touch with the freshman office to ask for some follow-up or to alert us to potential issues that were going on with a student.

And you're talking about, from an academic standpoint, it would be faculty members who were also advisors. But even faculty members, they knew that if they had a first-year student struggling in their class and that kid had just totally bombed exam one, and was just acting sort of out of it in class... I'd get a call saying, "This is an alert because I'm afraid this kid's going to go down the tubes in calculus, because the grade even in the first exam is so low that they've got a hole so deep to climb out of that they're going to be lucky to get a D."

So you get the student in, and you try to set up the tutorial supports and so forth and so on. Or -- this is difficult to do in the fall of freshman year -- if there's still time to drop a course -- you never do that in the fall of freshman year, so forget that thought. But you would try to figure out with the student what the best move was for that person, depending on sort of their overall picture in the situation, academic situation.

DONIN: Was advising limited to just faculty? Could you be an advisor if you weren't faculty?

BONZ: No, the administration were advisors.

DONIN: So they really had to know the curriculum.

BONZ: Yes. Well, they had to know the rudiments.

DONIN: And know their way around the course guides.

BONZ: Yes. Well, there are only so many courses a first-year student can take, generally speaking.

DONIN: When you said you had a hard time coming up with some qualified advisors, or you had to take some advisors that weren't necessarily that great?

- BONZ: Well, you've got a thousand new students, and you've got 300 faculty members, and you've got an advising load that's typically five or six. And I want to say 300 faculty members, not all of whom were on campus in any given term. And then you've got a cadre of administrators. So you had to have the numbers. So every year we were probably scraping and scratching around to find two or three more advisors. Make the last-minute phone calls and get down on your knees and beg.
- DONIN: Well, when you added this stipend, did that help you recruit more?
- BONZ: Only to a very, very small extent. The devoted advisors were always there, and they would have been there without the stipend. There were others who were lukewarm who perked up at that. Then we might have drawn in a few more because of the stipend who thought it might be worth their while or would give it a whirl for a year to see what it was like.
- DONIN: And did you get feedback from the students? I mean how did you find out who the good advisors were and weren't? Was there a way for students to let you know if this was a successful relationship or not?
- BONZ: I think we had an evaluation system. But I can't remember. A lot of it was by word of mouth, and a lot of it would be advisors who... If you never got a reimbursement request, then you knew that they weren't doing anything with it. One of the requirements was that they all... All of them had to do the Sunday picnic at the end of orientation week.
- DONIN: One would hope that they would have met their students by then.
- BONZ: Well, they definitely would have met with their students by then. We would have known that because the kids would have registered by then, and we got all of their course information. So there was no way around that. There was too much visibility around whether you hadn't seen the kids to help them plan their schedule.
- DONIN: What other advising was available to the freshmen? What was the setup in the dorms at that time in terms of...?
- BONZ: UGA's and freshman officers were responsible for the undergraduate advising program.

DONIN: Ah, so you had to have people in the dorms as well.

BONZ: Yes. I don't know what the dorm situation, our residential situation, is now because I think there are resident directors in some of the residences. But we had undergraduate advisors, and they lived in proximity to a group of first-year students. And they had about 12 to 14 for whom they were responsible. They were sort of peer advisors. Not sort of. They were peer advisors. So they were a link to the freshman office. I mean they were our eyes and ears in the residence halls, you know, for eating disorders and all kinds of stuff, alcohol abuse. And being peers, they were pretty circumspect about not ratting, as students are wont to be. But they knew, because it was part of their taking on the job, that if they saw stuff that they knew was potentially dangerous and harmful going on, that they needed to let us know so that we could intervene more directly.

DONIN: Important sources.

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: The clustering program in the dorm. Do you remember that?

BONZ: I remember it, but that was done when we established the office of residential life, and a new dean was brought in to, I think, implement what I think was already a blueprint plan.

DONIN: Were you part of coming up with that blueprint plan?

BONZ: I'm sure that I was part of a group that had conversations about it.

DONIN: Were you on the committee that hired, I believe her name is Christina Lescher?

BONZ: I chaired the search committee.

DONIN: Oh, you chaired it.

BONZ: Yes.

DONIN: What were the goals of this new office?

BONZ: I don't know. Well, I say I don't know. I know there was a job description. But the office was to manage the fraternities and bring

them under the residential life umbrella; to enforce "minimum standards," and to establish a more, what I would describe as a more, traditional residential life system where you had resident directors and undergraduate advisors and more supervision in the residence halls, which was anathema to Dartmouth's tradition. Because our residence halls were accustomed to zero supervision, essentially.

DONIN: Ah, interesting.

BONZ: Except for places like the Choates, where they had built-in faculty apartments. Then when they did the River cluster, they had, I think, faculty apartments down there. Then when they did [East] Wheelock, of course, that was the big experiment.

DONIN: So before that time these free-standing dorms basically had no faculty residential oversight.

BONZ: Right. One of the things we did in the freshman office, come to think about it, is that we did begin to assign faculty to residences, where they were, what did we call them? Not faculty fellows, but faculty something-or-anothers. Let's say we had mid Mass., north Mass., and south Mass., there might be three faculty members assigned to that cluster, if you will. They would -- with support from the freshman office, be responsible for organizing and working with the UGA's, who were sort of their logistical arms and legs -- set up little discussion groups with some faculty member who would come in and talk about life on Pluto or whatever. So it was trying to introduce a greater intellectual presence or substantive opportunity for intellectual life within the residence halls. That was the philosophy.

So when the office of residential life was established, I think that was probably the big overriding goal: to improve the quality of life certainly from an intellectual standpoint but also from a social standpoint in the residence halls, because of the limited social opportunities outside of the fraternities that Dartmouth had. I think we started out talking about alternatives to fraternities, which was the truth. But then people began to recognize that this should be just sort of an integrated part of student life on campus so that you had those opportunities available. It wasn't an alternative; it was just there, it was it. Fraternities were whatever they were. But this other life was going on, life and activity, was going on in the context of residence halls.

