

R. Harcourt Dodds '58

Trustee Emeritus

An Interview Conducted by

Chris Burns

Hanover, New Hampshire

May 19, 2001

May 20, 2001

DOH-9

Special Collections

Dartmouth College

Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: R. Harcourt Dodds '58, Trustee Emeritus

INTERVIEW BY: Chris Burns

PLACE: Baker Library, Room 158

DATE: May 19, 2001

BURNS: Today is May 19, 2001 and I'm speaking with Harcourt Dodds, class of 1958 and trustee of the college from 1973 to 1983. I'd like to begin by examining your decision to come to Dartmouth College in the first place as a student. You were born and raised in New York City?

DODDS: Born and raised in New York City and, more particularly, in Harlem. I went to public schools in Harlem and then passed the entrance exam for Stuyvesant High School, which was one of New York's selective high schools, and I was a good student. Stuyvesant, along with Brooklyn Tech and Bronx Science, emphasizes the physical sciences and careers related thereto, engineering and so forth. So my bent was engineering and, initially, I applied in my senior year to schools like Cooper Union and N.Y.U. School of Engineering and a few other places that had engineering schools, with the idea that I would go on and pursue a career in engineering. But a number of things intervened. It was made clear to me that (this is the 1953-54 academic year), that there were very, very few, if any, blacks in the profession so that whatever I might do might well have some sort of a path-breaking quality to it.

I had a session with a representative from an organization called the National Scholarship and Service Fund for Negro Students, who made the very helpful suggestion that it was probably better to look at a liberal arts institution because, to go to engineering as an undergraduate experience at Cooper Union, for example, might mean that after a semester or two, I would find that I wasn't cut out for it, I didn't like it. And then what would happen? I was stuck in this engineering program and struggling. His suggestion was, "Go to a liberal arts school. Get a broad base and, afterwards, if engineering is what you care to pursue. Fine. You would at least have sampled a wide range of offerings."

So it happened that he had a nephew attending Dartmouth and he said, "Why don't you apply to Dartmouth? It's a fine school. My nephew goes there. He enjoys it." I should say, just parenthetically, that this was a white man that I was speaking with. So, at this point, I had no concept of what Dartmouth was like with regard to minority students or anything of that nature. In fact, I didn't even know where it was. [Laughter]

This is now February or March of senior year, so I had to scramble around and put this application together. I was then slated for an interview. Now that I am thinking liberal arts colleges, I also applied to Columbia and to Yale. Since those were places that were really better known to me, they were the ones that I was really anticipating making some choice between. The Dartmouth interview was first; Columbia did not give an interview. The Dartmouth interview was first and I went to a businessman's office in the Wall Street area. There were three alumni and we had the usual conversation about high school, background, my extracurricular activities, and so on and so forth.

At one point, they then said, "Well, what questions do you have?" So I said, "Well, I'm interested to know, and I hope you don't mind my asking, what is the racial climate like in a place like Dartmouth?" They then proceeded to tell me about the referendum vote, which was then in the process, perhaps it had been concluded, having to do with fraternities that had restrictive clauses and that there were students that had been there when they were there. These were all white interviewers. There were students that they knew who had been there who seemed to have had positive experiences. And they were very upbeat, very positive. In fact, complimented me for raising the question. They thought it was very forward-looking and very helpful to them that I had, in fact, raised this matter because, the way our conversation was going, I mean it just would not have come out on to the table for discussion unless I had raised it.

Well, given their glowing response, I figured that I now had the magic bullet for these interviews. So, with the Yale interview coming up -- I sort of targeted Yale as my primary place -- the Yale interview was just with a single individual. He was an executive director of a boys' club in Manhattan. So the Yale interview went along, again, the same basic questions about background and so on. Again, at the appropriate moment I was invited to ask any questions I had and I raised the same question. Well, this interviewer was flabbergasted that I had not heard of Levi Jackson, who was a Yale football player and he was, in the late '40s, elected captain of the Yale football team. That was, of course, a

big item of national news. His picture was on the cover of *Life* magazine; it was really a big deal. I had heard of it, but I'm ten years old or something when this happens, so it wasn't like it was something that I was going around thinking about all the time. [Laughter] This interviewer, he just couldn't believe that I wouldn't have known that Yale was this wonderful place, having elected this guy as the football captain back in the late '40s and so on.

Not to prolong the story, I later learned from my high school debate partner who interviewed with the same man that he was of the opinion that I was very immature, that my raising the question about race relations showed that I didn't have the self-confidence and the ability to kind of get along in an environment like Yale. So he sent back a recommendation that I not be admitted. [Laughter] So I get this rejection from Yale.

So I'm now reduced, so to speak, to Dartmouth and Columbia. There were a couple of other schools, CCNY and Howard University. But my parents, at this point, really came into play because, from their standpoint, they were immigrants from the Caribbean, from Barbados--going to college to them always meant going away to college. So there was never any question but that, at whatever point I went to college, I would go away. So when you took away the New York--the NYU, Columbia, CCNY possibilities, what was left was Dartmouth and Howard University. So, between those two, at least as they viewed it and I viewed it, there really wasn't much of an issue, so I accepted Dartmouth's offer. There was a scholarship that went along with it. So it worked out.

BURNS: But you didn't come to Dartmouth before you came in as a freshman?

DODDS: No. It's interesting because, in fact, I had even made a note of that, the idea of campus visits was just nothing we ever considered. I mean it would have been possible to go to Columbia to visit classes, similarly to CCNY. Even the schools in New York, I mean, I never, none of us in high school ever made visits. We would get the brochures. We'd read them and, whatever they said in the brochure, we believed was the case. [Laughter] We had no car, so to go away would have been a major undertaking. It was just never part of the equation. The idea that you would actually go and examine a place just never entered our thinking at all.

BURNS: And so those alumni interviews for the college's perspective, too, really played a...

DODDS: They played a major role because that was really how you made human contact and you got a chance, literally, to have a face put onto the college and have it humanized. So, they were very, very important. No, it wasn't until the autumn when we came up. My dad and I flew up. The first plane ride for us both.

BURNS: Into Lebanon?

DODDS: Right into Lebanon. Yeah. But, before that, there was something that had happened that I think future listeners or readers of this transcript might find interesting. I had a great uncle. He was married to my mother's aunt, who worked for the Downtown Athletic Club, which was one of the then very exclusive private clubs in Manhattan. In fact, it is the club that sponsors the Heisman Trophy Award every year in college football. My uncle was a waiter; he would work to clean up. Basically, he was one of the laborers in this club. He and the other people in the club were working-class men, although it was considered at that level, a job of some prestige because you were working in this environment with the very wealthy Wall Street types and so forth.

So most of his co-workers were, in fact, white but they were working-class like Irish, Italian immigrants, sort of on their way up. He, himself, was from Guyana, British Guyana, but very, very fair and could have passed for white and probably did in order to get that job. They knew that he was from the Caribbean. It wasn't that he was hiding or anything; but as you looked at the group of workers, he would not have seemed that different.

In any event, he, in the banter around the job, said that he had this great-nephew who was going to Dartmouth and his co-workers, realizing that this was a school that the clientele went to, the members of the club, they didn't believe him. They said, "You're kidding. How could you have a grand-nephew--when Dartmouth is a place for the sons of these businessmen and lawyers and so forth?" So they would keep teasing him and insisting that he was making it up and so one day he asked me if I would let him have my letter of admission. He explained that he wanted to show the people down on the job. Well, in those days, there were no photo machines or anything. So, all I had was this one copy of the letter. [Laughter] And so, "I don't know. Am I going to give him this thing? What if he loses it? Does that mean..." In any event, I made the letter available to him. So he took it in, showed the people at the Downtown Athletic Club that he did, in fact,

have this grandnephew going to Dartmouth. They were satisfied. But it was of that kind of magnitude in our family that I was going away.

BURNS: Did you have brothers and sisters?

DODDS: I have an older sister and a younger sister. At that time, I was the first to go to college. They both subsequently went, but I was the first to go. So we flew up to Lebanon and had our second major pre-matriculation experience which was the ride from Lebanon to Hanover. Now, in those days as is probably the case now, the housing office gives you the names and addresses of your roommates and there was no pre-selection or preferences. You were just told, "This is who you're rooming with" and the name of the dorm and the room. And I was in Russell Sage, which is just down this little street here [Tuck Drive] on the fourth floor. So I made note of these names of my roommates. One was from Miami and the other was from California, Menlo Park, California, which I had no idea where it was. I assumed, but I didn't know one way or the other--but I assumed that they were white students.

We lived in Harlem at 126th Street and Fifth Avenue. I don't know if you know Manhattan at all, but that's pretty much right in the heart of Harlem, one block north of 125th Street which is a major thoroughfare. However, our apartment building fronted Fifth Avenue, so our mailing address was 2-0-4-1 Fifth Avenue and, of course, my name is Harcourt Dodds. I will get to that phase of it later on. We're riding in from the airport, about five minutes in the cab, my dad and I and three others, and this student, I assumed he was a student. He seemed to be older. I thought he was actually an upper classman. He strikes up a conversation, white fellow, and he wanted to know where I was from, "was I going to the campus?" "Yes." "Was I just starting?" "Yes, I'm a freshman." As it turns out, he was a freshman, too. So he was interested to know what dorm I was in, so I said, "Russell Sage". He said, "I'm in Russell Sage." He wanted to know what floor I was on and I said, "I'm on the fourth floor." Amazing thing, he was on the fourth floor. [Laughter] Well, you can see where this is going. "What room was I in?" I said, "Room 407." He thought for a moment and then literally I could see a crimson shade beginning around his neck and it started to go up. He said, "I'm in 407, too." [Laughter] Initially, he thought he was across the hall from me, but then he realized that his room was also 407. Sort of a noticeable silence that fell over the cab for the rest of the ride to Hanover. [Laughter]

It turned out that he was the roommate from Florida. [Charles] Chuck Panettiere, class of '58, graduate of the Lawrenceville School. So he had at least spent some time in the north, but he was for all intents and purposes, a southerner. And Lawrenceville being one of the exclusive prep schools, I doubt if they had any black students there at all. So there we were. Then our third roommate eventually joined us and that was Dan Varty [Daniel "Dan" Varty '58], class of '58 from Menlo Park. So here we are. The three of us are in this room, a triple. We had one living room area with our three desks and then one, I guess we had one desk in the living room. The sleeping area had the three bunks, a double-decker and then a single, and two other desks. So you're responsible for furnishing your room and both Varty and I are scholarship students. Panettiere, his father was a doctor, physician, in Miami. So we got some marginally steady furniture. I mean we had a sofa that no two people could sit on at the same time. [Laughter] We had a bare light bulb that the college had issued in the living room. We each had a desk lamp, but it was sparse, put it that way.

As I say, Varty and I were on scholarship. So this continued on for about the better part of two months and all the while, I didn't realize this until later, all the while, they had assumed that, by my living on Fifth Avenue in New York, they discounted the fact that I had a scholarship. They just assumed anybody that lives on Fifth Avenue in New York has got to have money. There's just no two ways about it. I, on the other hand, I naively assumed that any white people going to a place like Dartmouth, they have to have money. So nobody shelled out anything for furniture. I mean, not that I had a whole lot, but I certainly wasn't putting down what I had if they weren't offering to come forth.

Well, this was all resolved because Panettiere, who was somewhat the social gadfly of the northeast in some respects--not gadfly, but social butterfly--had a date for a weekend and he knew that he would be bringing his date to the room at some point and he just couldn't abide the fact that it looked the way that it did. So suddenly all this furniture starts arriving from merchants downtown. We suddenly had a matching three-piece set, a sofa, two easy chairs. We had a rug. We had lamps. The place looked totally different thanks to Chuck Panettiere and his doctor dad. [Laughter] So then we were set up. We functioned very nicely.

The interesting thing about all of that is that I didn't realize it and I never have ever understood how it came about. Up until then, all entering black students had either been given single rooms or had been paired. For the first time in anyone's knowledge, recollection, a

black student was put in with white students. There was no fanfare. I mean, at the time I got the notice, it didn't say anything. No one had ever asked me, did I have any preference about it one way or the other. It just happened and I don't know whether it was done consciously or if somebody just overlooked it because there were nine black students who entered that year, the fall of '54, the largest group that had ever been admitted to the college up to that point, and the same housing policy obtained for each of the other eight. They were either paired or in single rooms. I was the only one of the nine who had white roommates.

But, in a sense, that really worked out very much to my benefit because it put me in a setting in which I automatically was interacting with the--not that my classmates were not, but when your roommate and you were basically the same, you tend to move in similar circles and so on. I was in a situation in which I was mixing and mingling with the other people in the dormitory. It happened that in that particular dormitory and on that particular floor were a number of members of the fraternity that I ultimately joined and the fact that they could see that I got along with my roommates I'm sure made it attractive to them that I would be ultimately invited to join that fraternity.

The transition was, I think it was a very smooth one. I really found no particular difficulty on the academic side. If anything, the nature of the high school that I had attended, which was very selective in its admission, probably as selective as the college was, and very competitive because it was populated mainly by students who were up and coming, often the children of immigrant groups of modest means so it was always a matter of needing scholarship assistance to go on to the next level. So you had some people who were always striving to get as high a grade as they could.

BURNS: So would you rank your preparation for Dartmouth pretty high up there in comparison?

DODDS: Oh, very much so. At the end of the course, so to speak, comparing the two experiences, I did substantially better in the sense of finishing higher in my class at Dartmouth than I did in high school. In other words, the competition here was not as severe as the competition was in Stuyvesant. Part of that--I don't think it had anything to do with intelligence. I think part of it was that many of the students here didn't feel that they had to excel. It was still an environment, back in the '50s, where people went to college pretty much to get their ticket punched.

It was what you were expected to do as a way station to going into the corporate world.

I didn't know this at the time, but what would happen to people at the end, aside from those who went on to graduate school, bore little relation to how they had performed in college. In other words, the ability to get a job in a corporation was more often a function of how people presented themselves, how did they package themselves, who did they know and all of that. I thought it had to do with how well did you do at school, so I was knocking myself out getting all these wonderful grades, assuming that at the end I would just present my transcript and I'd get a good job. That was the way it was supposed to work. It didn't work that way. [Laughter]

I had to really learn. It just took a long time to really learn that because it just didn't compute with what I understood to be the system. Everything up until then had worked pretty much on merit, even getting into the high school I did was in part a function of preparation. There were a group of teachers at my junior high school in Harlem who said, "In order for our students to compete on the entrance examination, they're going to need and should have the benefit of some special preparation." So they designed, in effect, a prep course for us and they culled fifteen of the better students in the junior high school and would have us stay for extra sessions. They got our parents' permission to give us extra training and so on. When the results came out, we had all passed which was, for a school in Harlem, it was a remarkable achievement that it sent over a dozen of its graduates to Stuyvesant. It was really quite something. So that preparation really carried over.

BURNS: And you learned some good study habits pretty early on.

DODDS: Oh, yeah. Very much so, because we had time constraints. The school was very antiquated physically, so we had to operate on a split session and, as the years went along, some of us as we got into the upper years, would work part-time jobs, so you really had to learn how to budget your time and so on. It was a very good discipline--a very good learning experience.

I must say that I also realized early on that I was lacking in a lot of the social skills that many of my colleagues had. In other words, I came up here, I was sixteen plus, sixteen and a half. I had only started dating the summer before coming up and we had no car, so driving and all of that was not part of my experience. I didn't have any sense of really

how to develop a relationship with females. There was one girl that I was dating with some regularity, but I was a novice. And coming up here and realizing that people had dates for entire weekends was absolutely flabbergasting to me. I just couldn't imagine how much conversation you would have to have to carry through a whole weekend. I didn't know how people did it. How do you sustain that date for a weekend? [Laughter]

So I fairly quickly, after some unfortunate early experiences, pretty much retreated to the books. I kind of made up my mind that I could not run with the social thing. I mean, I was underage as far as drinking was concerned, so that whole side of things had no appeal. I was not an athlete, so I did what I had to do for the phys ed requirement, but I pretty much decided, "If I'm going to get anything out of this place, I really am going to have to do it as a student." And I didn't really think I was particularly brighter, but I kind of figured that if I worked hard-- because I could see that the attitude among so many of my colleagues was just to get through. The gentleman's C was considered respectable and I figured "to heck,' if I can out grind these guys and get the B's and the A's, then I will have made my mark." I was inspired also by an upperclassman, Warner Traynham, class of '57...

End of Tape 1, Side A – Beginning of Tape 1, Side B

BURNS: You were speaking of Warner Traynham.

DODDS: Warner Traynham was the class of '57, a black student from--in the nomenclature of the day, he would have been a Negro student--from Baltimore. And I was looking through a publication having to do with honors--what they would do every year is list all the students who had made honors, and looking through that that fall, I saw his name, that he had--not only was he on the dean's list, he had in his first year achieved the rank--I don't know if they still use it as a designation--something called Rufus Choate Scholar, which was dean's list plus. It was like being in the maybe top five percent of your class, but really a very, very fine achievement. So I sort of took heart from that, that he's somebody who was a non-athlete. He was quiet, a friendly fellow, but not somebody who is obviously active socially in a sense of being involved in weekend things and so on. So I said, "Well, clearly there is room for someone like that to succeed and he seemed to be having a fine time, in any event." So I thought if I could do as he has done, there's an indication that that pattern can produce success. So it was very helpful that that was the case.

BURNS: What role did faculty members play for a student such as yourself who had high academic aspirations? This is at a time where John Dickey [John Sloan Dickey '29] and Don Morrison, the provost, were bringing in a lot of new faculty to replace some of the retiring Hopkins faculty.

DODDS: I guess we were somewhat aware of that; but, of course, not really knowing the history, we pretty much took the people as we met them. I do know that, as the years went along, I was aware of people being brought in. I remember in the sociology department, they brought in a number of new people who seemed to be pretty much go-getters, and so on. But I would say that, at the time, the old guard, if you want to describe it that way, pretty much held sway because the lore of the place was that there were these giants of the faculty that you would get the benefit of if you took their courses. I, myself, didn't follow that, but there were people who would major in history particularly so that they could get the benefit of the so-called "cowboys and Indians" course that was taught by I think it was Professor West [Herbert "Herb" West]. And Al Foley [Allen "Al" R. Foley '20] was very popular. He would give--I guess his courses in American history.

I did take Professor Adams, John Adams, who was tough. I mean he was a ferocious marker, but his lectures were really fascinating because each one of them--and it was evidently something that he had perfected to a fair degree--It was just remarkable how much information he could give you in an hour. European history--all kinds of anecdotes and insight--the events leading up to World War I. It was really quite something. It was almost too bad that it was like eight in the morning when it started. It just took a while to kind of get warmed up. [Laughter] This guy's already--ten minutes into it, he's already covered maybe ten or twelve particular gems; but, obviously, he had been around for a while.

So I think, from our standpoint, since we were often receiving information from the upperclassmen who knew the Old Guard--I mean those were then the people that we sought out and the newer people would not yet have made their reputations. They would not yet have been known. Kemeny [John Kemeny '22A], for example, came in '56, I believe. Well, I mean, he would just have been an instructor. Nobody would have paid any attention to him unless you happened to be into sciences.

BURNS: Did you have a course with him?

DODDS: No. See, he would have been involved with the math so that, I guess, anyone in pre-engineering, maybe the pre-meds, chemical engineering people, they would have more likely had him. The math that we took, we who were liberal arts types--there was a math course that was really designed for non-science people and it was taught by a Professor [Bancroft] Brown. It was concepts, but really done for a lay audience. You see, I had had hard math in high school, so I knew cosines and all of that. I didn't understand it particularly, but I knew what was involved, and I knew that I didn't want to go near that stuff again. [Laughter] I had gotten through high school simply by rote. I'd just memorize the formulas and, when I recognized that they applied, I would apply them; but I never really understood what it was all about. It is just as well that I didn't try to go into engineering because.... [Laughter]

BURNS: Which is interesting with your prior desire to go into engineering.

DODDS: Exactly because I didn't know what it was about. It was only when I got up here and started reading the catalogues. "Is this what this study involves?" [Laughter]

BURNS: I wanted to go back to your decision when you chose Dartmouth College for a second and ask you if Dartmouth's engineering school played a part in it at all or whether it was just a good liberal arts school?

DODDS: It only played a part once I got here and, literally, picked up a Thayer publication and saw--because I was still thinking along those lines to some extent. I quite literally picked up a Thayer publication and saw the degree of technical involvement and so on and I realized I just did not have that burning an interest in pursuing. It was okay in high school because, even though our advanced physics classes were--I could handle them. I'll put it that way. But this was at a different level and I just knew that I didn't have as clear a grasp of the concepts. I could do the mechanical formulas; but the underlying concepts were really not things that I was comfortable with. So once I saw that, then it confirmed to me that I would be going in the area of the social sciences for sure.

BURNS: Was that fairly early on?

DODDS: Yeah. It was fairly early on because you pretty much had to start structuring a program of pre-requisites and so on in order to qualify ultimately for the Thayer course offerings. So I pretty much opted--I'm

almost certain that by the end of the first term, I had decided I would not be doing that. So the math that I took was--we would do things with astronomy--it was interesting, but the binary concepts were then coming in, the one, zero, one, one, all that way of representing numbers which ultimately became the basis for some of the computer language. These were the kinds of concepts that were discussed. It was challenging, but it was not nearly the kind of demanding mathematical, pure mathematical approach as I would say that Kemeny would have been involved in.

So that when he arrived, I don't know that anyone in our class would have taken note of it because we would have been past the point of taking introductory math and whoever else was coming in—Clement, I know came in around that time. 'Mugsy', Meredith Clement in economics. He's probably emeritus now. I did have him. In fact, I had him in one of his first economics offerings and he was very helpful to me. I didn't recognize that he was ultimately to be a star or anything like that, because it was like his first year. But he taught a course in international economics and, since my major was international relations, that was my way of sort of moving laterally to bring in a field of knowledge where I was weak basically. I did all right in economics as an introductory course; but, as it applied in the international sphere, it really took a little bit of work on my part to be comfortable with the concepts and he was very helpful in that way.

The government people were pretty well established. Richard Sterling, Gordon Skilling, H. Gordon Skilling. I can't remember the man we had for introductory government. The name escapes me; but they were solid performers. But, again, they had been there.

BURNS: Were there particular faculty members that sort of guided you outside of the classroom?

DODDS: Yeah. I was just going to say that probably the faculty member that I had the greatest interchange with, the best relationship with and who was particularly helpful in all respects, was Eldredge, H. Wentworth Eldredge, in sociology. Because, although my major was international relations, I had sort of a heavy concentration on the sociological aspects of culture, trans-cultural relations and things of that nature. He was my thesis advisor because, what I chose to write on was the emergence of Guyana as an independent country, only the third independent country in Africa, south of the Sahara, and the first essentially in the twentieth century. Guyana became independent in 1957 and my senior year was '57-'58, so the timing was perfect. And

so I delved into the history of it and the government relations; but a lot of it had to do with who the people were and the interrelations between the different tribal groups and how that affected the move to independence and so on.

Eldredge--it wasn't his field. There were really no Africanists as such, but obviously research was something that was important to him. So he was able to guide me and be very helpful in how I was structuring it and making the ultimate presentation. We became good friends. He lived in Vermont, Norwich, and we kept in touch. In subsequent years, he invited me to come up and you had put on the preliminary list the Shockley incident. And largely as a result of an invitation from Eldredge to come up and speak to a couple of his classes in the late '60s, I happened to be on campus the week just prior to Shockley's appearance. So I have some recollections of that, not that I attended the lecture, itself; but of some of the meetings that were being held where the students were trying to decide, black students, how they would react and so on. Yeah. Eldredge was very helpful.

Skilling was very helpful, as was Sterling, Richard Sterling. Skilling, when my family was up for graduation, invited us to come to his home to be with himself and his family, which was rather unusual that a faculty member would do that. It was within walking distance. I think it was somewhere down Wheelock because we walked there to his home. He received us and entertained myself and my immediate family which was very, very nice.

The Sterlings became good friends, as well. Richard Sterling was particularly helpful in giving me some insights about post-graduate study. I was very much torn between going to law school and going to graduate school for a Ph.D. and got accepted to both and was just trying to work that through and conversations would start. I mean he actually would have preferred that I go to the Ph.D. route, but understood that I really felt a need to have kind of a professional grounding, something that I could use practically. [Laughter] As we used to say in the practical '50s. So I opted to go to law school.

As I'll relate subsequently, becoming friendly with he and his then wife, Lu Sterling, who ultimately became Lu Martin [Lucretia L. "Lu" Martin], and then an assistant to Kemeny and to McLaughlin [David T. McLaughlin '54 TU '55] and to Freedman [James O. "Jim" Freedman] and to Wright [James E. "Jim" Wright]. She's like a fixture over there. [Laughter] Having become friendly with Lu really was very, very instrumental in a number of other things happening along the way.

That was almost serendipity because she was, as so many of the women at that time, she was just a faculty wife. She would show up at the student-faculty events, had very little to say. She was busy raising the family and that sort of thing; but really became a major player here and a force of some magnitude, and she still is. It's a very interesting story. I would urge you all at some point, if you haven't done so, to make certain that she's a candidate for your project because she--I mean, you talk about covering some administrations...

BURNS: She's certainly on the list and Jean Kemeny repeated over and over in her interview, "You should talk to Lu."

DODDS: Right. Absolutely. Lu's quite something.

BURNS: I wanted to ask you, you had mentioned that your first meeting with President Dickey was actually downstairs here in Baker. I want to ask you about what your initial impressions of him were and how much of a presence he was during your time as an undergraduate and whether you had much interaction with him.

DODDS: I would say that, answering the latter part of it first, I think the whole idea of what a college president is about has evolved over time and, in those days, my sense was that the president was the leader of the institution, who was to be seen as leader, setting an example, setting a tone; but very much above the fray, so to speak. Meeting John Sloan Dickey for the first time was a very impressive occasion. He made it a point--I don't know whether presidents have done it since--he made it a point of meeting each individual undergraduate in the 1902 room and spending a few moments with the student, signing the matriculation certificate, shaking hands and, whether the class was six hundred, seven hundred, seven fifty, whatever the number--bring them on and he would do that.

I would say that, unless you were involved in student government or were prominent on the campus in some way, that was probably your only direct contact, one-to-one, or even with a small group that you would have with the president. The idea of meetings with the president for the sake of meeting, just to sort of sit down and get together and so on, I really don't think were part of his agenda. And I speak now as a member of Palaeopitus because, looking even to senior year, I don't recall any occasion where we as either the undergraduate council as it then existed, heads of all the major student organizations and other people elected at large or even as Palaeopitus, which was the executive committee--I mean we were "the big men on campus," the

twelve of us or so, in our white hats and sweaters and white trousers and all of that--I don't ever remember that we had a session with the president. Now, it may well be that our president did. That there might have been some one-on-one that Joe Blake ['58] who was our chairman of Palaeopitus. He might occasionally have meetings maybe with the dean, just sort of liaison basis, but not with President Dickey.

He addressed us in our--we had our freshman course where everyone--big lecture in Webster Hall, as a matter of fact. We would meet once every other week or something. It was called "I and C", the individual and the college, and there were weekly presentations on the environment here, basic hygiene matters, standards of behavior, perhaps some of the academic offerings. It was sort of a general orientation course that was presented to help us understand the setting in which we were and what was expected of us, pep talks on civic responsibility and that sort of thing. I know that President Dickey addressed that group early on so that, in addition to our meeting with him individually in the 1902 Room, here he was, the president of the college, addressing the class and that was also a very impressive occasion.

We would always show up at those things with jackets and ties. In the early days, we were wearing our freshman beanies, which was *de rigueur* until we beat the sophomore class in the tug of war and were liberated from that. I do remember the occasion because I had never been in a setting where the president of the institution was presented in that fashion and, when he walked in, everybody stood up. I mean that was--nobody told us to, but I guess there were enough prep school people there and so forth who knew that you were supposed to stand up when the president walked in, so everybody else--we all stood up. It was very impressive. He gave a very, very good talk and again spoke of the Dartmouth spirit, the ways in which he could tie into the place. It was very, very impressive.

My only real encounter with him was one that I sought senior year, at a point where I had decided in fact now to go to law school. It had gotten beyond the business of, "Would it be law school? Would it be a Ph.D.?" I might say parenthetically that it had to be something because, in those days, there was something called the Selective Service draft that was applicable and so, as soon as you stepped outside the educational cocoon, provided you weren't a minister or farmer, you were handed a rifle. So you had two years to account for, so to speak. I really preferred not to do that. I ultimately fulfilled the requirement in a rather bizarre fashion, but the opportunity was there to

go on to graduate school. There were no open hostilities going on at the time, so the draft was still in place because we were still within five years of the Korean conflict and the country was in the Cold War with the Soviet Union and, as far as anybody knew, war might break out over Lebanon or some other hot spot. But, at least for the time being, it seemed safe to go on to graduate school and I had this happy dilemma of having been accepted to both Harvard and to Yale Law School.

So I went to see--made an appointment and went to see President Dickey. He was sympathetic. [Laughter] "Tough problem you've got there." But very gracious and very generous with his time and he talked about the pros and cons of both institutions as he understood it. Of course, he was some number of years beyond his Harvard Law School days; but he did say something that was very helpful to me and ultimately deciding because, what he said was, and he did it very delicately, he said, "You can put the faculties of both places on a scale and they will probably balance out. Facilities, what do facilities mean in a law school? You go to the library and you get the books and that's all the facilities you really need. What you really come down with as the possible difference is the nature of the students that you're there with." And the phrase he used was, "You know, the Yale people are clearly outstanding; but, if you want to run with the swiftest..." That was what he said. "If you want to run with the swiftest, then, it's Harvard."

Now that meant something to me because, as I looked at the array of students--my classmates--and, as I say, I had done comparatively better here at Dartmouth than I had done in high school. Still, being even in the top five percent or whatever I was, the people who were in the top five percent were the ones who were going to Harvard. [Laughter] I said to myself, "I've been eating these guys' dust for four years, I don't think I want to eat their dust anymore" [Laughter] Plus, I felt that, in light of what had happened when I was an undergraduate or applying to the undergraduate, that I owed the Yale people a payback. I really needed to go down there and show them that they had made a mistake when they had turned me down. [Laughter] So, for these totally irrational reasons, I wind up going to Yale.

You can justify it, as I often did--it was a smaller place, and it was closer to New York and in point of fact, at that time, Yale was doing some things experimentally with its curriculum. I don't know how familiar you are with the law school, but basically Yale was enabling you to break away from the traditional curriculum that law schools gave and to major, you could actually develop an area of concentration,

much like you could as an undergrad. And you could concentrate in criminal law or labor law, whatever area you felt you would benefit from in immersing yourself. They had gotten Ford Foundation and other grants to support that innovation. It ultimately did not take hold, but at least it was available during the time that myself and several of the other classes in the late '50s and early '60s were there. So that was another reason for heading in that direction.

But John Dickey was very, very helpful and I think having spent the time with him on that occasion and having been part of the leadership group gave him a good impression of me, which was to ultimately also work to my benefit at a point where the possibility of an African-American joining the board of trustees surfaced and a number of names were being considered. Mine was one that he knew personally because of my being there during his time and my having had at least those few contacts that I did with him.

BURNS: So he still had some input at this point when you became a trustee.

DODDS: Oh, very much so. As I was to learn later on. [Laughter] Very much so.

BURNS: We'll come back to that.

End of Tape 1, Side B – Beginning of Tape 2, Side A

BURNS: So we were in the midst of talking about John Dickey. I guess one direction to take it in is the Great Issues course. Was he much involved with the course by the time you were a senior in '57-'58?

DODDS: I know that he spoke to us maybe even more than once; but, when you say "involved", I mean--and the way Great Issues ran was to, as I'm sure you know, it was really a weekly presentation by outside guests, usually, although not always, followed the next day by a question and answer period. And then we did our journals on a monthly or quarterly basis. I know that he was involved in the sense that he—I'm almost certain that a large part of his talk at the beginning was to exhort us to really take it seriously; that this was an opportunity to become engaged with outside issues, that the college had done its best to bring us a nice lineup of outside experts and speakers and so on. And he, himself, was probably—I'd want to say he was probably a substantive presenter in addition to whatever kickoff presentation he did. He was probably a substantive presenter on at least one occasion. It might have had to do with some aspect of international relations which was,

of course, his *forte*. I don't really recall that there was any particular involvement that he had beyond that; but he clearly was very much behind the course and really saw it as a way of giving us a broader vision and kind of opening our minds to current issues and to things that were abroad in the world that, as educated men, we should have been aware of.