Then I remember, too, there were renovations that were made to insure that each one of those clusters had a social space and a gathering space for kids to come together for these kinds of things, whether they were social or more academic or academically-oriented.

DONIN: That was my next question. These dorms that had existed for all these years didn't really have large gathering spaces.

BONZ: No, they didn't. I remember... Let's see, which one was it? I can walk to it over there. I'm forgetting the cluster. Maybe it's Streeter. But there was one where some really magnificent renovations were done. But in all of the clusters there was an attempt to create new space for student interaction.

DONIN: As an alternative to gathering at fraternities.

BONZ: Yes. Or, as I say, as just a... I mean, you had Collis and you had the fraternities. And in those days Collis was not much. We thought it was great when it first opened. We thought it was, well, Dartmouth College campus did. But anybody else who'd been in any student union or student activities center on any other, especially large university campus knew that Collis was a drop in a bucket by comparison. Of course we've now made enormously greater headway there with Collis. But it was Collis as it was or it was the fraternities, and there was not much in between except for what the special interest groups on campus were running by way of weekend parties and stuff.

DONIN: An ongoing theme in reading articles about you in the D was that space was always an issue, where you could have access to space for these alternative social activities to take place. There was never enough and I think that probably continues to be a problem today.

Why don't we stop here?

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

DONIN: Good morning. Today is October 31, 2002. I am here with Dr. Margaret Bonz in Hanover, New Hampshire, at Dartmouth College, for session two of our interview.

I thought we'd pick up again on your freshman dean days. We finished last session with your remark that a number of people told you that the freshman dean job was the best job at Dartmouth. Can you explain why that is?

BONZ: I think probably it had to do with the exposure that you have to every new class of students. They're just delightful folks, and they're still sort of needy as they're getting their sea legs as new students, and not averse to having conversations or coming in when they're asked to drop by or coming in with whatever concerns they have. So I think it has to do with the work with students.

DONIN: The interaction with the new students?

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: Okay. We were talking about some of the work that you were doing as freshman dean, including "clustering," the clustering program in the dorms?

BONZ: Right. We did talk a little bit about that the last time. The idea was to bring more organized, both social and intellectual, life into the residence halls in sort of a systematic way because Dartmouth's residence halls were pretty informal as residence systems go in colleges and universities. There were the undergraduate advisors, but that group of upper-class students worked only with first-year students. They were not your typical resident assistants who were there for the entire student population and who had responsibility for planning social activities and so forth and so on. They were primarily there simply to be a liaison with the freshman office and to serve as sort of informal counselors and advisors to new students. And to organize activities for new students.

So this new clustering program was designed to bring faculty into the residence halls, and, as I recall, the system was such that there were a number of faculty who would be assigned to a particular residential cluster, and maybe one of those was sort of the supreme faculty member for that cluster. And who, hand in hand with perhaps an undergraduate advisor, would work together in a creative fashion to bring new events into the residence halls. There might be a Friday afternoon occasion where a faculty panel would come in and talk about a particular, say, current-event topic of interest. Activities that sort of elevated the quality of life within the

residence halls, and that were more intellectual than just sort of the hanging around, eating pizza, and talking social activities.

DONIN: There was a problem of space in terms of having a place to do this in some of the older dorms.

BONZ: Right.

DONIN: Were you able to do it away from the dorm? Or was the idea that you wanted to do it in the dorm?

BONZ: Well, money was found and allocated to do some renovations so that each of the clusters did have a gathering space. Some clusters lent themselves to those renovations better than others, but there was an attempt to insure that there was a central gathering place in all of the residential clusters where a fair number of students could gather together.

This was a David McLaughlin initiative is my recollection. Again, this was one of the many efforts that were designed to give students alternatives to social and other activities beyond what was available in the fraternities. Because fraternities then -- I don't know what the situation is now -- continued to be the place where social life occurred. There were a lot of complaints from students, or had been complaints from students, over the years, not to mention faculty, that there just weren't other opportunities for folks to either socialize or engage in other activities that might not necessarily be strictly of a social nature but had a higher plane in terms of its intellectual quotient.

DONIN: You said that one of the jobs then that you felt as the freshman dean was to try to provide these alternatives.

BONZ: Well, it wasn't just a responsibility of the freshman office. Of course, you know, we were certainly interested in what was going on in the residence halls as it affected first-year students. But the clustering initiative and all that accrued from that was designed to offer opportunities for all students. It wasn't just first-year students.

DONIN: They created in 1983 the office of residential life. You chaired the committee that hired Christina Lescher.

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: And was that part of the clustering initiative? Did that come out of it, or did that come out the new residential life office?

BONZ: There were a lot of things going on with regard to residential life. I think this was the day of minimum standards being developed and applied to fraternities. So this office was responsible for insuring that those were met and adhered to.

Residential life wasn't strictly residence halls. It had to do with every place on campus where students were living, including fraternities. The office of residential life was really designed to get a better handle on residential activity at the college, and to help oversee those efforts that I've just described that were part of that clustering operation.

I think, as I was leaving Dartmouth or in the late 80's, the college, via the office of residential life, went to a system of hiring graduate students, Dartmouth College graduate students, or even people who, say, had master's degrees in student personnel administration or something of that sort, to come in and be an older adult presence in the residential clusters. Much as had been the case in, say, the Choates, for many, many years, where faculty members lived in residence. The operation was becoming a much more professionalized one in terms of staffing of the residence halls and the programmatic activity that the college was trying to promote within the residence halls. So the office of residential life was the sort of locus of administrative authority for both residence halls and fraternities.

DONIN: Was this a mandate from David McLaughlin?

BONZ: As I recall, I think all of that did come out of David's interest in the residential system. Ed Shanahan [Edward J. Shanahan "Ed"] was part of that as well. He was dean of the college at the time. And I think that whatever... I don't know whether Ed influenced David or David influenced Ed or together they were of one mind. But the two of them... I think of that era, of their partnership, presidency/dean of the college office as an era when residential life became a much more prominent concept on the Dartmouth College campus.

DONIN: Was it generally supported by all the departments on campus?

BONZ: I think the principle, the concept of what was being tried, was supported. I mean when you talk about every department on

campus, I'm sure some people were completely indifferent or perhaps had no clue as to what was going on, nor did they care. But I think by and large, for people who were tuned in, that it was something that they supported certainly from a conceptual standpoint. I mean you can't argue with trying to improve the quality of life of students in residence and elevating the intellectual discourse that occurs.

DONIN: Was it viewed in any way as a negative reflection on the fraternities?

BONZ: I'm not sure how to respond to the question. I think the take on fraternities then was that by and large they were negative. If anything, this was an attempt also to bring fraternities into the fold of being more positive influences within the college community through that minimum standards route, through the attempt to have fraternities embrace some of the same philosophy that was behind the programmatic activity in the residence halls, the more academically-oriented kinds of programs. And to get fraternities to buy into that, too, so that they were doing some of the same things in their houses.

DONIN: Speaking of behavior, you had to deal with some freshmen behavior always, I assume, every year, especially at football games. I guess there were certain traditions that the freshmen were expected to carry out at some of the football games in the fall each year. Can you remember some of the more memorable events?

BONZ: Not necessarily more memorable. When you talk about traditions, that amuses me because for adolescents, and even in the independent school world where I worked, there are traditions that I like to think of as instant traditions. You know, when kids talk about traditions, they often talk about things that happened once before but it's suddenly become a tradition that they must uphold. So this rushing the field at football games on this campus was known as a tradition. But it was one of those instant type of traditions.

Unfortunately, it did take hold, and it was just a headache, that's all. I mean it was just a huge headache. Again, I'm smiling because we always got outwitted. [Laughter] We would sit around every fall waiting for or planning for that first football game, the director, Bob McEwen [Robert G. "Bob" McEwen], director of security, and the director of athletics, and you name it. We'd all sit in a room, and we would come up with the most creative thoughts that we could to

contain this or to minimize it or whatever, and, you know, it was just impossible. I mean when you've got 1,000 kids who are determined to do something.

And I always just got such a kick out of -- although it annoyed me at times -- getting these letters from alums who would say, "Why aren't you stopping this?" I could see myself kind of standing out in the middle of the football field with my arms held high, trying to block this mass of 500 first-year students who were stampeding the field. I mean it was just ridiculous. I don't know whether it's happening in this day and time or not.

But it was just an utter headache that we just had to live through every year. And we were successful. We were rarely totally successful, but some years we were more successful than others. We even went to the point of telling students that they were going to be arrested if they were on that field. And, in fact, some of them were. They weren't held for long. But we reached the point where we said, "We just have to get very draconian, a relative term, about this." I remember a guy by the name of Hans Stander [Henricas J. Stander III '86] who was from Kansas City, Missouri; a tall, blond guy, who was a great rush-the-field leader. He was one of the first of those who got arrested. His father was the head of an independent school out in Kansas City, and he was not amused, but he should have been. [Laughter]

DONIN: Not amused with you or with his son?

BONZ: With having his son having been arrested in his first week in college.

DONIN: Now they confined this business to home games, or was there stuff going on at away games as well?

BONZ: Oh, sometimes. At the Harvard game in particular, they would get up to some little fancy shenanigans. But there wasn't much that we could do about that at all, other than to try to exhort. But when you've got a bunch of kids who decide they're going to do something, they're going to do it.

DONIN: And it is hard to punish all of them.

BONZ: Oh, yes.

DONIN: You can't get them all.

BONZ: That's right. [Laughter]

DONIN: It's too big a crowd. [Laughter]

BONZ: But it was a headache. But I think the thing that was the most embarrassing about it, which otherwise you could just let it happen, was the disruption of the half-time show of the visiting team's band, and that was what was rude. That's what got everybody outraged. It wasn't just the rushing of the field; it was when they chose to rush the field. Sometimes they even disrupted the Dartmouth College band in its half-time show as well.

DONIN: That's fair enough. But the other team, that's terrible.

BONZ: Yes.

DONIN: Now the alums were probably the most vocal complainers about this behavior.

BONZ: Usually. And it was very definitely the older alums. There is a great irony here in that a man, who lived in New London at the time, that I got a letter from Don Hagerman [Donald C. "Don" Hagerman '35], turned out to have been an acting head of the Ethel Walker School. He and I became great friends when I became the head of Ethel Walker because he liked to, when he was in the area -- and that was when he was still pretty mobile -- drop in from time to time. But he and I both recalled together the very lengthy and pointedly angry letter that he had sent to me about my needing to take care of this rushing of the field, and it was all my fault.

DONIN: Do you remember David McLaughlin's reactions to these events?

BONZ: Not really. I think David probably, in his heart of hearts, understood, just like most of us, that it wasn't something that you could have a huge amount of control over, although there were hard-liners who continued to insist that there was some solution to this. As I say, we always sat down in August of every year to figure out what new thing we were going to do this year to try to come to grips with it, and we never were quite successful.

DONIN: It's homecoming this weekend. I'll have to watch tomorrow -- on Saturday -- and see what happens.