Personally, I really took the--I did follow his advice. I took the course very seriously and I got a lot out of it. I would rate that Great Issues experience as probably one of the better things that I had here. It was informational. It was timely. It was well structured and it was challenging if you got into it, if you really went to the lectures and, you know, really tried to be engaged with the issues that were presented. Again, the tenor of the times, it was the kind of thing that some guys treated lightly if it conflicted with whatever might be going on, a game or a date with some local nurses or something like that--that they'd get fill-ins. [Laughter] They'd slip some undergraduate a couple of bucks and have them sit in their seat because the way they took the attendance, there were spotters in the balcony and you had an assigned seat. So, if the seat was filled, it meant that the person was there. If the seat wasn't filled, they were absent. [Laughter] All you had to do was have a body in the seat and you were covered. I wouldn't say that there was a lot of that going on, but guys would do it every once in a while.

But it was good. What I—and for years, I would always think back on how that course was helpful. What I really relished was the assignment that we had of following six, or maybe there were four, different news publications over a six-week period. I think that's where the six came in. So you could pick any four, there was a set group, and the idea was to compare how they treated similar stories. What were the kinds of features? What were their editorial positions like? It was just a revelation because I had never really been, up until that point, a very conscientious newspaper reader. But I got into it. I got to understand the way in which newspapers approached issues and how they had, in fact, a point of view and how it affects not only their editorial position, but how the news is presented. And that it was very careful to understand that there were these different aspects of them all and that they were not totally divorced, as the papers would have you believe. That one did tend to influence the other.

I got introduced to *The St. Louis Dispatcher*, I remember specifically. I remember reading *The Christian Science Monitor* and, for years thereafter, every opportunity I had, I would read *The Christian Science*

Monitor. Fortunately, being in a place like the Ford Foundation, and even when I was with the New York Police Department, I had the opportunity to just order in subscriptions and I always would have *The Monitor* as one of the ones I would bring in because I'd been so impressed with it.

The journals, I relished because, in a way, it was an opportunity to do a diary and I think I had always some craving to put things down that were more of a personal nature and the journals really invited you to do that. "What was your reaction to what the speaker had to say? What did you agree with, what did you disagree with?" And again, some guys blew it off. They would just do a quick and dirty. I really kind of got into it. It was my goal, yet unfulfilled, that every five years, I would go back and update the journal because it covered such a wide spectrum of things, presentations on natural resources, on the politics of the day, on race relations, on you name it. World politics, on and on it went.

When we had our twenty-fifth reunion in '83, the class put together sort of an updated version of the *Aegis* in which you were encouraged to do a personal statement. So my statement included the observation that, here it was twenty-five years later, and now I've got these three young kids, and I'm married and trying to deal with the house and mortgage and all the rest of it, and I still haven't gotten around to updating the journal. But I'm going to do it. [Laughter] One of these days, I'll get around to it. I got probably one of the highest commendations that I've ever received. The reviewer, I think it was Professor [Jere] Daniell ['55] in history wrote that my journal entries had restored his faith in--I forget exactly how he put it--in higher education, in liberal arts, in Dartmouth College. He just--the whole paragraph. He just went on and on. It was really something. [Laughter] And somewhere in the recesses of my attic, somewhere is my collection of journals from Great Issues. It was good. I really got turned on by that.

For me, and this may have been less true for guys who were in the sciences, it was sort of a unifying experience because, since I was a major in international relations, we sort of covered the waterfront anyway. So there was—what with my sociological leanings and a strong dose of political science--there was hardly anything that came into Great Issues that somehow couldn't be tied in with all kinds of other stuff that was going on.

I should also mention, although I know we didn't exhaust it necessarily, one of the best course experiences--I really had nothing to do with him

outside of the classroom--one of the absolute best course experiences I had was with Professor [Eugen] Rosenstock-Huessy. He gave a course that was--on the surface, it just seemed so off-the-wall. It was all this stuff about holidays and time-lines; but then I just began to think. I mean he really sort of forced you to think about things from a different perspective. Then one day--the way he would do it is, for each class, a selected number of students had to prepare a paper that would then be presented to the class and there would be discussions that followed. So I was in the group of six or so that had done papers for one day. He happened to call on me to make the presentation and, in doing that paper, it was like a light had gone on. I suddenly understood what he was getting at, what his system was and what his worldview was and was able to write the paper as though it was he, himself. I mean, I had bought into his whole way of thinking and I just made this presentation. I knew it was good. In fact, I was hoping he would call on me because I knew I had really gotten it. When I finished, he again, he just said something that was wonderful, I don't remember exactly, but he said, "You reaffirmed my faith in life." It was some really fantastic thing that he said.

BURNS: It sounds like you really saved a lot of careers here. [Laughter]

DODDS: Grahmlich [Francis Grahmlich] was another. Grahmlich gave a couple courses in philosophy that were really very, very helpful to me, very good in laying a foundation that I could carry over to--the beauty of what I found was that there were so many areas of cross-contact and fertilization that you could have a concept in philosophy that would have applicability in the political science realm. You could just sort of move ideas back and forth across disciplines and find things that were similar and supportive and all of that. It just became fun. I just enjoyed that whole inter-relation of ideas, interplay and concepts and so on.

BURNS: So the liberal arts education really worked well for you?

DODDS: Oh, yeah. I--it was just so--it was so attractive that there would be an opportunity to go on to graduate school to do more of this at an even higher level. It was just a very, very difficult thing to decide, to go the other way, which I don't regret in a sense of having done it; but I have always had a sense of, what might have been to have gone the other way and, indeed, I still have this fantasy of whenever my ship comes in, I will go back to school and get that degree. [Laughter]

This is really sort of a diversion, but when I finished law school, I went to Nigeria for two years and worked there in law reform activities and

so on, which we can talk about briefly, I guess. When I was coming back, I then had to decide, all right, now I've done the law school, I've now done--it was an academic program that I was on run through Syracuse University's Maxwell School, so my student deferment continued and I was now twenty-five and a half. Selective service was in force until you were twenty-six. So I still had the better part of a year to account for and I began to realize that employers were aware of that, too. You know, they could count. They knew what the law was and I wasn't getting any job offers because nobody wanted to bring me on and then the Selective service would say "Okay. Now it's your turn." [Laughter]

So I looked at the possibility of, once again, doing this Ph.D. thing. I contacted Columbia. Lo and behold, they still had my application on file. They said, "You still look good to us and, if you want to come, come on." It was astounding to me that they still had all everything, letters of recommendation, they were still good. "Fine, Let's go." "Oh, no. I've got to decide this again." [Laughter] But, again, I got some advice, which again was sound at the time. This was really the time. I had been away. I had sort of done my, you know, service to the world community and now it is time to come and start sinking some professional roots in the law, so that's what I wound up doing. But it was still out there and it's just a way of answering your question, I guess in a somewhat different way. That yes, that liberal arts experience was really a very, very powerful one and very, very enjoyable.

We had a seminar for the major in international relations that was run by Sterling. That's really how I got to know him every more intimately. He was our seminar leader for the major and, of course, because he was a political scientist, we tended to emphasize, not exclusively, but we tended to focus on political writings, John Locke and just a whole series of people over time. Abraham Lincoln. But what would happen is, you would take something that was so commonplace that you thought. "Well, you know, I know all about that." The Declaration of Independence, and we would get into it and start taking it apart and analyzing it and figuring out "Well, what was it that motivated them to say this and not that?" It was that process of analysis that was very, very instructive. He led us through it, really teaching us to be critical thinkers and I think that was probably what I came away with that has been so useful over time that you have a framework of analysis that encourages you to be critical and to constantly be challenging things that even you are inclined to accept, but you still look for ways to look

at things differently to see how they might change over time and be prepared for change.

But I would say that that senior year had, in addition to Great Issues, the benefit of the thesis preparation and the comprehensive exams, because that was a feature then--there was some talk when we were on the board of that being brought back again as something of a unifying experience. Because I gathered that one of the things that began to slip away, particularly with year-round operation and aspects of the trimester system that were in place was a loss of a kind of collective experience in the final year, which we had with the Great Issues, of course, because everybody was there, the pre-meds were there, the history people, all the various disciplines under one roof.

And that comprehensive exam--I mean, it was a bit of a nuisance because, in addition to working on this thesis, you had to suddenly reach back for all these history courses and, "What are they going to ask now after all these years?" But, at the end, it was certainly valuable because, in a sense, each one--I guess it ran about fifteen majors in international relations--so you could pretty much pick your area for concentration no matter what the question was. The question had to be broad enough to encompass everybody's interests, so you could pretty much work through the things that were of primary importance and concern to you. But preparing for it was, it was a challenge. You had to really sit down and think through "what did it all mean" after two years of all these different courses and so forth. It was good.

BURNS: I wanted to shift a little bit away from the academic experience to some of the social experiences that you had as an undergraduate, I guess starting with sort of what it was like to come to Hanover and Dartmouth as a young black individual from Harlem. Was that a major culture shock? You've already sort of alluded that in part, you kind of threw yourself into academics.

DODDS: I did and that was, for the reasons I was intimating, it was pretty much a protective thing because I just felt very inadequate socially. I think, and I've always felt, that the difficulty of adjustment had much more to do with economics than it did with race. Being in a place like this and being at an obvious economic disadvantage was very apparent to me. I mean I just was, I'm sure, in the minority, not only in racial terms but just among people who didn't--came from families that didn't own their own home. Everybody seemed to be from some environment where they were homeowners. It was like a standard thing that they had

homes. They had cars and I just assumed that that was a badge of wealth. I didn't appreciate that there was a struggling middle class even among white people. I just figured, well, gosh, if he's from a family, and they've got a car and a house, that's more than I have got so he must be rich. [Laughter] But it was really more a measure of how little we had rather than that the others had so very much.

BURNS: It may have tied into where you were coming from as an urban environment.

DODDS: I think that that's true. Yes. I think that's definitely true because it was unusual in our social setting that people did, in fact, own homes. My older sister was married and living in her own home in Queens; but that was an exception. I had several aunts who were homeowners out in Brooklyn; but, among the people that we socialized with, with regularity, they were apartment dwellers like we were. The great uncle that I had described who worked at the Downtown Athletic Club, he and his family owned a home in Harlem, a brownstone in Harlem, and so that was an exception. And we would go there for holidays and that was a home environment that I was familiar with.

So the availability of social opportunities, since they were so limited in Hanover, obviously meant having to go elsewhere and the whole idea of travel to get to other campuses or to Boston was just not one that I was in a position to get heavily into. I did go--I know our freshman year--I'm pretty sure it was our freshman year--there was a little trip to Brown, Providence, around a football game. I did go to that. Getting a ride and winding up crashing on some fraternity couch. It wasn't a matter of being able to pay to stay any place. You just sort of got along as best one could. But that was about it. And the way the calendar was set up that year, there was no opportunity to go home for Thanksgiving. The only day off that year was Thanksgiving Day and I think I wound up with dinner at my faculty advisor's house. So the social opportunities were really very limited.

The college pretty much deferred, I would say, to the fraternity system to provide the social environment. Dormitories were just dormitories. There were no social rooms or social facilities in the dorms. On the occasion of a big weekend, there might be a college dance; but it was generally viewed as being a fallback available for people who couldn't go to fraternities. I mean the action was in the fraternities, so here was this--they might have a band over at College Hall and a dance for the non-fraternity types. There was no parity in the situation at all.

The black students had discovered that there was, in fact, a black family in Hanover and there was a teenage daughter in that family who, as one might imagine, became enormously popular. [Laughter] But, by the time that we, we being the class of '58--there were upper classmen who had already staked out that territory, so there was not much that was happening there. A very nice girl; but as soon as she became of age, I think she took off for Howard University. She got out of here. She wasn't about to be hanging around Hanover. I think her father worked for the college in the buildings and grounds operation. In fact, she had a younger cousin who was only about fourteen or so; so she was really too young as a social possibility.

We would organize the occasional weekend where black college students from the girls' schools would come up. But there again, I found that I couldn't really get too much involved in that because there was a lot of phoning back and forth and the letter writing. I just realized that the amount of energy that they were spending in generating these opportunities was energy that I could spend hitting the books. I wasn't quite sure what the rewards that they were coming up with. [Laughter] Obviously, in those days, the opportunities for privacy, especially if you didn't have the access to a fraternity with its basements and all that stuff, was very, very limited. Then you had to house them and feed them, particularly if they were coming up this way.

What did happen was that my classmate, two of my classmates were very helpful in sort of bringing me along. Robert McGuire [Robert McGuire III '58] from Washington, D.C.—Robert McGuire III was a social dynamo. He knew everybody on the East Coast. He was very active in a black social group called Jack and Jill, which was of the middle and upper class professionals, their children. Mothers were very active in this club and people in different cities would have parties and dances and others would then come and they'd get to know each other. So, through him, I got to meet some young women. In fact, he fixed me up with a girl at the Northfield School. And so I wrote and made an appointment to go down and meet with her at Northfield. We had lunch. So, that was nice. Then there was a girl he introduced me to in New York and, similarly--but these were girls--I would never have met them ordinarily because they were up here and I was--meaning in the upper strata of the black social world. My dad was a postal clerk and my mother, a seamstress. We just didn't move in those circles.

Then my other classmate, Arch Whitehead [Arch "Archie" S. Whitehead, Jr. '58] from White Plains was, again, a socially active young man in Westchester and, as people would import to him for

information about escorts, "Who can you fix me up with?" "Who can you fix my daughter up with? There's a dance coming up." So Arch would include me.

End of Tape 2, Side A – Beginning of Tape 2, Side B

BURNS: Garvey Clarke [Garvey Clarke '57]...

DODDS: Garvey Clarke was from Brooklyn. He was a '57, is a '57. And he was also helpful in--not so much up here on campus, but during holidays, Christmas and spring break and summer and so forth. We would be in touch and go to the parties and so forth that he knew of in the city. So, in that way, I began to really develop a social life, not so much Hanover-based, but I began to become active socially in black, middle-class circles in ways that I probably would not have or at least would not have easily done so had I been at a school in the city or gone some other place to college. They were very, very helpful contacts.

But what began to happen also was that I had the friendships built around my roommates and the people in the dormitory and, as we got into the fraternity-rushing season, which was the spring of our freshman year, I realized and expected that I would join the fraternity. So--I'm sorry not in the spring. We didn't rush until the fall of sophomore year. I think they changed it with year-round operation to the spring of freshman year; but, during our time, it was the fall of sophomore year. So, once we got back to the campus now, my roommates and I had elected to room together again. We got along well, but the three of us had never really socialized. If I had the occasional date, and they were only occasional dates, I might bring her by the room and introduce her, but we never really all dated together or anything like that.

Chuck, just to sort of fill out the picture for you--Chuck, the socialite from Florida, introduced me to this concept that I had a hard time grasping. One weekend, he is putting his tuxedo stuff together. "Chuck, what's going on?" He says, "Well, I'm going to Boston." "What's happening in Boston?" "Well, I'm going to such and such a debutante cotillion." "Oh, really? Who's the debutante coming out that you know?" He said, "I don't know any of them." "So how do you get to go?" Well, the way that they worked was Chuck was part of this social network and, once the network understood that he was in New England, he would get on some list that emanated out of Boston. So, whenever there was a thing that needed male escorts that was taking place in Boston, he basically had tuxedo and would travel. So he

would go down. He said, "It's wonderful. You go down. They put you up and they have a party the night before and then there's the reception and then the cotillion. They match you up by height." I don't know how it worked. But he would then wind up with one of these debutantes to escort for the evening. He said, "It's great. It's all you can drink, all you can eat." I just couldn't believe that these things happened. He would show me the invitation. He would get these things in the mail, these fancy printed invitations. It was just astounding to me. [Laughter] Total stranger, he would walk in to these.

Dan, on the other hand, was much more middle-class American, sort of a traditional guy, a high school athlete and he was our straight-and-narrow guy, so to speak. No drinking. No smoking. I mean he was Mr. Clean Cut, straight arrow. He was in R.O.T.C., so he had this military haircut all the time. Spit and polish and what have you. He would have the occasional date as well, but his whole thing was that his girlfriend was back in California. He was dating one of a pair of twins and--I forget her name, I think it was Heather. Anyway, that was his girlfriend, so there were always these letters back and forth between Dan and Heather. As far as he was concerned, that's all he needed, was to know that he had this girlfriend back home so, whenever he would fly back, she would be there waiting for him. As far as he was concerned, that was going to be his life. He was going to marry Heather or somebody like Heather and ride off into the sunset. And that's basically what happened. It wasn't Heather, but it was somebody of that type. Very nice woman that he married. We have kept in touch over the years.

There I was. I was like the grind. I would find--I discovered Silsby Hall, the beauty of which was that it was open all night. It was then a laboratory facility, so I guess it had to be open for the science majors to come and check on the animals or whatever experiments were going on. But you could find a lab in there, and if you didn't mind the little odor of formaldehyde or whatever, you could study there as late as you wanted. They never locked the door. I don't think many people knew that, but myself and a couple of the science majors, because I knew the crew that would be in there studying. You'd find a little quiet corner or an empty room.

It was great because I could just--my thing was—you'd go to Thayer and I used the Thayer environment as a chance to meet more classmates. I would just go into Thayer cold. Sometimes I'd go with roommates; but, more often than not, I was coming from the Library, or

I was coming from Silsby so I'd just walk into Thayer. And in those days, the freshmen ate separately. I think that's right. I think there was a freshman wing or freshman commons. So I'd go in and just pick a table. I'd just sit down and start talking with guys and, as a result, got to know more and more classmates and discovered, again, getting back to your question about what the transition was, that there were all these suburban people. You see, I didn't know anything about the suburbs. Growing up in Harlem, for us to go outside of our neighborhood basically meant to go downtown Manhattan or to visit family in Brooklyn. That was our world. Or Queens, where my sister lived. Nassau County, Suffolk County, Westchester County, Bergen County, all of these places around New York City were foreign to me. I mean I knew they were there, but I didn't know who lived there, no contact whatever.

So I am sitting in Thayer and talking to guys. "Where are you from?" And they'd say, "I'm from New York". And I'd say, "I'm from New York." They'd say, "Where?" Or they would say, "I'm from New York City." and I'd say, "I'm from New York City." "Where are you from?" "I'm from Manhattan. Where are you from?" "Well, I'm not actually from the City. I am from..." Then it would come out. They were from Scarsdale. They were from Great Neck. I began to say, "Well, isn't this something? All these guys..." And it would be true around Chicago. You would sit down at a table and a guy says, "I'm from Chicago." "Where are you from in Chicago?" "Well, I'm not actually from Chicago. I'm from Oak Park, Winnetka." I began hearing all the names of these places and, what really came home to me was that these guys were in public school because, you see, the big thing at the college at that time was we had more people at Dartmouth who go to public school than go to private school. The college really portrayed that and it was accurate as a way of, "Dartmouth is a place for the common man. We're not the snooty Ivy League with seventy percent private school. We're more public school." But where were the public schools? Public schools are in Scarsdale, New Trier, Winnetka.

Then it dawned on me that this is really a suburban thing that's going on here and that we who are in the city, truly city people, were very much in the minority and, even those who were from the city were from the upper east side of Manhattan. [Laughter] There were literally no people who were like me, not just in the matter of race because, among the black students, I was in the minority. The black students were from White Plains and from Lawrence, Long Island and you really had to look hard to find a black--which is why I became so close to

Garvey Clarke. He was from a Brooklyn neighborhood that was like my Harlem. He was from Bedford-Stuyvesant.

I had a running joke with one of his classmates. In fact, we were sitting together at the dinner last night for Garvey, and that's Eugene Booth who is also class of '57. He was on the varsity basketball team. When Gene first met me, I had now developed this routine of being very coy about exactly where I was from because I realized that everybody else was being a little coy. They were masking their suburban thing, so I started to be a little coy. So, I now meet Gene, who's a black student and "Where are you from?" "I'm from New York." "Well, where are you from in New York?" "I'm from Manhattan." "Well, where are you from?" "I'm from Upper Manhattan." [Laughter] So at that point, he said, "Now you stop that. You come from Harlem. You know you come from Harlem. Stop playing games with me. I know you come from Harlem." So, with that, we got into a very good relationship because I no longer had to be coy with him; but that was really the shocker, in a sense, was coming from an environment in which--I mean we weren't poor. Dad had a full-time job and so forth; but it was from a very modest background. But I really had no inkling at all of a suburban lifestyle and the values that went along with it, the whole routine that was really so commonplace with the students that were here.

BURNS: Was there also the outdoorsy-type student at this point?

DODDS: Oh, yes. There were a number of those and, in fact, I had not--simply because the timing didn't work--I had not gone on the freshman trip, but that was not limited to the outdoorsy type. Yes. There were those. I would say there were--it isn't a total--they're really are different groups. There were the "chubbers," we used to call them, and then you'd have your outdoor sports types, skiers, people who go snowshoeing and so on. The chubbers were really in a class by themselves. Those were people who really got into the D.O.C. [Dartmouth Outing Club] activities and they would go up to the college grant and things like that; but that was like a specialty avocation for them. Mountain climbers--but they were not--I mean I didn't feel that it was anything so different amongst us. That was an interest, that was a background that they had.

I had things that tended more to the urban side of things; but I would respect what they did and, in point of fact, although I never became a skier, I took up ice-skating. I bought a pair of skates, which I still own actually, much to my wife's consternation. Because every time they

show up in the tag sale box, I manage to retrieve them although I'll never use them again because I had hip surgery, a replacement hip...last year. So my surgeon has kept me away from the ice. What I would do is I'd go out to--because I had to find alternatives for recreation since I wasn't heavy into the social stuff. I would go out to Occom Pond by the D.O.C. House and they had a rink in the middle of the lake, all wooden sides, and basically taught myself to skate. I had done it a little bit as a child in Central Park, but not nearly enough to become proficient at it. Of course, being out there, there were other people who would come out to skate as well and you'd develop a nodding acquaintance and so on, not only with college students but also with people--faculty, family and so on.

Then there were times when I would either borrow--there was a point at which I owned a bike when I was working at the Norwich Inn--but there were other times when, on a weekend, I might borrow somebody's bike at the fraternity house and just ride, just get on a road here and ride, just to get away a little bit from the campus and to explore some of the countryside around. I discovered the Union Village and the dam, was it Route 10? Somewhere a bit to the north of here. [VT Route 132] It's one of the dams on the river. It was a nice experience, occasional covered bridge I'd run across. So I enjoyed that.

I would look for opportunities, especially in the freshman year when I wasn't so much involved in extracurricular things, to earn extra money. And they had in the placement office, they had a list of local jobs that you could sign up for--people would ask for college students to help with yard work or babysit, whatever it might be. So I would sign up for those, maybe spend, on any given weekend, five, six hours helping to clear someone's yard and so on in the Hanover area. I came down with a nice case of poison sumac one time for my troubles and for the seven or eight dollars that I earned for the afternoon. So I would relate to the environment much like the chubbers, although I never got into those kinds of activities; but I knew skiers. I knew chubbers. It was fine. We all co-existed comfortably. [Laughter]

Things really changed, I'd say a lot for the better--this is my own experience as of that time--once I did, in fact, get into a fraternity because it meant that there was now a regularized environment in which I could function socially. So much of my freshman year, it really had depended on whether somebody else was going to have a date that weekend and was there some party that they knew of that I could go to because we couldn't go into the fraternity houses. So you were

really dependent on whatever occasional social activity the college organized or what people would just do on their own. As I suggested, it was just taking too much time to try and organize all of that. I just felt—I'd better just--let me just do what I'm here to do. Let me just focus on the studying.

But being in a fraternity meant that somebody else was organizing a party. I mean, you knew that come house parties--there was going to be a party. There was going to be a band, there was going to be, refreshments and so you could invite somebody for the weekend, go to the game and then there'd be entertainment and so forth at the house. When there'd be big weekends, the fraternity brothers in the house would vacate so the dates would stay in the house. So lodging was not a problem, and we had meal tickets for Thayer. And of course, being a scholarship student, I was on the Thayer work detail anyway, which was another set of experiences locally that brought me in contact with the local population in Hanover.

So it all began to kind of fall into place. I could rely on the fraternity now to give me a social footing and, because friends had joined other fraternities, it meant that, in addition to my own fraternity, there were black students--we had sort of decided amongst ourselves that, as black students in the spirit of the time, we would really try to integrate the campus. The Supreme Court, the desegregation decision had come down in 1954, the spring before we entered, so the country was very much aware of the idea that desegregation was the order of the day. And, while there was no segregation up here per say, traditionally black students had joined the Jewish fraternities of which there were two. Those black students who had joined other fraternities had joined those that were local fraternities. And in the one instance where a black student had joined a national, as a prelude to that whole issue of the referendum, that national had gone local rather than confront the national, because I think they had a restrictive clause. The man—it's interesting--the man who triggered that was Reverend James Breeden of the class of '56, who ultimately became dean of the William Jewett Tucker Foundation in a later phase of his career.

What then happened was that, with my class of nine, of those of us who joined fraternities, one, two, six of us joined fraternities and we joined five different fraternities. Two guys were Phi Lam [Phi Lambda Phi], one of the Jewish houses. Wil Dourousseau [Wilburn P. '58] joined TEP, Tau Epsilon Phi, which is the fraternity that Warner Traynham was in. And then [H.] Carl McCall ['58], who is now the New York State Comptroller, Chester [C.] McGuire [Jr. '58] both joined local fraternities.

And I joined a national, Chi Phi, which was in itself somewhat significant in that Chi Phi was a national that was based in the south, which will have some significance in a way that I'll describe in just a moment. It was not the first time that they had pledged a racial minority, because there were Chinese-Americans who had been members of the fraternity. In fact, there was one who was a member when I joined, James Quan of the class of '56. But what it meant was that, for the first time, a black student had joined a white national fraternity on the campus that then did not go local. So, while I was there, I was essentially the first black student who was part of a national, other than the Jewish houses, that retained its national status.

BURNS: So your fraternity did not have a restrictive clause?

DODDS: It did not. It did not, and most of them did not. The ones that did were few numerically. The practice, however, differed so that, even though a house may not have had a restrictive clause, it was just sort of known that Jews or blacks wouldn't be welcome. It was just sort of an unwritten understanding. Interestingly, and this is totally aside, while all this was going on, the woman who was to be my wife was experiencing, a couple of years later, her own difficulty at the University of Toronto where she was a student. Pledging a sorority up there, which was headquartered in the United States, and it was the American national headquarters that said to the Canadian local chapter "Don't take that Black American student." Which caused an uproar because the Canadians said, "Who are these people south of the border telling us how to run our..." and got into a whole thing with the press and all of that. That was a few years after all of this was going on.

But it was fine for me. The house had a very eclectic mix. It already had Jewish members. It had Asian-Americans. So, adding a black to them it wasn't that big a deal. They had already had a measure of diversity within their ranks anyway. One of my roommates joined as well. The guy from Florida, Chuck. He became a member of Chi Phi also. Our third roommate joined the fraternity of--at that time--which was primarily the athletes. That was the Beta Theta Pi fraternity. But we had agreed to room together our sophomore year anyway; so, you know, if there was something going on at Dan's fraternity, the guy from California, we would go by and my classmates who were in the Jewish houses, we would go by there. I had rushed, that is to say I had gone to be interviewed by these fraternities so I knew the brothers in the upper classes. It was always kind of a nice thing to have my own fraternity as a base and then maybe mid-way during the party, we

might say, "Let's go over to see what's happening at such and such". A group of us would trudge over and visit the other houses and vice versa. People would come along to ours. So that sort of settled me down in a social sense. I really just never had to worry about the social side.

The only thing was then, you know, finding a date to bring. [Laughter] What I did essentially was to--now that I knew how the game was played, I started relying on the girls that I knew back in New York, girls that had been part of my church who were now in college, girls who were friends of the family and that sort of thing. So I didn't have to go scurrying around the eastern campuses or I chose not to go scurrying around. I would just write and make dates with girls that I knew from home that I was friendly with. There wasn't always a romantic thing involved, but it was very acceptable because it was a great thing for them, going up to Dartmouth for a weekend. That was a big deal. So it was generally never difficult to get dates. People would sort of jump at the chance to come up, especially for Winter Carnival. That was always a big thing.

Sophomore year then, I began getting involved with some of the extracurricular activities, the debate team. I think I had been on the staff of the *Green Book* my freshman year. The D.C.U. began to play more of a role, which was, that was an interesting thing as well. In the later publication, I was mortified, absolutely mortified, to see the D.C.U. translated to be the Dartmouth Conservative Union, which, in my day, it was not. It was the Dartmouth Christian Union. It was an arm of the fledgling Tucker Foundation; but it was basically run by the college chaplain and it was a way for people to get into discussions. Every Sunday, there were discussions on biblical topics--activities that had a religious basis, the occasional campus conference or conferences off-campus on religious themes. I had been very much a church-oriented person coming up. In fact, that had been sort of the major activity of our families. My mother was the church organist. My father was chairman of the board of trustees. So I had been in junior choir. I was an usher. I was used to that kind of environment and would go, not with regularity, but would occasionally go to the church on School Street, I forget which one that is now, on Sundays. But this D.C.U. became something of a substitute for my church attendance. We had chapel daily. There was a twenty-minute period I think between 10:00 and 10:20 when there were no classes and Rollins would run a service, a mini service. But I never really got into that. It was not compulsory. It was voluntary and it became the time when you would go back and

check the mail. [Laughter] "It's chapel period. Did the mail come yet?"

End of Tape 2, Side B – Beginning of Tape 3, Side A

BURNS: So was there more on the Dartmouth Christian Union?

DODDS: Well, only that it was a chance to get to meet yet other students because those conferences, particularly the ones that were off campus, I would then end up rooming with someone that I didn't know that well. And the man who ran the operations, George Kalbfleisch, was a figure of some note on the campus and a person who tried to lend a moral dimension to our doings and to just try to keep people's spirits up and so on.

But I must say that that sophomore year was--they used to talk about the sophomore slump, and I did experience it. I had done quite well freshman year and, come sophomore year, I really just sort of hit a--oh, I think I know what it was. In fact, I kind of analyzed this not too long ago--realizing that I was really sort of burning up the track in a way, I figured to myself that making dean's list is--I can almost do that on cruise control and I eased up a little bit, because now, I'm in a fraternity--it wasn't that I was going wild socially and so forth, but I basically just took my foot off the accelerator a little bit and I remember getting really surprised by an anthropology course in which I thought I was right on top of it. I didn't think I could have done any better and, lo and behold, I got one of the few C+'s. I was absolutely thunderstruck. I mean I hunted up the professor, Elmer Harp. I can never forget him. I went to see him. I mean, "What is this? A C+?" He wouldn't budge. He sat there puffing his pipe. [Laughter] It was just "I called it the way I saw it."

That was a bit of a wakeup call because I then realized that I had to do better--I certainly had to do better than a gentleman's C. I knew that all along and that I needed a better goal than the dean's list. The dean's list was okay, but there were these other rungs above it and so, to make dean's list was, to me, like the gentleman's C. In a sense, I've already demonstrated I could do that. The real test is "Can I get to the Rufus Choate level? Can I get to Phi Beta Kappa?" So I sort of said, "Okay. We will really get serious now. We'll still keep up with the social stuff and the fraternity--all that will stay in place; but I will really burn these books."

Now I should probably just say a word about that first summer. I was given, myself and my younger sister, were given a trip to Barbados by my parents, the summer after freshman year...which was a wonderful thing. I mean it was a chance to meet family--we still had relatives down there, aunts and uncles--a chance to spend a whole summer in a totally different environment. I wasn't working. I wasn't going to school. But I was learning about a different cultural environment and getting a chance to do a lot of socializing that I had not been doing in my freshman year because everybody there was basically middle-class. They had cars. They had houses. In a sense, I'm now living a life unlike the life I was living back in New York. I would just go down there as a tourist on vacation and suddenly I'm getting invited to all these parties and going on with guys my age and driving around. [Laughter] This is great. Beaches all the time. So that was a very nice confidence-boosting summer experience. And as a result of it, I made some social connections because the whole traffic flow is for young people, once they get of college age and so forth, to go to the U.K. and to go to the United States for further education. So there was, for years, a whole stream of people coming up to study and/or work in the United States that I had met during my summer in Barbados. So this was yet another source of dates, you know, that I could then invite up to Hanover and so on. So that was a real boon, that summer.

So, my sophomore year progressed not as successful academically, but I was beginning to start with the extracurricular activities. I had a certainly better social environment. Then came the summer of junior year, or the summer between sophomore and junior year. I worked at a department store in Manhattan. This was when I really realized that it was more a matter of--more than what you know in terms of how you move in the world because I couldn't, for the life of me, get the kind of jobs that my classmates were getting. They'd come back from spring break and say, "I'm going to be working at such and such a corporation this summer." "I'm working for such and such a law firm." "Wow. How do you get jobs like that?" I mean I had gotten this terrific, well, it was not as terrific as it was freshman year, but it was still a pretty good transcript.