- BONZ: It may be too cold, and nobody's there. [Laughter]
- DONIN: It's true, it's true. I read about something called the freshmen exclusion rule that went into effect I think before you took over the dean's office. I gather this was another effort to sort of protect the freshmen from exposure too early on to the fraternities.
- BONZ: Yes, I think that's it in a nutshell. That was another place where kids love to push back. And there would be a few who ended up every fall in the freshman office because they'd been found in a fraternity inappropriately.
- DONIN: What I don't understand is how you enforce a rule like that?
- BONZ: I don't even remember whether they went to... I don't think they ended up going to the committee on standards. I think what happened, as I'm recalling our system, is that they'd get a letter of warning from me, and it would be in their file. Something of that sort, where there was a record of it. And an admonition that if it happened again, that it would go to the committee on standards, and there could be more severe disciplinary consequences.
- DONIN: And the idea was to keep them out during their initial sort of orientation to life here?
- BONZ: Mmmm hmmm. To allow them to become aware of and partake of and participate in other kinds of social life on campus beyond fraternities. It was almost so that when the exclusion rule was lifted, they knew they had choices, not just fraternities.
- But quite frankly, in that day and time, those choices were pretty limited. I mean this was the days of the very early Collis Center. I mean it's nothing like it is now. And even the range of, for example, just restaurants on Main Street wasn't anything like it is now.
- The other thing that used to drive me nuts is that kids couldn't access events at the Hopkins Center because of the cost.
- DONIN: Oh?
- BONZ: I understand that Jim Wright has, I mean through Jim's administration there apparently is a subsidy now, because Dartmouth students can go to practically anything that's going on at

the Hopkins Center for five bucks. In those days they had to pay near full freight. And so there wasn't much of an outlet there. Even though wonderful things were going on, kids couldn't afford it.

DONIN: Okay. Let's get on to the broader topic of coeducation in general. Some of this I think we touched on last week. But when you arrived here in '75, women had been on campus as students, full-time Dartmouth students, for three years. Can you recollect what it was like then for the women students that you interacted with?

BONZ: Well, you have to recall that I was in the affirmative action office at that time, and my interaction with students was very limited because my interactions were with the employee population. The only students that I really saw were those who were my advisees and then the occasional, our intern in the freshman office and the occasional student or students who would drop by just to talk about something that was on their mind that had to do with equal opportunity or discrimination or something like that. Somehow they found their way to the affirmative action office.

In a kind of non-direct response to your question, one of the things that we did out of the affirmative action office that was sort of fun... I had an intern by the name of Park Dougherty ['78], and I think Park was a film studies major; if he wasn't, his avocation of interest was making documentaries and videos and stuff like that.

And so I had been collecting stories that had been told to me by women students about their experiences in the classroom or their experiences with Dartmouth professors where they would be told things like, "Well, I don't know why you are thinking about graduate... " A student would go in to ask a professor for a recommendation. "I don't know why you're thinking about graduate school. All you're going to do is get married and have kids." The professor that referred to or that was still masculine-centered in all of the pronoun uses. I mean this was the 70's, after all.

So I had a bunch of really sort of interesting vignette stories, and we decided to do a videotape. We entitled it *Men and Girls*. Alan Gaylord [Alan T. Gaylord] in the English department was willing to play one of the professorial roles. I remember Alan in particular because he's such a commanding presence.

Anyway, what we did on the *Men and Girls* videotape was to -- and it was designed to be an educational piece -- enact these vignettes,

these stories. And I can't remember how many of them we ended up doing, probably five, six, or so. Park had a great time doing it and editing it, and it was just his sort of Dartmouth opus. And then we showed it all over campus, I think even in all of the divisional council meetings for the humanities and the social sciences and the sciences. And it got a fair amount of play, not without some grumping and controversy about it.

What was so interesting about it was that the content was so obvious to mostly all women and a fair number of men, but there were other people who just said, "What? What? I mean what is this all about?" I mean they still didn't quite get it. But there were some sort of in the middle ground who did get it and said, "I can see how this could create a climate that maybe is not hostile or actively hostile, but that is sort of blatantly if not hostile, not very positively conducive for women students." Anyway, so that videotape was an interesting by-product of those days. It's around somewhere, over probably in OISER in some file.

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

DONIN: Okay. So we were talking about *Men and Girls*, and I'm happy to say that there is, in fact, a copy of it over at the Jones Media Center. There was another one I saw called... I think it was a videotape of a play that was actually performed called *You Laugh*.

BONZ: Right.

DONIN: Which was... I don't know what the right word is. It was very sad. Obviously there was sadness in the message in *Men and Girls*. But *You Laugh* was, in fact, very sad and very angry. I don't know what the chronology of which came first, whether Park's video came first or whether this play, *You Laugh*, came first.

BONZ: I can't remember either. And since I wasn't involved in *You Laugh* in the same way that I was with *Men and Girls*, my recollection is dimmer. But my recollection is that it was student-conceived and student produced and implemented.

A group of women students got together and created the script and did the whole thing. And I think it was actually performed live in several venues around campus and ultimately ended up being captured on videotape.

DONIN: Was there reaction to these productions on campus from the students?

BONZ: Well, as always, varied, but by and large, I think that certainly the male student population--and this is in regard to *You Laugh*--I think that there was a hostile reaction to it. Not among all students, but I always--and I hate to categorize--but I think of the sort of fraternity mentality group, and it was always, you know, "What's the big deal? Why are these girls so upset about something I don't understand?"

DONIN: Was it your sense that the administration saw these as well and were aware of them?

BONZ: Yes, yes. If not saw, certainly were aware. And this was in John Kemeny's day. I just feel very strongly that to whatever extent John could influence any initiative, whether it came out of the dean's office or wherever on campus that would help move the Dartmouth College climate to a better place in its acceptance of women and people of color and such, he would have been thoroughly behind that or thoroughly active in that.

But a lot of it ultimately, I think, had to do with getting a greater critical mass on this campus, having women on the faculty and in visible administrative positions. And we were still in the very early days of coeducation and early days of thinking about hiring the kind of candidates that you're looking for in different ways. So that literally the complexion of the campus could be altered.

DONIN: Yes, I think we talked about this, touched on it last time anyway. Even by the class of '84, there were still far more men than women. It was 38 percent, I think. Why did it take so long to bring it up to 50-50?

BONZ: Well, there was a mandate to the admissions office for a number of years to keep the ratio at a particular place of imbalance. And then finally the trustees -- and I don't remember the timetable on this -- voted to lift that. Even after they did that, it was still slow going. I don't think we got to 50 percent until Karl Furstenberg became director of admissions.

DONIN: And this was not only because of the board of trustees. What were the other factors that slowed it down?

BONZ: I don't know for sure. But I think, as I alluded to, if not said directly in our last conversation, I think it was leadership in the admissions office, just being very conservative and very cautious, and moving relatively slowly. Because one of the things that we knew quite clearly, because the data was there, is that the women who applied to Dartmouth College were, as a group, more qualified than the men. And therefore there should have been no reason why you couldn't have gotten to that 50-50 place a lot more quickly.

Now, what I don't know -- or maybe knew once and can't recall -- is whether there were a disproportionate number of women admitted in order to try to move that more quickly but because of Dartmouth's reputation, the acceptance rate was lower. That could have been a factor as well, and I don't remember what those data showed.

DONIN: Speaking of scripts, I think you took part in the 15th anniversary of coeducation here in writing a script that the Women's Studies Program produced called *Breaking Tradition*. Do you remember that?

BONZ: Not at all. [Laughter]

DONIN: Okay. I'll play it for you sometime. [Laughter] All right, we'll pass on to another question then.

BONZ: That's interesting. I have absolutely no recollection of that.

DONIN: I'll show it to you. It's very good. In your role as dean of freshmen, it appears from reading the D and everything, that you were a regular speaker before alumnae and parent groups.

BONZ: You know, I really wasn't.

DONIN: Really?

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm. I can practically count them on my hand. And the reason that I'm very aware of this is because it was something that I hated to do. I would go down to Boston every August and meet with the Boston area incoming students. They gave a big luncheon for all the kids in the Boston area and their parents. And as freshman dean, I would do a little talk there. And then parents' weekend I had to make a presentation. That was about it except for this going up to Moosilauke every night for freshman trips, which was very, very

informal. But, no, there would be the rare occasion where I would go out on the road.

I remember in my later days in the freshman office Tom Campion [Thomas B. "Tom" Campion '64] used to haul me around with him to parent gatherings. But I would say even then I went with him no more than three or four occasions, three or four times.

DONIN: What was the message as the dean of freshmen? What was the message that you wanted to send to the parents of the freshmen?

BONZ: Well, there was no deliberate message. Parents' weekend was held in the spring at the end of the year. My talk to them was about seven or eight or ten minutes' long, and it was mostly humorous. Just looking back on some of the typical foibles of freshman year: Kids learning to do their wash for the first time, you know, putting the colors in with the whites and that sort of thing. So I can't think that there was a particular message.

I mean if I was going out on the road with somebody like Tom Campion, it usually had to do with fund-raising kinds of things, and my role was to just talk about what was going on at the college, you know, things that they would be interested in.

My most significant communication to the parents of first-year students were these letters that I would send. It was a tradition, a long-standing tradition in the freshman office, although I think I did elevate it to maybe a higher plane. But these would be letters that would, again, talk about the kinds of things that new students in the fall particularly typically experienced. And the purpose was to just ratchet down the level of anxiety that parents might have, thinking that their kid was the only one who was homesick or who was calling home six out of seven nights a week and so forth and so on.

One of the stories that I remember somehow conveying in one of these letters, because it was such a standard event, would be that I'd get a call from a parent in the office at quarter of eight in the morning, and this call would come through as soon as the switchboard was open in the freshman office, eight o'clock. The parent would say, "Johnny called me last night at eleven o'clock, and we spent two hours on the phone, and he's just miserable, and it's awful, and he's failing all of his courses, and he's homesick, and he hates his roommate, and on and on and on. And you've got to

do something about this. I mean I'm a thousand miles away, and I can't get there fast enough, and you've got to do something."

So I assured the parent that I would get Johnny, and we would get Johnny in. And Johnny was just fine. Because what Johnny had done was just dump all this stuff on his parents, and once you've done that, you know, he probably spent the next two hours having an illicit beer or two with his friends until three o'clock in the morning, which might have had something to do with why he thought he was failing all these courses and was panicked and so forth and so on. So then you call the parent back and say, "I did talk with Johnny, and this is what's happened." And they would say, "Oh." And I said, "So the next time, just take it with a grain of salt. It's going to be okay." But that would happen time and time again, you know, the kid would just bowl over mom and dad, and then be fine.

DONIN: Well, it's a good process. It works. [Laughter]

BONZ: Yes, it does work.

DONIN: How about alums on the occasions when you did go out on the road with Tom Campion? What sort of issues did they bring up to you?

BONZ: Oh, I can't remember. I do remember being asked by David McLaughlin to go speak to I think it was actually his [Dartmouth] class on some occasion in New York City, and that was when... It wasn't John Kemeny who asked me. It must have been in the freshman office. But I was tainted because I'd been affirmative action officer. So he got attacked. I remember getting attacked a little bit about politics or political kinds of things. But by and large, it was pretty benign stuff. I mean I really didn't do that very often.

DONIN: You did a whole lot of committee work, though. Let's start with the committee on standards, and that was during your time when you were dean of freshmen, during the 80's. This was under David McLaughlin. You had to deal with discipline of the protestors?

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: Can you talk about your work on the COS, as they call it?

BONZ: COS, sure. I don't know. This is something else that's rooted in longstanding Dartmouth history. But the custom was that the dean of freshmen chaired the committee on standards, which was part of the job description. I think that eventually changed. And most of the time that was... I mean it wasn't "ho hum," but it was just that you chaired the committee, you had faculty and other administrators and students on the committee. The students were elected to serve on the COS. And, you know, there were tough situations where students had to be expelled or disciplined in pretty severe kinds of ways. But that was just... I mean you never like to see that happen, and sometimes there were nasty and difficult cases.