I went to the Urban League office in New York, which wasn't far from my church, and saw the job placement person and basically said, you know, "Here is this Ivy League transcript. Dean's list. Honors. Where is the corporate job for me?" I will never forget. The guy looked at the resume and said, "This is terrific." He opens this three-ring binder and says, "What we've got is an elevator operator, if you're willing to work nights." He said, "There's this elevator operator job in some

apartment building." I said, "What are you talking about? This is a Dartmouth transcript." [Laughter] This is supposed to be a gateway to the front office." He said, "We don't have those kind of jobs here. You need to know somebody to get a job like that." Ah. Then the light goes on. "You've got to know somebody. I see. Ah ha." Of course, when you analyze what my classmates were talking about, yeah, they had a job in such and such a law firm where their uncle was a senior partner or the corporation where they were going to be working, well, their father was the senior vice president. It all fit in because they used those connections which I didn't have. So there I was in S. Klein's, was the department store, working like a longshoreman. We were unloading appliance trucks and things like that for eighty-five cents an hour; but it was a learning experience anyway.

With junior year, I moved into the fraternity. We had a number of vacancies. Normally, only seniors would live in the fraternity, but we had a senior class where several of the students were at Amos Tuck, so they preferred to live at the Tuck School. Others, for various reasons, did not choose to live in the fraternity and I got myself elected treasurer of the fraternity house and that then led to a series of other student government assignments. I became automatically a member of the inter-fraternity treasurers' council and, by being elected president of that body, all of the treasurers together, that made me automatically a member of the undergraduate council which numbered, I guess in those days, maybe fifty-five, sixty students or so.

BURNS: It was still a fairly young body, if I remember correctly--mid-forties, I think, it started.

DODDS: I never really knew much of the history. I mean, it was just there. We just, I guess, always assumed that it was there. One other thing I did, which actually was quite important in the student government sequence--the selection for Green Key, which is the service honor society, maybe about forty members of the junior class were members of Green Key, was done in the spring of our sophomore year. Certain people were automatically members of Green Key. I guess they were students who served on the judiciary committee, president of the class, president of the dormitory group, there were a number of ex-officio members. But about ten or fifteen, maybe ten, slots on Green Key were at-large elections. So, in the spring, there was an election process for class officers and Green Key, so I put in a petition and ran as a candidate. And did something that I think was helpful. I mean, I might have won the election anyway, but the candidates were all listed alphabetically and I put my full name, R. Harcourt, and then, in

parenthesis, I put "Harry" in quotes, close parenthesis, and then Dodds. So, when you looked at the ballot, that name stuck out in the list because it was so long. You couldn't miss it. [Laughter] It was a marketing ploy I had figured out. I had to do something that would stand out so I wrote my name out, writ large, and was elected to Green Key.

So that was then really something of a big deal because Green Key would run the campus tours. We did a number of service projects for the campus. In addition to being fraternity treasurer, I was active in Green Key. I was not a Green Key officer, but I was very active in it and developed, this was a big innovation at that time--we hit on the idea--the football team was doing pretty well. We had sort of survived the initial Bob Blackman years, which were lean. Suddenly, the team was starting to have a winning record. So we developed this technique of showing game films.

It fell to me to organize it--I'm not sure that it was my idea, but I was sort of part of the group that put it together. We would arrange with the football coaching staff to get the game film from the preceding Saturday and, on Monday--I think we did it in 105 Dartmouth. I think we did it there. It was someplace where you could project and, you know, service a large audience. Maybe we did it the following Tuesday because the team would meet on Monday. Yeah. I guess we did it the following Tuesday of the game and a member of the coaching staff would come and would analyze the game film. Now this was a big hit because certainly for an away game, there was no TV in those days and, if you listened to the game, fine. If you didn't, all you had was the newspaper accounts. Suddenly there was a way that you could actually see an away game, or even a home game, if you had missed it. So I had helped set that up and that was kind of my project, so we would do it every week.

BURNS: And the audience for this was students?

DODDS: Students. Yeah. Well, anybody. I mean it was open to anybody who would be interested in coming. We'd use the ditto machine to print up the little announcement and run around dorms and post it and everything. So it was a nice innovation. We also organized, I don't know that it was a "first" necessarily, but we started student/faculty coffee hours. We got the Hanover Inn, which had a coffee shop in those days, where they now have one of those boutique stores. It was actually the Hanover Inn Coffee Shop fronting on Main Street. We got them to donate the coffee and the donuts or cookies or whatever and,

for a period in the afternoon, three to four-thirty, three to five, anybody, faculty, students, could go into the Hanover Inn Coffee Shop and have coffee and sit and chat with faculty and so on. We tried to get publicity for it. It worked for a while.

The only problem was that, unlike what Susan Wright, President Wright's wife, is doing now, we never had a designated faculty person coming, so you had to sort of depend on--we would ask faculty, "Can you come by?"; but you had to depend on their availability and their willingness to show up. Then you had to commandeer, if you couldn't persuade, students to come in, sort of go out and grab people. "We've got Al Foley sitting in the coffee shop. Come on in and talk with Al Foley." [Laughter] So we had to kind of manipulate things a little bit. But, in concept, it worked fine. It was just difficult to do it day in and day out, and have it really sustain the level of participation. In any event, we tried.

We were always looking for ways to sort of add something to the rather sparse life outside of fraternities that was available to us. But there were concert series. I don't want to paint too bleak a picture. I got to see Duke Ellington at Webster. I probably would never have seen him, an Ellington live performance, other than that. Leontyne Price came up. She was part of the concert series for that year, I forget which year it was. So there were those things. But you had to make yourself available to do those things--to get out there and, of course, have the ticket money and so on. It was okay. It was okay. There wasn't a whole lot going on like on weekends. These were invariably weekday tours that would come up.

BURNS: And certainly a different pace from New York City.

DODDS: Oh, yeah. [Laughter] But, you see, I didn't know that New York City because I was just a kid. I did get to know, eventually, the legitimate theatre. I mean that became a major source of entertainment for me. So junior year was good. Then I did something that was really unusual. I got to the spring of junior year--it was really difficult looking for a job. I had been home for spring break and didn't have anything lined up and could only envision going back to the department store again. I dreaded that possibility.

And then one of my fraternity brothers, who had been accepted to Amos Tuck, said that he had this job, in fact, he had already started the job, at the Norwich Inn and the job was that of a bellhop/bartender. I'll explain a little bit more in a minute. He was married and that job, it

just really wasn't suitable for a variety of reasons. It didn't pay anything particularly, and he and his wife really wanted to start building some resources, so he had basically lined up a better job. But he didn't want to leave these people in the lurch. "Was there anybody in the fraternity who might be interested?" Well, I didn't have anything to do, so I said "Sure. Let me go over and talk with them." And it was the Avery Family, who then owned the Norwich Inn, who were also the owners of the Lake Morey Inn in Fairlee, Vermont. Borden Avery was the owner and so I went over and met with him. He was fine, I mean, because he basically needed a body. Roger Bruttomesso ['58] was my fraternity brother. He was going. I mean it wasn't that he was thinking about it. He had given notice. He was leaving, so they needed someone to come in. So I took it on and basically spent the entire summer as the bar tender at the Norwich Inn and Motel in Norwich, Vermont.

BURNS: And lived in Hanover.

DODDS: Lived in Hanover. I started out living in the fraternity house, which was illegal. I tried to conceal it. I put up blankets at night so the campus cops--but they caught me at some point. [Laughter] They saw me going in. "You're not supposed to be living there." As the fraternity treasurer, I had the keys. They kicked me out and I wound up renting a room in the town of Hanover on School Street, and my commute was by bicycle. I would pick up speed going down the New Hampshire side and then coast up the Vermont side.

BURNS: And that was affordable for you to rent a room in Hanover?

DODDS: Yes, because the deal was I got all of maybe twenty-five dollars a week; but the tips were all mine. The tips were pretty decent and I got all my meals. So the only thing I had to cover was the room. I mean the room, it wasn't much. I can't remember what she charged. Myself and a couple of other students who were in similar situations...being here for the summer, rented from her. It was ten dollars a week, I don't remember now. But, yes. The answer is yes; it was affordable.

Having the meals was the best part of all. I would go over in the morning and have breakfast. My tour was split. It was eight to twelve, essentially as a handy man, whatever needed to be done. People checking in and checking out. And then four to eight. That was, again, bell hop duties and bar tending. But, by getting there early, the chef, who was from Vermont, he'd fix whatever you wanted for breakfast. I mean, there was eggs. There was French toast. This guy was good. His last name was Rich. I can't remember his first name. His wife did

the baking and that was some treat. I tell you. So, at the end of that tour, I'd have lunch at twelve fifteen or whatever. Then I'd come back to Hanover, rest up, maybe do a little tennis or whatever in the afternoon. Then come back--now I've got my bar tending jacket on and my little bow tie, so I'm available to tend bar from four o'clock to eight. Because some people would come in for cocktails in the late afternoon and you'd have the dinner crowd. And then there are people checking in. So, when it was busy, it was busy. I'd have to check people in, carry the bags then whip back to the bar and take any orders from the waitresses and then, the very people who had just checked in would come in for dinner and they'd say, "Oh, it's you again. What are you doing here?" So I was getting these tips, I was getting tips from people checking in and then tips from the bar.

I was probably underage. We never explored that. [Laughter] I was probably an underage bartender because I was only nineteen at the time. The bar was equipped with a bartender's guide so all the drinks were there. The specialty of the house was a daiquiri made with maple syrup. Folks enjoyed that. I never sampled any of the wares; but there was one salesman, traveling salesman, he would go up to your area, up around St. Johnsbury and back. He would cover all of Vermont and New Hampshire. He swore that I made the best dry martini he'd ever had. Considering what the martini cost, he would leave a pretty sizeable tip. [Laughter]

Faculty would come in. Al Foley was a regular. Sometimes faculty would come in for dinner. So it was a nice opportunity to really see a side of the area that hardly any students ever see. The people I was working with lived in Hanover. They lived in Norwich. So, with the banter back and forth, you'd get to know what their lives were like and their aspirations and so on. When the Norwich Fair took place everybody would go to it. It was like the big local thing. The cattle-pulling contest. [Laughter] That was great stuff. I mean it would often take you, what is there to do. But it was fun. It was very enjoyable. It was all accessible because it was just a mile away by bicycle, so it was literally no big deal at all.

I also got involved in experiment that the psychology department was doing. A professor--I think it was the chairman of the department whose name escapes me at the moment, but he was doing an experiment in perception and one of the people that was renting at the house that I was staying told me about it. He said, "You know, Professor so and so is doing these experiments and he is looking for subjects. Why don't you give him a call and see if they'll take you in."

And sure enough, I contacted the professor and he said, "Yes. I'm doing this thing on perception." What was involved was looking at a series of patterns that were put up on a screen and your fingers, or some of your fingers, were attached to electrons. Periodically, you'd get a mild shock and it was that you were to recount what you saw before and what you saw afterwards. The shock would affect how you saw things. So that was it, maybe for an hour or so. Then it was five dollars. That was a princely sum there for one hour. Great! So that was a little diversion.

There were always little things like that that would pop up. Being, as I was, a member of Palaeopitus, because, by this time, we had been inaugurated--with each spring, there was this ceremony, I don't know if they still have it, called "Wet Down". Wet Down involved the running of the gauntlet. It was a whole traditional thing where the--in order to become a--let me see, how did it start? In order to become--oh, that's right. The seniors would line up and then the junior class would run through the gauntlet. That was their symbolic promotion to become the new senior class. This was right across the Green, two lines. The seniors and juniors are now lined up, so the sophomores run through and these are with belts. This is real, this is a serious gauntlet.

BURNS: I don't think they do this anymore.

DODDS: I guess they don't. [Laughter] The sophomores would run through and they'd get trashed, slashed; so they now symbolically become juniors. Now you've got the three classes. The freshmen would run through and they now symbolically become sophomores. Now you've got the whole student body lined up. Right? Guess who comes through last? Palaeopitus. [Laughter] The idea is, these are our senior leaders. Let's get them. As luck would have it, I had an appendectomy a week before, or two weeks before, whatever it was. So I had just gotten out of Dick's House. I was in pain and, very fortunately, my fraternity brothers recognized that I needed attention so they got me up to Dick's House and they did the surgery about four in the morning. But I'm still recovering, and I've got the thing. So the eleven other colleagues of mine ran through it. I just waved them through. [Laughter] That was a hell of a thing. You had to run through each one of the classes right across the whole diagonal of the Green.

But the good news was that Palaeopitus, we got to wear the uniforms and we were the big deal, etc. and we got passes to the Nugget Theater. So it was almost like winning a yo-yo contest. You could literally go to the Nugget anytime for nothing. You just showed your

pass. Since we were the student leaders, we never had a chance to go. We were always involved in--and it was non-transferable. You couldn't give it off or sell it to anybody or anything like that. But the summer before senior year, I was there working, so that's when I really had the chance to use my pass. I would often go. That was my evening recreation was to go to the Nugget on my pass, so even my entertainment was "on the house" so to speak.

BURNS: I imagine there weren't a lot of students around.

DODDS: Oh, no. Not many at all. You would have the occasional research assistant, which is what one of the guys was doing and the occasional person like myself who was just doing a job that happened to be in the area. Even the students who were from the area, I mean they invariably would go someplace else. I mean they weren't about to spend a summer in Hanover when they had to be there all year. No. There wasn't anybody around. The whole idea of using the summer as an educational, came much later, for reasons having to do with the coeducation switch over and so on. But it was the ideal time to be here. I mean, it was just so beautiful and that really made me a fan of the area. I mean with that, I knew that this is just a wonderful vacation spot. When my wife and I were looking for places to go, shortly after we were...

End of Tape 3, Side A – Beginning of Tape 3, Side B

DODDS: ...I knew the Averys, being the owners, ran a nice place up there, so we came up there for a weekend. It's always been nice to come back, especially in the warmer weather. [Laughter]

BURNS: It wasn't the long winters that...

DODDS: No. Although I must say the very first time I came back as an alumnus was, in fact, to a Winter Carnival. It was the Carnival after I graduated and was still in law school. I had just started law school and a number of us came back for that. For the way Carnival was in those days, whatever the weather was, it almost didn't matter. So much had to do with the internal party activities, what have you.

BURNS: Your senior year, there's several events which you had mentioned in your correspondence and phone calls with me and one of them, maybe the first one, was the Harvard football game down at Harvard where there was...

DODDS: Harvard Stadium. Soldiers Field.

BURNS: ...I guess, there was a bunch of pledge trips.

DODDS: Right.

BURNS: And a bit of a near riot happened.

DODDS: Yeah. I was not there, let me quickly say for the record, but the idea of these pledge trips was to set some task for the pledge class. It was a bit zany, but the basic idea was you want to do things that promote camaraderie, get them working together so you--one thing we used to do with our pledges was you'd give them a new toilet seat and they would have to get it autographed by members of the faculty and the administration. Set them that task so guys would have to go in carrying this toilet seat into the associate dean's office and get their autograph, silly stuff like that. But the idea again was to get them to work together on this thing. Now, I don't really remember that it was my fraternity, Chi Phi, that had set a task specifically as it related to the Harvard band at Soldiers Field.

BURNS: I think that's correct.

DODDS: But somebody, somebody had told--and there might have been seven or eight different fraternities that were involved in some form of a pledge activity in Boston, because Harvard was always a big weekend in Cambridge. We had no classes the preceding Friday because the assumption was that everybody would go down to the game. So it was always a big event and always away. It wasn't until, I think it was Blackman's second year as coach that Harvard began to come up to Hanover and then they'd do a home and home.

In any event, here were these pledges--so it was my senior year. You're right. That would have been the fall of '57 and our pledge class would have then been the class of '60 sophomores. They were sent down to Boston to do something. I wasn't really involved in supervising the pledges; but, at the stadium, whoever the other pledge groups were, apparently somebody's assignment was to get sheet music, to get a cap, to get something from the Harvard band that meant physically interacting. I don't think the instruments had anything to do with it. I think they were supposed to get somebody's hat or, you know, just to do something mischievous like that, and, in trying to pull this off things got out of hand. There was scuffling and whatever and then maybe some of the other pledges, seeing what was going on,

went to the aid and comfort of the people who were then being attacked by the Harvard people who were, of course, just defending themselves. Evidently, a melee broke out of one kind or another and, in addition to all the bad press and the embarrassment which I think resulted in Dickey formally apologizing to I think it was Nathan Pusey, who was Harvard's president back then.