But that was sort of a piece of cake compared to the (it seems like) hundreds of meetings that we had to have after the shanties were destroyed on the Green. I think I'll probably sort of cut to the chase here. I am a committee chair who lets people around the table have their say, in other words, the committee members. I am not an authoritarian committee chair. I think my gender has something to do with a different style of operating.

There were many people in the college during those hearings who I'm sure, who I know were very critical of the COS and uncertain of my leadership of it because we didn't come down on, or we did not make decisions that, for example, David McLaughlin was comfortable with. Or maybe Ed Shanahan was comfortable with. And I think the sense was that I could have been more directive with that committee and moved it to a different place in terms of its outcome, and that was not something I was prepared to do, even if I could have. Because you've got senior faculty members sitting around the table and students sitting around the table, and this is a collective. Everybody hears the same testimony, everybody has his or her take on that testimony, and we came to joint decisions that I had to own. And quite frankly they were decisions that I agreed with.

But I remember it was a very, very tense time. It was the worst time of my professional life in terms of the stress and pressure. You just had to get up every morning and grit your teeth and go in and hold your head high because there was just criticism everywhere: externally, from the administration, about the work of the COS during that time.

I remember -- this is the thing that I just was quietly furious about because you can't get publicly furious about these things -- that the

president sent Cary Clark, who was the college counsel at the time, in to basically berate and lecture the committee for having made the decisions that it made. I mean, he was an emissary from the president's office to just kick us around the block. And it was obvious, it was nasty, it was condescending, it was inappropriate, it was humiliating. I don't know how Cary felt about having to be this messenger, but he carried it off pretty well because I think he was in agreement, too, that we hadn't done the job that the president wanted done in terms of delivering the decisions that the president would have liked to have seen.

DONIN: You're referring to whether or not to allow the shanties to stay?

BONZ: No, no, I'm talking about the disciplining of the *Dartmouth Review* kids.

DONIN: Oh, when they attacked the shanties.

BONZ: Yes.

DONIN: Okay.

BONZ: Because you had the *Dartmouth Review* kids, and then you had other students who were... Talk about repressing. But you had students who were in the shanties. You had the *Dartmouth Review* students who attacked the shanties. Then you had students who were involved in counter protests, and I mean it was just a rat's nest. And we had meeting, after meeting, after meeting. I remember--we'd have meetings sometimes until two o'clock in the morning. It was just horrendous. And it really occupied almost all of winter term of whatever year that was. It was just all-consuming. And I don't think David McLaughlin ever spoke, well, I won't say "civilly", but ever had a cordial conversation with me again after that. But he was gone shortly thereafter himself.

DONIN: He didn't last long after that. Did you have trouble reaching consensus within the committee?

BONZ: Not really. A lot of it was... I say these meetings went on and on and on because I think the issue was more the kind of discipline to mete out and trying to both be consistent and figuring out different levels for, different responses to different levels of engagement or activity. It was very, very complicated.

But we were very hard on, for example, the *Dartmouth Review* students, and that was what was unpopular because the shanties were unpopular in the first place. And there were a lot of people who felt, "Good for them."

It was a really tough time, and it was a tense time all over campus for everybody because there was a lot of divisiveness in terms of how people viewed those events, starting off with the destruction of the shanties and the protest and counter protest and all of the stuff that was then coming out in the *Dartmouth Review* subsequently, and on and on and on.

DONIN: What was it that David McLaughlin wanted you to do as a committee?

BONZ: I think that he would have... Some of this may have gotten overturned eventually; as I say, I've repressed a lot of this stuff. I think I even threw away everything that I had involved with that era just because I didn't want to think about it or see it again.

I think he would have preferred that the kids who attacked the shanties did not get as severe a response from the committee as they did. I think he would have preferred that other students who might have been labeled more liberal had gotten a firmer response from the committee in terms of their activities. I mean I'm sure he was under extraordinary pressure from alums to have a particular kind of outcome, and we didn't deliver that. And it's probably, in a way, like my description of not being able to control the freshmen rushing the field, but being criticized because you couldn't.

David couldn't control the Committee on Standards and was being criticized because that wasn't happening. There are a lot of people who when they look at a situation and they see someone... I know this from having been the CEO or been a head of school. Who'll look at you and say, "But you're the boss. You can. All you have to do is to tell Josephine that this is the way it's going to be." And I'm sure David had all kinds of people saying, "You need to tell that committee what it's supposed to do and get these outcomes to be what they should be." And of course he couldn't do that. So he was under enormous pressure as well. I mean I know that. And so he was very angry at the committee and particularly, I'm sure, me as the chair of the committee, because I wasn't maneuvering that committee to a place that he would have liked for it to have been in.

DONIN: He was under pressure from all sides, though, from any number....

BONZ: Oh, yes. Everywhere, yes.

DONIN: By then it sounds like things had really started falling apart by the time they reached the shanty incident. He'd lost the support of the faculty by then.

BONZ: Well, I don't know that piece of it. But I do know that that was an extraordinarily difficult time. I never, until well after the fact, I mean even in recent years, since I've been back in the Upper Valley from my time at Ethel Walker, I only in the past four years have learned of the deep animosity that the faculty had toward David. I mean I knew that some of that was there. But I just had not understood the depths of that until people are now talking about it much more openly.

DONIN: Let's talk about him as a leader in general. I guess you started in the dean of freshman office about the same time that he started, that he was elected president.

BONZ: Right, right.

DONIN: What were your interactions with him in the beginning?

BONZ: Very few, but all of them were very cordial. I mean we would be up at Moosilauke together during freshman trips. I always had, until this shanty/COS era, I always had, I felt, a very cordial relationship with David. But I didn't have all of that much interaction with him.

DONIN: You weren't part of his sort of inner advisory council, his senior advisory council?

BONZ: I remember sitting around the conference table in the president's office on occasion, but there is nothing compelling at all about those memories. Just nothing there.

DONIN: What was your take on him as a leader?

BONZ: I don't know. I don't think it would be fair for me to comment on that because I felt... I think I was just too removed from that level. You know, personally I liked David. I think he made... I can think of a couple of places where he made strategic errors. I don't know

whether it had to do with sort of the Type A personality and the need to control things so highly.

But one was being out of town on Martin Luther King's birthday, which you just don't do, and you certainly don't do it in the climate of those times. That was a bad move. He should have had better advice. Somebody should have advised him because he's charting unknown territory. Because, I mean, he's not been an academic. He's not been in that kind of institution. He doesn't know the symbolic things that you need to do. And so I don't fault him so much on that as I fault his inner circle by not saying, "You need to work that travel" (I think he was in Florida) "so that you're here and not away." Because that made kids furious.

The other strategic error that he made, I think, was....

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

DONIN: So you were saying the other strategic error he made?

BONZ: Was I think the way that he dealt with the kids who "occupied" Parkhurst. His initial response was very harsh. These students were hurting. We kept the freshman office open and just stayed there until late in the evening with students. This is when they were sitting in.

That was not well received either, and we were criticized for aiding and abetting, if you will. But, you know, we had kids who were crying and emotional and upset and wanting to talk with mom and dad and on and on and on. So we just were sort of a haven down there. I don't know whether they were doing it in the upper-class dean's office or not. We could sort of hide out in the basement, I suppose. [Laughter]

But all of us in the freshman office just stayed there and sat and listened to what the kids had to say. I think we even arranged for food to be brought in and stuff like that. And I think that if the institutional response had been more thoughtful and showed a little bit more compassion, as opposed to kind of a rigidity that, "This is bad and how dare you think that you can occupy this building and do these things?" Those kids would have gone away.

If David had come down and just talked with them. Or arranged to have a delegation of them come to his office to talk with them. I

mean these weren't your militants from the 60's. These were just hurting kids. They weren't going to burn anything or destroy anything or damage anything. They just needed somebody to listen to them, somebody to acknowledge them and some of the things that they were standing for, if you will.

Finally, I think about two or three days into this, I do remember being in the president's office with a group of students that he had either allowed or invited to come in. That was a very helpful moment in that it finally began to defuse things. But that could have happened a lot earlier. And I think there would have been a lot less chaos and pain and press, ultimately, if the president had been a more sort of kindly and approachable. He could have used that occasion to be firm as well, after he had heard them out. But he stayed aloof from it, and was... The order, if you will, that seemed to be being given was, "We're not going to put up with this." It was a much more sort of authoritarian response from the president's office than I think needed to be.

DONIN: Who was advising him on how to handle this?

BONZ: Rumsfeld, Cheney. [Laughter]

I don't know. You know, college counsel? I don't know. I don't know who he... I mean he clearly had a trusted inner circle but I didn't run in those circles, so I don't know who. I'm sure he was hearing from trustees and alums.

DONIN: Well, he had Ed Shanahan as dean of the college.

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm. Well, Ed shared that kind of personality trait with David and would have been, I think, at first blush more likely to dig in heels and establish a hard line than the other way around.

DONIN: I assume he's the next in command.

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm. Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: When the president is not here.

BONZ: Well, I don't know. I think we had a provost who probably would have been second in command. But certainly insofar as student affairs goes, the dean of the college would have been second in command.

DONIN: Right. So that was 1986. Shortly after that, the next year was it, that you decided to take the semester-at-sea job?

BONZ: Mmmm hmmm.

DONIN: Was that tied into the pressures of what you'd just been through?

BONZ: I don't think, certainly not directly. I just happened to have... How did this come about? Okay.

Well, I know how it came about. And this was another interesting little tidbit, too. I was a member of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, which later became the National Association of Women in Education. I was the program chair for the annual conference that year. It was in Denver. I had gotten Gloria Steinem to be the keynote speaker, with some help from Marysa Navarro [Marysa Navarro-Aranguren]. We had Jill Ker Conway as another one of our speakers. It was probably the most star-studded program that the conference had ever had. I obviously had to be there because I had a major role to play.

David McLaughlin forbade me to go because there was something going on on campus. I don't think I was directly involved, but he wanted me available. Eventually I was finally able to make the case -- I don't think I talked with him directly, but I'm not sure how it happened, maybe in writing -- that I had to be there. That it would be a great embarrassment to Dartmouth College if I suddenly wasn't there and could provide no really plausible or acceptable reason why I couldn't be there, other than I was told by the president I had to be available on campus. I can't remember what it was, but it was not anything that was terribly significant.

I went to the conference, and it was at that conference that one of my colleagues, who was dean of students at the University of Northern Colorado, Jean Shober, told me about her experience of being the director of student life on Semester-at-Sea. And I thought, "Boy, does that sound interesting." So she sent me some information, and I sent stuff into the University of Pittsburgh's Semester-at-Sea office. I just had no idea what was going to happen to it.

Later in the fall -- I guess early in the fall -- I got a call from the executive director of the program who said, "I've got this stuff from

you here, and we're looking for a director of student life for the spring '87 voyage." He said, "Don't you think you're overqualified?" And so I quickly disabused him of that.

Anyway, I ended up getting the job. But I said, "I'm delighted with this offer, but it's going to have to be contingent--I mean this has happened very fast, and this has to be contingent on my getting a leave approved." So I scurried around.

By virtue of being dean of freshmen, I had faculty status. So I researched the handbook and saw that someone with faculty status after my tenure in the freshman office was entitled to some sabbatical time. So I put together my little proposal with all of that because I wanted this to be a paid leave because I was getting paid peanuts on this trip. But the pay was the trip itself.

Ed Shanahan told me -- I guess he took it to the president and said -- "It's not going to fly. You're not a faculty member." I said, "But see, in the... " What is the green book?

DONIN: ORC.