There was some institutional apology that went, together with a pledge that whatever the damage was that had been suffered by the Harvard band, would be made good. You know, the undergraduates would make good on it, which meant that we, the undergraduate council, had to figure out a way to do this. Now we had a budget which was for the various activities during the year; so, in effect, we had to take a hit. I don't remember now how we softened the blow. Maybe we got the fraternities to chip in. I don't remember how that was all pulled off; but, since the plea of guilty had already been entered, I mean, we were just left to make good on the promise and we had some discussions about it. Essentially, we said to the Harvard people, "Just send us your bill. What can we do? We've already been confessed by our leaders, so tell us what we owe you." Back came the bill. It was, I don't know, it was over three thousand dollars, and itemized--clarinet was bent and the drumhead was cracked, and all the rest of it. We paid and somehow I think we got some of it back from the fraternities. I just don't remember.

But the houses, themselves, went on probation, were put on probation. Any house that had a pledge group that went to Cambridge that weekend, whether the pledges were given any assignment regarding the Harvard band or not--because it was just too difficult to sort out who had, in fact, gone onto the field and tussled with the Harvard people and so on. My fraternity, Chi Phi, was one of those.

Two things came about, in a sense, as a result of that. One was a bit of a revelation. Fast forward to my first year in law school--one of the people in my law school class was a Harvard undergrad who had been a member of the band. So, in the conversation we were just sort of reminiscing about one thing or another and I mentioned this instrument business and he said, "Oh, yes. That was like a godsend because they saw the opportunity to basically refurbish the band. Anybody who had a bent key, anybody who had the smallest nick in their instrument, they put in for a replacement because, hey, Dartmouth was paying the bill. It was a blank check." So he said, "Oh, yeah. That was a great thing. We just refurbished the band." So I said, "Great. Harvard owes us one."

The other thing was that we were building, in my fraternity, a new bar in the basement social area when this probation thing hit. So it was somewhat demoralizing; but the guys said, "Well, this probation can't last forever. Let's go ahead and finish the bar and we'll do it." And one of the fraternity brothers in the class, I don't think he was in the pledge class. I think he was the class of '59--[Malcolm] Mel Swenson was from a family in the granite business here in New Hampshire, so basically, he supplied the granite at cost and it was this fine granite-covered bar, you know, nicely done and so on. The bar is finished about the time that the fraternity comes off probation; so we say to our fraternity community, the college campus fraternities, basically, "Hey, not only are we coming off probation, but Chi Phi is inaugurating this wonderful new granite bar. Come on. You all come."

We had this blast. I mean that was about the only way to describe it. It was an open, generally fraternities don't have open parties simply because there was no way you could entertain the fraternity community and, if you call it an open party, if somebody wanders in, you don't have a way to know that this is or is not a fraternity member of some other house. So basically it was an open party that Chi Phi was having to celebrate coming off probation and the inauguration of this bar. It went very, very well. I think it was timed to be on a Saturday night. We had whatever the popular band was out of Boston, the Black and Tans, or whatever. Wonderful. Great event.

There was--in light of the president's current tussle with the fraternity system, this may seem like something that I know he doesn't want to hear, because this is actually what happened. There was a keg that was left over. Ordinarily, you could not buy a keg, you couldn't buy any alcohol on a Sunday, so this Saturday party, at whatever point it was supposed to end, it ends, and there's this keg left over. So somebody said, "Let's tap it, you know, for Sunday. We will just have a..." On a big weekend, you would normally have, what do you call it, a milk punch party. It is sort of a last social event on Sunday around brunch time. So we will just have this as a Sunday treat and, again, the euphoria of coming off probation was such that it again attracted a nice crowd, but pleasant, nothing untoward. There wasn't any bad behavior or anything and so this thing now begins to pick up a little bit of momentum.

Members of the house themselves chip in for another keg the following night, it's Monday, and somebody says, "What's the record?" So this thing keeps on. Some nights the brothers chip in. Some nights other

members of fraternities would come by and say, "Let's order a keg." I mean, there was nothing illegal about it, you called Tanzi's, who was this local vendor. If you had the money, they'd send the keg. It was like that. So long as it was within the hours that that was permitted, it was allowed. The only thing was that, if you were going to do a consecutive thing as this was building towards, you always had to make certain that there was one that was left over from Saturday because you could not purchase one on Sunday. So a streak as such there was to be would be broken unless you made allowances for a Sunday keg.

Well, I don't want to prolong this, but it kept going and the brothers, in their collective wisdom said, "All right. We will run this for sixty-nine nights." [Laughter] So that's what it was. Come the sixty-ninth night, then there was another celebration to commemorate this streak that Chi Phi had done. We became something of a phenom in the social genre of the time. Meanwhile, I'm the treasurer while all of this is going on, so I've got to make sure that our budget isn't overloaded. You had a certain social thing; but we were able to do it by contributions, making certain that people who were there would chip in and what have you.

I will say one other thing because it sort of ties in with this business of being involved with the local community and the social environment of the fraternity. We had any number of fraternity competitions. Houses were graded on how well they kept their books. The grade point average of the fraternity was calculated. Sports, intramural sports, I was on our--we had a little intramural hockey team and, because I had now learned to skate well enough to play hockey, I would get out there as a reserve. Usually the game was well beyond reach. Either we were losing badly or winning big; that was when I would make my appearance. You know, it was all in the spirit of taking part.

And we put on a play. The interfraternity play competition involved a production. You either did an established play or--we had a guy who was very creative musically. He was a year ahead...Larry [K.] Elliott [Jr.] in the class of '57. He wrote a production. He wrote a play about college life and it was called "We Are College Guys." There was a theme song and it was set on the Dartmouth campus and involved, you know, lots of comic illusions to the professors who gave gut courses and the social back and forth with dates and all of that. The focus was a guy whose date comes in and they have a fine time and then there's some crisis, and they break apart and come back. The usual kind of stuff, but nice catchy songs and that was our entry into the play

competition. It did very, very well and it was decided that it would be staged again and it was.

During the production itself, they were looking for a way to change scenes. In other words, you'd have the guy and his girl together singing and acting or whatever it was. Then the next scene might be in a classroom or a fraternity meeting or something like that. "Well, how do you get from one scene to another?" They were looking for some transition. So they hit on the idea that they'd have me walk across the stage as the scenery was being changed behind the curtains in a railroad conductor's uniform, cap and lantern and so forth, calling out in a New England accent the name of the... "White River Junction, White River," adding "aye yup" at the end, which was a tremendous hit with the audience. They just visually—here's this black guy playing this New England train conductor. So I did it in one direction, that was one scene change and then in the other direction I'd call out the names of the stations, "Thetford" and "Union Village" and all that. Well, the audience just loved it. Every time the production would go on, here I am doing this little bit. But it was a way to sort of acknowledge that I had, in fact, mastered the accent pretty well [Laughter], and to also take part in yet another fraternity activity. So we had a very, very good time with that.

I don't know that there is anything else to really add on that aspect of student life. In senior year which, I guess, is where you really began, we did come to grips with the issue of the new dormitories and that was one in which I was asked to head a--basically it was an undergraduate advisory commission. It was probably one of the few times the administration actually reached out to us for some advice and counsel. New dorms were being built which had a central social area. Now they were really looking at the dormitory as a social opportunity, not just as purely residential, and there were then the separate rooms that the students had. The question was, would the same social rules that applied in dormitories apply in these clusters? I guess it was the River Cluster that was going up at the time.

In the normal dormitory, you would have the opportunity to have a female guest in your room and, if you had a single room, you know, so be it; because the room would consist of, in addition to your bed and desk, usually a chair or sofa or some other combination. These living quarters, with their main social area, eliminated, at least as the designer saw it, the need for any social space in the individual room. The individual room just had a bed, a desk and a chair. To the consternation of some of my classmates, I agreed with the

administration. I just didn't think that you could, at least in the tenor of those times, sanction having female guests going to that area because the only thing that you could use was the bed. [Laughter] You wouldn't expect that your guest was going to sit on the desk, you know, because it was basically just one chair in the room. So anyway, we endorsed the idea that the more limited parietals, as they were called, with female guests only being allowed in the social area would apply to those new dormitories.

BURNS: This is a U.G.C. committee?

DODDS: Yes. I believe it was. I think so.

BURNS: So they reported to the U.G.C.

DODDS: We reported to--well, we may have reported to the U.G.C. simply to say what the results were; but we were asked for our opinion by the office of student affairs and, as my recollection has it, it would have been David Edson. I think he was the associate dean or assistant dean for student affairs back in those days. So, with that, that basically ended our assignment.

But it was one of a number of things that sort of irked our class and, as the spring went along, things got a bit testy. I mean we had been, you know, the so-called silent generation. There had been all kinds of things going on in the outside world, the Birmingham bus boycott, the beginnings of protest activity in that civil rights arena, all of this stuff and, around the campus, you would never know that there was an outside world particularly. I mean the stuff was reported; but we just went about our business. Nobody organized any sympathy marches or anything like that. Everybody just sort of noted those things. I think we really were impacted by the McCarthy years, the idea that, whatever people did as young people would be recorded someplace and, at some later time, the government or somebody would be able to access it and say, "Oh, you protested, did you, back in your student days? Okay, well, we're going to make it tough for you now to be admitted to the bar or to get a medical license or whatever it may be. So that sort of hung heavy over our time and I think it really did add to us not being prone to get involved in larger social issues.

But, with the announcement of the Hopkins Center, I don't know, that somehow triggered something and a number of our guys--it took me the longest while to really get it. I just didn't understand what they were getting upset about, but guys would--guys were starting to have

meetings. They were starting to complain to each other. "Why are we being treated like this? Why don't they ever consult us? Why aren't they ever looking to us for opinions? They just sort of announce this thing, this Hopkins Center, and they don't even tell us about it. I mean it's going to change the whole character of the place." In one sense, it was almost, you might even say a reactionary response because these fellows believed, probably correctly, that it would begin to attract to the campus a different kind of student, who was not in the traditional Dartmouth mold, who would be of a different sort. There was some worry and speculation, "We're going to lose our image; we'll lose our manliness, our competitive edge," whatever it might be. This thing with the dormitory didn't help and there were one or two other things that had happened as well. I don't know whether a tuition raise was part of it.

BURNS: Saturday classes seemed to play into it somehow.

DODDS: It might well have. It might well have. But all of this emerged or got linked together as what was called the Senior Protest and a petition went around. I don't even remember whether I signed it because I wasn't sure that I understood it, and then again, this thing that, if you sign things--because the McCarthy hearings always involved them bringing out these documents that people had signed back in the '30s. "Is that your signature? Did you really want to free Willie McGee from the death penalty" or whatever it might have been?

So here was this protest and it was left to the president of our class, the head of Palaeopitus, Joe Blake [Joseph B. Blake '58], to present this petition to the president. I know that I was not there when this happened; but Joe and a delegation of the protesters went to the president's house on Tuck Drive and they were going to present this petition. Now there's no precedent for this in our generation. We'd never protested so nobody knew, "How do you protest? How do you present a petition to the president?" Nobody knew, so Joe's got this petition and he goes up to the door, and knocks on the door and the door opens and there's John Sloan Dickey. By this time, Joe has backed away from it. I mean he wasn't quite sure what to expect. He's sort of backed away from the door. He's a little bit in the shadows. The president is aware that there is this group out there--this is all being told to me after the fact. He's looking out and he says, "I see there are some students out there. Joe, is that you, Joe Blake? What have you got, Joe? [Laughter] What is that?" So Joe said, "We have this protest here, Mr. Dickey, Mr. President." "Protest? What protest?" There was a lot of, I guess, stammering and so on. It almost took on,

as it was told to me, a bit of a tragic comedy routine because there was no agenda. There was no program. There was no format. So evidently, the president took the petition and said, "All right. I'll take a look at it. I'll get back to you." [Laughter] It was something like that. And that was pretty much it. I don't think anything ever really happened after that. You see it was not an environment in which you could call the administration to account. I mean we lived in fear of the administration.

BURNS: How much of that or was any of that due to John Dickey's character?

DODDS: Oh, I think it had a lot to do with it. Yeah. He was so imposing. He was "The President". He was aloof, as I suggested--not that he was unfriendly or anything; but he was just on a different plain. In later years, one of our classmates, Ralph Manuel [Ralph Manuel '58] became the dean. This is after Kemeny is president. His predecessor and Kemeny had something of a falling out....

BURNS: Carroll Brewster.

DODDS: Carroll Brewster, who was a law school classmate, so I knew them both as classmates. So I was chatting with Ralph at one point. I knew Ralph as an undergraduate. I was just asking him, "How's it going" and so on and he said "Fine. Sally and I," his wife, "Sally and I are having some students over for lunch." He made some reference like that. I said "Really?" He said "Yeah." We both remarked right away how different that was because it meant a personal contact with the dean of the college on a level that we would never have considered. The only time you would ever have gone to the dean's house would have been that you were summoned. I mean that there had to be something drastically wrong that you would ever, you know, be in the company of the dean at his house. I mean it just wouldn't happen. It just didn't function that way. I mean you might see the dean at some sort of a gathering, but...

BURNS: Was this Neidlinger [Lloyd "Pudge" Neidlinger '23] still?

DODDS: No. This was [Joseph] MacDonald. Neidlinger was Kilmarx's [Robert Dudley Kilmarx '50] father-in-law. But there was always that sense of separation. I mean the administrators that we were closest to were invariably the people down the line, the associates like David Edson [David H. Edson '52]. I remember--I mean he was accessible and there were things that, if you needed to arrange for a room or, you know, get approval for something, he would be the one that you would

deal with. But that upper administration really--and trustees, I mean we never saw a trustee. Obviously, they were there at commencement; but I don't think there was ever an occasion as an undergraduate where I had any interaction with a trustee. I never met them. I mean I think we knew of some names of trustees, but they were, you know, totally...

End of Tape 3, Side B – Beginning of Tape 4, Side A

BURNS: So we sort of left off in the social life side of things and I wanted to give you the opportunity to sort of talk about kind of black student social life in that period of time, whether--I guess I'm particularly interested as to whether the black students were kind of drawn to each other essentially as a support network. How did that function?

DODDS: Well, much of it had to do with numbers and since, historically, the numbers were low. Literally, those few students who were here very much had to be drawn to each other. The class of 1955, at the time we matriculated, had three black students. The class of 1956 had three, there was actually a man from the class of '52 who had left to join the military and who returned and then participated in the college as a member of the class of '56. So, there were three black students in that class and the class of '57 had four black students. So that tended to be about the average as it would run. So those nine, ten or what have you, were really a core group and they would share information about where Negro women students, black women students we would now call them, African-American students, were located. Since just about everybody was on scholarship, there really was no transportation that they had *per se* so whenever it became necessary to go some place, it was a matter of getting a ride through the students who did have cars. I don't know what it's like today; but, in those days, there was an absolute prohibition on car ownership if you had a scholarship.

There was something which became a bit legendary at other schools, perhaps even more so than it was on the Dartmouth campus. There was in Topliff a room that about two or three of the black students had and they had it like for a period of years. It might have been Gene Booth [Eugene Booth '57], Richard Fairley ['55] and, at various times, perhaps Joe Dunston [Joseph Dunston '56] was there. But this room, and I think it was 301 Topliff, became known as a club. It was the 302 Club and, when there were weekends and these fellows had dates and so forth, they would congregate in that room for parties and, on a selected and very limited basis, they would include us first-year students because theoretically, we weren't supposed to be drinking

and so on. But the way they included us was instructive because we were included to the extent that we had dates. We were not included if we were just carousing around on our own. So, as we came to know, our dates became fair game--if you showed up there with a date, well anything might happen, including your date vanishing for a period of time. [Laughter] So, you know, we would tend to be a little bit weary of these. They were very gracious, very hospitable; but, you know, we always suspected there were ulterior motives in their hospitality. But, you know, it was all good-natured. Nobody ever got their nose terribly out of joint by the skull-duggery and chicanery that would go on.

But I would say that was really the extent of that kind of thing on an organized basis among my classmates. Since we were now nine in number, we really had numbers to sort of coordinate things. But I really stayed back from that. I would say the two McGuires, one from Chicago, one from Washington, Carl McCall from Boston, Arch Whitehead from White Plains were probably the core of my classmates who spent any significant social time together. I would see, you know, others on the campus in these fraternity migrations that would take place.

There was, in fact, one weekend that was recorded in *Ebony Magazine*. You know, just for your own edification, you might try and track that down. It was the Winter Carnival of 1957, the calendar year 1957, January of 1957, and Arch Whitehead knew a family in Westchester who were in the publishing business and, through them, there was a connection with the people running *Ebony Magazine*. So it was worked out that *Ebony* would cover that Winter Carnival and they did and it was a cover story that appeared the next year. The story itself did not come out until--it was early 1958. As it turned out, the girl who was featured in the story was a girl, she was this girl that I had started dating before I came to Dartmouth. That was my contribution to the effort. She was then at Bryn Mawr and so I arranged for her to come up and be Arch Whitehead's date, because we were no longer seeing each other. Arch is somewhat short in stature. He is actually shorter than I am and so, to portray a more photogenic Dartmouth figure, Chet McGuire, who was like 6'2", more of a strapping type, was substituted in the photo story as Carolyn Morant's date, that was the woman from Bryn Mawr. So, as you read the *Ebony* story, it's about Chester McGuire and Carolyn Morant, who were not each other's dates, but it was set up that way. At some point in the photo display, there is a picture of a group of us at the Phi Lam House around a piano and that's where I am, that's where I showed up in the story.

So we would occasionally have that sort of thing; but I pretty much hung out with my fraternity guys and I think the others coalesced certainly to a greater degree than I did. But it was pretty much a unit of four or five of them who did so. Our classmate from Trinidad, Tobago, really pretty much kept to himself socially and one or two of the others. We had one who dropped out after freshman year so we were down to eight and then the one or two others pretty much stayed on their own. They might all happen to be in a fraternity together, but it was really pretty much a core of three or four of my classmates who pretty much tried to stay together.

That was basically the core who organized what they considered a sort of a final statement in the spring of our senior year wherein they collectively, and this was obviously organized, decided that for our last big weekend, which was Green Key weekend, spring weekend of '58, May of '58--they all had white dates. They all decided that they wanted to make a statement of some sort and each one of them showed up--somehow I think it all emanated out of Boston or schools in Boston; but, there they were parading around with these girls, who were not the best specimens of their class. It didn't make any ripple. I don't think anybody, at that point, really cared. [Laughter] I think they saw it as a way of--not provoking anything but just to sort of say to Dartmouth, "Well, here we are. We spent four years and now we're your equal. Here we are dating white girls." There was just sort of a general shrug. "If that's the best you can do, okay." But beyond that, I don't know that there is anything that I can really add on the social side.

BURNS: Was it a difficult climate to be in for a black student?

DODDS: It was only difficult, again, as far as I was concerned, primarily because of the economic--it was really more--I just felt far more shortcomings as a student who just didn't really have the means that most of my classmates did. There was no free ride. I took a lot of ribbing, it was actually from my fraternity brothers. I think they felt that it was a show of their good naturedness to kid about racial matters so, simple things like, "Well, don't turn out the lights. We won't find Harry." If we, as the pledges, were given a painting assignment--I think we had to paint the front fence with white paint, so, inevitably, you get some splashed on your hands and stuff so, "Are you trying to become one of us now. You're covering yourself with white." Stuff like that which I--it was the kind of thing that, even at that time, some people would have really gotten their backs up and might have even taken enough umbrage to hurl back things and maybe even take it further than that; but I just took it as sort of part of the initiation. I didn't see anything malevolent about

it and, after all, they had the option of including me in the fraternity or not and they did chose to include me and eventually elected me to office. I didn't like it, but I would kind of just go along with it and shrug and kind of let it go.

There were a couple of instances where, I wouldn't say that it was more serious, but race really became a more obvious player, or the factor of race, and that had to do in part with the fraternity and, as I alluded earlier, the fact that it was a southern fraternity. The fraternity annually gave an award, one to each chapter across the country, for the student with the highest grade point average. You got a medal and a certificate and there was a magazine for the fraternity. It came out quarterly and, in one particular issue, the photos of all of the winners from the previous academic year would be shown so you'd see who had won in the University of Alabama and Yale and wherever the chapters are located. There were about thirty-five chapters around the country. So, being the aggressive, grinding student that I was, there really wasn't a whole lot of competition from my pledge group [Laughter] at least the first year. We later brought in a couple of guys who were more or at least as studious as I was, so I had a little bit more of a competitive thing. For all three years, I was the winner of--it was called the Sparks Medal.

The first year that I won it, at the end of sophomore year, one of the upper classmen said, "Gee, you know it will be very interesting to see when they publish the magazine story, how they're going to handle your picture." The rest of the country would not have known about my being up at the Dartmouth Chapter. So we waited with great interest because, at the time, they asked for the winner's name and the documentation, they also asked for the photographs, so we sent everything in. Sure enough, I got my medal and I got my certificate and out comes the magazine listing all the winners and, for the first time, they showed nobody's picture. [Laughter] Of course, our chapter knew what the game was, but here was the national based in Atlanta. I guess they just didn't want to rock the boat with these other southern chapters; so nobody's picture got shown and it remained that way, because I won every year that I was an undergrad. Look, I knew I had won, so it wasn't anything that I was missing. I had the medal to prove it and that was the story.

I had a member of the class of '57... This was sort of a real reality check. I used to work with buildings & grounds after the academic year. It was an easy way to make money, serving as a dorm clerk and, you know, helping to straighten the campus up for the commencement.

So it meant staying on a few weeks after exams and so on. So I was doing that while the class of '57 was getting ready to graduate. Since I was going to be up working in Norwich anyway, you know, it was just easy money to earn. One of my classmates came up to me, not my classmate, one of the class of '57, but a fraternity brother, came up to me and pulled me aside. He and I had been, you know, fairly friendly. He had lived in the same dormitory, Russell Sage, as I had. We often had meals together and so on. He was from Virginia and he said, "Look, Harry. This is nothing to do with you personally, but I just want you to be aware, my family is coming up for the commencement and they do not like black people. You know, just understand that they are not going to be friendly." Because he knew how outgoing and so forth I was. He said, "Please, and I'm sorry to say this to you, but just don't approach them. Don't try to have anything to do with them because they just don't relate in any way to black people." So we just left it like that. I mean I appreciated his at least letting me know that. I wasn't out to convert anybody. If that's the way they felt, this was still only 1957, and so it went. They were around for the commencement, came by the house for various things. They were just on one side of the room and I was on another whenever there were social events where I was present. So it passed.

The only other thing that I remember particularly was another southern fraternity brother had his family visiting and they had brought the family dog with them and so, at some point, he was having his dog at the fraternity house because we had our own pet dog and they were sort of getting acquainted as dogs do from time to time. I walked into the room and the dog, his dog, just began snarling and straining. Because he had the dog on a leash. Just acting very ferociously towards me and Nate, the fraternity brother, half jokingly, but he really meant it, said, "I'm very sorry, but this is a southern dog." I guess, in whatever environment they lived, black people were strangers and people to be kept at some distance. The fact that I was right there in the same room, I guess the dog just kind of went off. [Laughter]

But, again, it was pretty much a sign of the times. If you took affront at every single thing that was going on out there, you know, you would have a whole lot of energy spent in areas that weren't particularly productive. We had our donnybrook, so to speak, a couple of times. There were speakers who came to Great Issues who were southerners and, on a couple of occasions sort of presented the southern perspective on the change that had been brought about by the Supreme Court and, from their point of view, why things ought not to be run too quickly. That we needed, whatever the change was going to

be, it should be very gradual, let each generation sort of pick it's own way and eventually, at some unspecified future time, there would be equality, but we can't do anything right now because people are just too used to the old ways. There would be challenges back and forth in the Q. and A. periods in those kinds of environment. That was probably the time when you really got a sense that there were ranges of points of view in the class. Not everybody had the same point of view about an issue like that at all.

Then, on one occasion, as an outside speaker, the college invited a man by the name of Wang, David [R.] Wang, who was a member of the class of '55 and David Wang, although himself a person of color, was espousing basically the point of view that integration was an inappropriate goal of public policy. That the races should remain separate in the way that they had been in the jury segregation. This was his known view. I forget what he did. I don't know whether he was a writer or an executive. I don't really remember, but David Wang was a known quantity. I took my yearbook back, but there's actually a photo in the yearbook of him at the lectern and Carl McCall posing a question to him.

What had happened in advance of his coming--I wasn't really privy to this because I wasn't a part of sort of that small social core of the black students in our class, but Carl and I think Mick McGuire, the two McGuires and Arch Whitehead had sort of collectively thought of questions that they would pose and of mechanisms to get those questions posed. What they did was they picked aisle seats strategically in 105 at Dartmouth Hall and whenever Wang had finished, then they were easily recognizable and so got to pose, you know, the various questions that they had worked out in advance. So it really created quite a lively give and take because they had thought through with great care what they were going to press him on and try to show the contradictions and irrational, at least as they viewed it, the irrational nature of his presentation. All of this got wide coverage in the *Daily D* at the time and really represented probably the most controversial kind of public presentation that went on as far as I can remember during the time that we were there, the whole time, on racial matters.

BURNS: Did the rest of the student body participate in that sort of debate with him?

DODDS: Well, there were others who posed questions as well. Yeah. But it wasn't a sustained series of events. In other words, he was just there

for the one lecture. It wasn't even part of the Great Issues. It was just part of some lecture series, so he was there. He gave his lecture, he gave his presentation, and then there was the back and forth of the questions. Yes. There were other students who participated, both pro and con. I mean there were students who, while not supporting him, did voice some, you know, leanings in that direction. Invariably, they had some antecedents, either geographic or philosophical, that pointed them in that direction.

You had alluded before to the houses with the clauses, the restrictive clauses, and while that referendum did in fact set that timetable, its enforcement was very much a self-enforcing setup as far as I know. In other words, the house, working with its national, had to either change its charter or lose the privilege of being on the campus as a national organization with a local chapter. So, as we entered, and I guess during the time we were there, those houses to which that applied were either doing things or they weren't doing things. I mean it wasn't a visible process. It was taking place within, if it were the case and I don't know that it was. I don't remember which houses, but let's just take for example Sigma Chi. If Sigma Chi had such a clause, and I think they might have had one on religion. I'm not sure. I think they were limited to white Christians, religion, not race. Then it was up to that chapter to work it out with the national and get the national to change. To whatever extent that was happening or not happening, it just wasn't visible. It wasn't a matter of public discussion.

BURNS: It wasn't something that was covered by the U.G.C.?

DODDS: No, because the deadline was--if it was 1960 or whenever, that was the deadline. So it would have been operative at that point, at the point the deadline arrived. "All right, so where are you? Do you still have a clause or not?" Of course, by that time, we were gone, so I really don't even know, in retrospect, what actually happened when the deadline arrived.

BURNS: And the heat of the debate was probably just prior to...

DODDS: It was. That's right. When we came, it was a done deal. The referendum had passed, fairly substantially too, as I remember. So it was something that, as I say, would be implemented by each of the fraternities that was affected. We took advantage of what seemed to be an opening attitude to join as many different fraternities as seemed available to us, both local and national. I think my colleagues--I don't think we've ever really discussed it as such. I think the others had

pretty good fraternity experiences also. People used the facilities with varying degrees of intensity. I don't remember--other than Chester McGuire, I think he was the director of athletic activities for his fraternity which was Tri Kap, Kappa Kappa Kappa--I don't recall that any of the others had offices or at least major offices in their houses. Maybe McGuire might have been a secretary at Phi Lam -- Robert McGuire.

BURNS: We've talked a little bit about alcohol on campus, kind of anecdotally, that's certainly an issue that comes up again and again in the history of the college.

DODDS: Sure.

BURNS: I'm wondering if you can kind of characterize the role of alcohol on the campus at the time when you were an undergraduate, especially kind of comparing it to the "Animal House" image or the perception of it that you had when you were a trustee or even the perception that you have of it today.

DODDS: Right. Well, a couple of general observations. I think the use of alcohol as a social medium was, looking back on it, I think it was just a given. It was out there. There wasn't even a lot of discussion about the legal age in the state, which was probably twenty-one; but, you know, fraternities were the major social units on the campus. So, if that were strictly enforced to the extent that you wouldn't even have people under age in the facility where alcohol was being served, there would have been very little social activity. [Laughter] What else would there be to do? So the reality of it, I think, was that you need the fraternities to provide some social alternative. They use alcohol as part of the social process and we accept that that is the social life that this limited rural environment provides. But it was more than that because you would have fraternities with--each fraternity, I think at some point during the academic year, would do a faculty/student cocktail party. So it was an opportunity to bring in the faculty with their spouses, do a little schmoozing and so on. But, again, it was in the context of a cocktail party. No one said, "Well, we really shouldn't be promoting the use of alcohol in this kind of a setting."

End of Tape 4, Side A – Beginning of Tape 4, Side B

DODDS: The use of alcohol was something that we accepted and promoted as a social medium at C&G [Casque and Gauntlet], which was a rather elite environment, the senior honor society. We had weekly, what we

came to call tinkle times, at which one or two faculty would be invited. Sunday afternoons, four to five or five to six, whatever we worked out. You'd invite a couple of faculty people week by week, tinkle time. Those who were around and, you know, interested in joining in, meet and have drinks, chat with them, little snacks and that sort of thing; but it was really a cocktail opportunity to get to know faculty on a more individual basis. I mean about the only thing that I can point to where we tried something that didn't specifically make use of alcohol in that kind of a social thing was the coffee hour at the Hanover Inn, which had limited success and which might well have been better received had we done it with beer or something like that. But obviously, you weren't going to get the Hanover Inn to go along with that.

But it was not an issue because I just don't think people saw the existence of any alternatives. So, as I say, it was just sort of there. It was a given. There were proscriptions. I mean those were clearly enunciated, so you had a series of "don'ts" that surrounded it and amongst those were the hours, they were strictly enforced by the campus police; no open containers in public areas on the campus; and, indeed, the ban on freshmen participation in fraternity life, even to the extent of going into, physically going into fraternities, except that freshmen who were dragooned because they were wearing beanies to carry furniture and that sort of thing. You could go in under those circumstances; but, beyond that, we were absolutely forbidden. Part of that had to do with making certain that we were not exposed to something for which the vast majority of the freshmen, at least even legally, would not have been ready. It was never really enunciated specifically as such, but I'm sure the college administrators had in mind that we don't need four classes that are exposed to drinking culture.

You had ranges of behavior. I'm not going to say that I'm so naïve as to not have witnessed and not have even to some minor degree myself, participated in high jinx, cut-up kind of behavior, much of it alcohol driven. And sort of the essence of the time was, "Look. We are living in a harsh environment. We are out here in the middle of nowhere. There is little or no alternative, what else is there to do but use alcohol as a form of recreation?" That ethos was out there and, that it was not challenged, I think is a reflection of the fact that the administrators probably recognized that there really wasn't an alternative. What would you do if you were to strictly enforce the state's regulations and so on? But I will say that the rules that were on the books were, in fact, enforced and my roommate was suspended from the college because of a rules violation and it was something that you really had to pay attention to, take seriously. Were there ridiculous

examples of behavior? Certainly there were. Were there houses that had worse reputations than others? No question.

Without casting too many aspersions on them, we were next door to a fraternity that was probably one of the worst in that regard and it was always a matter of concern to us, just the physical proximity of our fraternity to theirs meant that we were often subject to just some nasty things that would be done, very anti-social behavior. They weren't bad guys, but, you know, they had a habit as a fraternity of allowing things to really get out of hand and the truth is that that was the house, that happened to be the house that was the model for much of what was portrayed in "Animal House". People came to that conclusion because I guess one of the scriptwriters had been in that fraternity. So, I mean you just sort of--what would he have based his portrayals on but his own experiences. And those who knew that house knew that some of those things, as outlandish as they were, were not all that far off the mark. So it could get pretty rough.

BURNS: Did your fraternity have a particular identity on campus?

DODDS: No. We were an eclectic group. We had some athletes, but we weren't a jock house. We had some party guys, but we weren't--I don't even remember what the phrase was now...we weren't a heavy partying house beyond our keg streak. [Laughter] We had some chubbers, but we weren't, you know, the outdoorsy sort. We had some preppy types, but we weren't a preppy house. We weren't a—I'm trying to figure the right way to describe it, we weren't an elitist group. Some houses had a reputation of being very hoity-toity or whatever. We were not that. We were, you know, a lot of average kind of guys. We were not particularly brainy. I'd say we were pretty much a general cross-section of campus life; but, you are right in that there were certain--some houses that were typable and, whether they had athletes or socially-prominent people or rich people, you could pretty much mark them in that degree.