BONZ: "See, in the ORC, it says I am." Anyway, we went back and forth and back and forth, and I was finally able to negotiate a leave with half pay. And to this day I wonder why I was allowed to do that. I don't know whether it was that David felt guilty because of the way I had been treated the previous year, or whether they just wanted to get me off campus. [Laughter] I mean there was nothing going on in this next year. But I really did wonder whether it was... I guess my theory was that there was a sense of some remorse or guilt, and that they were willing to give me this opportunity, knowing that I had been abused, heavily abused, the year before. I suppose I like to think that that was the motive. But heaven only knows what it was.

But anyway the nice thing was that I did get to go, and we had someone come in. I think it was Mary Turco, who was acting dean for that 100-day period. The freshman office was well-staffed and in good shape. And it was a good time of year. I mean fall, I would not have been able to do a fall voyage. But the voyage that left the end of January and returned early May was doable.

DONIN: So you weren't on campus when David McLaughlin resigned.

BONZ: I don't know when he resigned.

DONIN: Do you recall being surprised when you learned he was resigning?

BONZ: I don't have any recollection of that really. But I suppose... When I came back, come to think of it, my last year here was Jim Freedman's first year here.

DONIN: So you were here for that transition.

BONZ: Uh huh. Because remember I told you the last time about Jim and Bathsheba going up to Moosilauke for the first time. [Laughter]

DONIN: Great story.

Let's see here. Where are we? We've talked a lot about David McLaughlin. I feel like I didn't really give you a chance to talk about John Kemeny and his style as a president and how you reacted to him.

BONZ: I loved John Kemeny. I think probably this has been said hundreds of times about him, but he had this uncanny ability to make the most complex set of thoughts understandable to nitwits like me. I mean he could just reduce things and was so incredibly articulate. And was so committed to what was happening on campus at that time with respect to trying to move this institution into a new place with representation of women and people of color. It really was a commitment that came from the top. I always felt very supported by him, even though I didn't meet with him that frequently. I met with him maybe half an hour once a month just to go in and report on stuff. And would meet with the board of trustees--I think it was the January meeting--every year very briefly to talk about the status of affirmative action and such in the community. But I just admired him so much.

DONIN: You must have been distressed when he retired, although he did stay on campus, of course.

BONZ: Yes, yes. Well, I think all of us were. So many people were sad to see him go, but understood that there is a time where you just feel like you've done all that you can do and you've got to do something else. Or go back to doing what you love the most, which is what he did.

DONIN: You say he did so much on campus. If you had to identify his greatest achievement during his presidency?

BONZ: Coeducation and Native Americans.

DONIN: And Native Americans.

BONZ: John was not a highly visible president in terms of being out and about and interacting with students and that sort. I always found him to be a very gentle man. I mean he was a gentleman, but he was also a very gentle man and soft-spoken and shy and private and brilliant. I never saw him-- It would have been interesting, for example, to be in a meeting of the CAP when they were discussing tenure decisions. I have no idea what his leadership style in that setting would have been. I didn't see him much in a leadership situation in the smaller groups or with his senior people, because I did not have access to those occasions simply because of the nature of my position.

DONIN: If you had to credit David McLaughlin with an achievement?

BONZ: I think the attempt to elevate the quality of life for students on the campus, particularly within the residence halls and to de-emphasize fraternities at the same time. That's probably one of the biggest things that happened during his tenure. And certainly some of the bricks and mortar stuff.

DONIN: Right. What made you make the decision to go to Ethel Walker?

BONZ: Well, it probably had a good deal to do with having been on Semester-at-Sea. Because that just sort of changes your whole view of the world and life and possibilities and so forth. So that happened, and I had a new frame of mind. Our youngest son would be that next year a senior at Hanover High.

I don't like to be in a place where, or be in a position where I start doing the same things all over again. And I was beginning to feel like I had, within the confines of what I was able to do as freshman dean, was beginning to feel that I'd sort of exhausted all of the creative possibilities of that job, and that I was going to eventually just begin maintaining as opposed to creating. And I looked around the landscape here to see whether there were other opportunities for me here that I would be interested in, and there were not. So I then said, "What would I like to do next?"

Heading an all-girls school was one of the things I identified because of some things that I told you earlier about my experience here with students and hoping to have an earlier impact on them; so that when they came to Dartmouth they weren't afraid to be who they were, certainly from an intellectual standpoint. And I thought about an academic or a position in a university overseas such as American University of Cairo. I had a contact there. Or an academic position in higher education in the U.S., out of student affairs and more into the academic role. So those were the three areas.

The Ethel Walker opportunity came along. Interestingly, I had sent off material or information to the vice president of the American University of Cairo. His son was a student here, and I had met him as a result of that. He was once at St. Lawrence. I had just about a week before taken the job at Ethel Walker -- this was in January -- and I got a call from him. He said, "I haven't heard from you." He said, "I sent you..." He had sent a response to my materials offering me a couple of positions or, you know, holding out a couple of possibilities for American University of Cairo for me to think about and make a choice. He said, "I haven't heard from you, and I'm calling to see what's going on." And I said, "Well, I never got the stuff." But we decided it was meant to be. [Laughter]

DONIN: And how long were you there?

BONZ: Eleven years.

DONIN: So what was the reaction here on campus at your departure?

BONZ: I don't know. [Laughter]

DONIN: It wasn't seen that you were leaving because there was a new president?

BONZ: Oh, no.

DONIN: No.

BONZ: Not at all. Not at all. No, everything was just right because with Steve being a senior, I would not be disrupting his education because he was going to be out of the nest anyway. Semester-at-Sea had the influence of getting the juices running to do something

new. And there wasn't anything here. And so one of the opportunities I'd sort of defined for myself came to pass.

DONIN: That's great. Can you think of anything that we've left out, that I've left out to ask you?

BONZ: I can't think of anything.

DONIN: All right. Well, thank you very much.

End of Interview