But we were willing participants. We were in there for the competitions. There wasn't anything that we would never try. They ran one competition one year which was right up our alley. They devised a quiz format and the competition was to come up with the answer first. It was somewhat trivia-driven, although they didn't call it that. So our team consisted of myself and the guy who had the next highest grade point average, so we had this pretty high-powered outfit. We got pretty far along in the competition. We had also worked out a very effective way because, what they had was a buzzer--two people

from one team would be on one side of the table and two people from the opposing team on the other, representing their fraternity. There was a buzzer between each pair. So, as you determined what the answer was and felt you had the correct answer, you would hit the buzzer. The first one to hit the buzzer got the chance to answer. So Ben, Ben Fuller [Lawrence "Ben" Fuller '58] was my classmate and my fraternity brother. We were doing this together. We devised a way of both putting our hands over the buzzer. In other words, I'd have my hand resting on the buzzer and he'd put his hand on top of mine. If I knew the answer, I would jam down. If he knew it, he would push my hand, so either one of us would then wind up ringing the buzzer and we thought we would be able to beat them, and pretty much, we did, until other people started copying what we were doing [Laughter] with the buzzer. But that gave us an opportunity to capitalize on the fact that at least we had a couple of guys who were fairly serious students and we did very well.

But we didn't have artistic people particularly when they'd have the intra-fraternity singing competition. We would participate just to get the entry points because, at the end of the year, the fraternity that had the most points for all of these various competitions would get some kind of an award, so it was always something that we would strive for, but we were never in the upper, upper bracket. But we'd give it our best. You'd get points for the ice sculpture that you do at Winter Carnival. The judges would come around and rate each fraternity's statue. So there were lots of projects and activities that you could get into and it was wholesome in that regard.

The one thing that we did not have as a--on anybody's agenda, nobody really thought of it--was community service. We didn't see the surrounding community and its needs at all. You know, we were there. We did what we wanted to do. We entertained ourselves. Whatever projects we had, fixing up the house and so forth, were for our benefit. And, maybe when the blood drive came around, that represented, I guess in our minds that represented community service because we would give blood for the local Red Cross. But beyond that, the whole idea of becoming involved in projects for local schools and helping out the handicapped... Oh, there was one thing, that's right. Who did this? Green Key or was it the Dartmouth Christian Union? Once, on a weekend, I think it was on Sundays, a group would go to the hospital and would read stories to the children that were hospitalized. That was, I can't remember which organization sponsored that. That probably was the closest thing to community service that was going on.

Tucker--the Tucker Foundation and all of its outreach was still to come. That was down the road.

BURNS: I sort of sidetracked the alcohol conversation a little bit.

DODDS: I guess the only other thing to really mention about those times was, I think in retrospect, it becomes apparent to me that what the college did not do was look on alcohol abuse as--that is to say the abuse by an individual of the use of alcohol as something for which there was some communal or college responsibility. The idea that this was an illness of some sort that deserved treatment, that people needed to be warned and instructed about alcohol abuse, never really surfaced. It was sort of, as I say, a given. This is an adult thing. You all are in an adult environment and you're expected to act as adults and it was pretty much left to people to carve out their own interaction with the availability of alcohol, set their own standards and so forth. I have no doubt that there were any number of people who were abusers of alcohol because of medical conditions, mental conditions; but to think it out, I don't blame the college. I just don't think the thinking at that time was such as to recognize the illness nature of it and to initiate some proactive measures and steps that would be ways of treating it.

You could order, and you could even do it in a dormitory, you could order kegs to be delivered from the sales people downtown, the store downtown, and the only criteria was "Do you have the money to pay for it?" So the notion that the age restrictions that the state has would be factors, that whatever policy concerns the college would have about the heavy use of alcohol, the importance of alternatives that were non-alcohol related, none of those were ever really on the table. I mean we sort of went along with a pattern that we found. It wasn't challenged. It wasn't ever a matter of discussion. There would be weekends that, you know, you might have some bad incidents that happened, someone gets caught violating a rule, no use of alcohol after hours, so they're made an example of. And as I say, those certainly were enforced strictly; but the use of alcohol per say wasn't really a subject of policy discussion or action at the level of the administration.

And, left to their own devices--I mean the fraternities weren't about to restrict what was the social medium of choice. It was the way in which the moods were created. This was how people entertained themselves. It was the rationale. If you didn't have a date, you drank. If you had a date, well, all the more reason that you would both drink. [Laughter] It was just out there. I don't know that we were any different than any other campus in that sense. I think it was a reflection

of the times. This was just an area that young people were allowed to use and abuse and so it went.

It probably began to get people's attention with alcohol-related deaths and things like that. We certainly had instances in which there were major road accidents of our students coming back from late night runs to Skidmore and so forth. There was concern in that context about students being forced to drive in these circumstances and possible use of alcohol; but, to my knowledge, there was never a showing that some of the bad accidents--in fact, one that affected several of my fraternity brothers, a car went off the road, icy road conditions, and the guy wound up with severe back injuries, head injuries and so on. But there was really no indication that alcohol was involved. But the idea that your social alternatives were to party here on weekends or to go to Colby or Green Mountain or wherever and then come back in the middle of the night, that was sort of the price of being in this environment.

I suppose the only things that you might say the college did promote were participation in mixers. Freshman year, there were these mixer dances that would take place at other schools and, as I understand it, I never took part myself, but, as I understand it, you would go, a bus load of people would sign up and go to Smith for ten dollars or whatever it was. And, since you were really a host, I'm sorry, you were a guest at the host institution, you were pretty much governed by whatever they had going and those women's schools, as far as I know, never really allowed any alcohol in those kinds of settings. That was about the only sort of non-alcohol alternative that really was available.

BURNS: Why don't we come back to alcohol later when you're a trustee, those years, and I think that probably sort of wraps up your undergraduate years.

DODDS: Okay.

BURNS: Then I guess it's not really the scope of this project, but I'm wondering if you could sort of outline the years between your graduation and I guess the early '70s when you start to become a little more involved with the college again.

DODDS: Right. Law school sort of speaks for itself. There was really no particular involvement except, as I mentioned earlier, I did come back for the first Winter Carnival after graduation after I graduated in January of '59. I came up with law school classmates, one of whom

was a college classmate and we had a couple of our law school classmates that were not Dartmouth people with us. I would say that I sort of kept in touch with the fraternity; but, as time went on, I had less and less interest in the things that were going on.

And once I took off for Nigeria, I mean I was basically out of the country and really out of contact except that I did two things that were tying me still to the college. I volunteered to be the class agent, for our annual fund solicitations, who would cover the world. In other words, I would try to solicit all of the classmates who were in different countries doing different things with very limited success, I should say.

[Laughter] I was just trying to write to people in Korea and all this stuff, it was a bit of a task. But I hit on the idea and I think it actually paid off in one or two instances that we probably had classmates who were nationals of other countries. In fact, our valedictorian was a student from Korea, who might have difficulty sending hard currency to the alumni fund, but that we should encourage gifts-in-kind. You know, maybe there were books and manuscripts and that sort of thing that they could send as a contribution to the college. I'm not sure where that went, but whoever I posed it to thought it was an idea worth pursuing, particularly in situations where there would be no currency that the people would have available to send.

While I was in Nigeria, the University of Nigeria installed its first president. The university was one of several national universities that Nigeria was planning. It became independent in 1960. I went there to work in '61 after I graduated from law school. So the president of the University of Nigeria was, in fact, the president of the country, Dr. Nnamdi Azikiwe, a very prominent man in African political history. He was one of the people who led Nigeria to independence and, when he was being inaugurated as the president, the college was invited to send a representative. It was often the case. I don't think universities do it that much now; but, with the installation of a new president, universities are invited to send academic delegates who then bring greetings from their institutions and they're usually in academic garb. So you have this long procession as part of the inauguration ceremony. Well, this was a big deal in Nigeria because, for the president to be inaugurated as the chancellor of this university brought a lot of the Nigerian press, so the political leaders from all over the country came.

I got myself, in fact, I was asked, since the college knew I was out in Nigeria--I was asked if I would represent Dartmouth at this ceremony. That was a blast. I got a chance to go by train from the north of Nigeria, where I was--this was taking place in the east, and spent a

long weekend at the university and stayed with a faculty member and, at the appropriate time in the ceremony, I had this scroll, which was Dartmouth's greeting, its academic greeting. The college was called and I marched up as Dartmouth's representative. And handed my greeting to the chancellor, who then properly shook my hand and said "Thank you" and tossed it into a bin in which he had about a hundred of these things, because all these schools had asked their African graduates to be the representative or asked Americans working in the country to serve as a representative. I don't know what he did with all these things. [Laughter] But anyway, it was a wonderful experience. That sort of gave me a Dartmouth role even while I was in Nigeria.

Coming back, I became a federal prosecutor and worked for the Department of Justice at the United States Attorney's Office in Manhattan. Really very little contact there. I'm not even sure if I made my first reunion, which would have been '63 because that would have happened just about the time I was getting back from Nigeria. I might have made it. I don't remember. But in any event, as these years went on, I then did a short stint at the Pfizer Drug Company and then went to work for the [Mayor John] Lindsay administration in New York and was the general counsel or deputy police commissioner for legal matters in the late '60s when we had our tenth reunion in 1968.

A number of us who were involved in municipal affairs, in fact Carl McCall, who was then a New York City commissioner in the human resources area. He, myself, and a couple of other guys who were active in that way gave a panel presentation for our alumni reunion in which we talked about our experiences in an urban environment, you know, with all the conflagrations going on because there were civil rights protests. It was the year that Martin Luther King was assassinated. It was anti-Vietnam. I mean the place was just going wild, all these demonstrations. You couldn't turn around, but something was going on somewhere. So, yeah, I was, being with the police, sort of right in the middle of it. That gave us a chance to really present what was somewhat unique in reunion experiences at that time because this was a serious panel in which we were talking about hard issues. "What is this country coming to? Look at what's happening to our cities and so on." In addition to all of that, I had been involved, very directly, in the takeover at Columbia University where the students protesting a whole range of things, including the war, including Department of Defense recruitment, relations with the Harlem community, all kinds of stuff. They had taken over the Lowe Memorial Library, held university administrators hostage for several days. So,

talking about that in the Dartmouth context really caught people's attention that this was stuff that could really strike fairly close to home.

But, up until then, reunions had not treated matters seriously. Usually the panels were, you know, what we had been doing for the last five years since reunion. Do you remember when, that sort of nice social light stuff. This was a hard-hitting analysis of what was going on, what the issues were, the really dire problems and the fact that much of the country was unaware of the unrest and the frustration in the inner city neighborhoods and all of that. We just laid it all out there. The audiences were stunned. You come up for a reunion. There's supposed to be a lot of this light bon vivant, "How you doing?" Backslapping. Here they were treated to some really hard-hitting real times social science issues brought live and writ large. So it was, I think, quite a unique experience for us all.

BURNS: It went over well?

DODDS: It went over very well. It went over very well because in their own way--I mean the classmates who came back were obviously concerned about the college and their own issues, but they knew enough to realize that life just wasn't more parties and having a good time. That there were some real issues out there and the fact that classmates were so intimately involved and were directly dealing with these was just riveting to them. And a number of them and especially the spouses said, "Thank you. We came, you know, to have a good time, and we certainly are having a good time, but this is important. We need, we, the generation that's coming along, and will eventually move into these leadership roles. We really need to be paying attention to this because these are the cities that we might be living in, might be living near, and so on." It was not long after that that...

End of Tape 4, Side B – Beginning of Tape 5, Side A

DODDS: As the late '60s, early '70s evolved, I was pretty much content with what I was doing. I was making my annual contributions, modest as they were, to the alumni fund and I think at some stretch in there I was a member of my class committee and had helped out as a class agent. I would send in the occasional item to the alumni magazine, but really didn't think much beyond that in terms of any role for myself. I was invited by Professor Eldredge to come up at some point in the late '60s. I mark it around the time of the Shockley business because that's what I remember as being the major campus item at the time.

BURNS: Which would have been October of '69?

DODDS: It might well have been. Yeah. I don't remember precisely. But Professor Eldredge was interested, you know, particularly in the wake of the alumni reunion panel and so on that I come and relate--I was still with the police department as the deputy in charge of legal matters--so he was interested that I come up and relate some of those experiences to classes that he had on urban affairs, urban issues. And I did so. I came up with my wife and we had one child at the time.

My classmate, Robert McGuire, Mick, as we called him, Robert Grayson McGuire III, was on campus as a member of the faculty beginning the Black Studies Program. He was a Ph.D. from Columbia. I think he got his Ph.D. in international affairs or political science, one of the two. He had spent some time in Washington, affiliated with Howard University and with a research organization called the Joint Center for Political Studies. So we had kept in touch because I was the classmate that--I wouldn't say I was the only one who stayed in touch with him, but we had maintained some contact. Especially now that I knew he was back in Hanover, I went up and spent some time with him around the point of my taking part in this class.

An evening prior to the Shockley lecture, I don't remember whether it was the day before or a couple of days before, there was an emergency meeting of the black students with McGuire because the students wanted to come to some collective understanding, as best they could, as to how they were going to respond to Shockley being there. I mean President Dickey had made clear that, you know, "This is a community in which ideas, even unpopular ones, are to be circulated freely and without repression and you can't have an academic environment unless you're open to the free fall of ideas." So Shockley was coming. Whatever protests there were, don't--withdraw the invitation wasn't going anywhere because the college, whoever had invited him--he was coming and he was going to be there. So then the issue was, "Do we do things that will prevent him from spewing this very hateful message?" Which people interpreted--I never read anything by Shockley, but the interpretation was that blacks and others of racial minority groups were inferior in some way, that they genetically lacked intelligence comparable to that of whites and, therefore, were worthy of whatever inferior status society assigned to them.

And the students went back and forth. I mean there were students who said, "The most effective thing we can do is just not show up.

Why do we dignify this by even being there?" Others said, "Well, we should be there, but we should show him our displeasure, so whenever it is that he's about to start, well then we'll start clapping and cheering and, basically, we'll disrupt his talk." Others said, "Well, then you run the risk of getting the community against you. People might react negatively to what you're doing. Why don't we just make a visible display of our displeasure and we'll stand and turn our backs to him? We'll be present. We'll not prevent him from speaking or even attempt to prevent him from speaking; but we will, by our witnessing, standing with our backs to him, we'll show the community that we are opposed to what he has to say." And they went back and forth.

There really was no consensus at all and, throughout, my classmate, he was sort of tortured because he's a member of the academic community so he has to support the idea that this is a forum for ideas; but the ideas themselves, he finds odious, so he's trying to find a way that he can register his own protest, but he's not sure what the students have in mind, makes any sense, for him. What does he do and what example does he give to them? It was a very trying time for him. It was just very taxing. I mean I could see that it was wearing on him mightily. I left, you know, the next day or whenever it was that I was slated to leave and Shockley, I guess, was due to arrive the day after or maybe that night. I really don't know what happened because I had to come back to New York and got caught up in the maelstrom of everything else that was going on. I really don't even know what the ultimate outcome was. I think, if my recollection of subsequent conversations and so forth--that the students elected to stand and turn their backs to him, those that showed up.

BURNS: It was actually the applause option.

DODDS: Oh, did they do that? Okay.

BURNS: He never had a chance to speak.

DODDS: Oh, is that what happened?

BURNS: I believe that the story is that John Kemeny and Leonard Rieser [Leonard Rieser '44] really wanted the students to let him speak so that they could then refute him. So it kind of divided the campus. There was also some talk that the S.D.S., Students for a Democratic Society, sort of pushed the Dartmouth Afro-American Society to take some steps to protest this. It was a time when there were a lot of factions.

DODDS: Yeah. Now you mentioned Kemeny and Rieser. In what capacities? Because he was not the president.

BURNS: No. Rieser was, I guess, I guess he would have been both provost and dean of faculty at that point. Kemeny, I think—I'm not sure why he was involved. It was, I think, a National Academy of Sciences meeting. I'm not sure that he was a member. I think Shockley was and I think that was the kind of hitch to it--was, their meetings, anyone who was a member who wanted to present a paper essentially could and that was how he got in.

DODDS: I see.

BURNS: So did you meet with any of the students when you were on campus to talk to them or was it mainly through your discussions with McGuire?

DODDS: Oh, it was both. I mean I went to this emergency meeting which the students had called, so I was there; but as an observer. I mean they knew that I was a classmate of McGuire's, but I really had no input. I didn't--I had not been a part of any of the conversation up until then so I really didn't have--I didn't really even have a point of view. I guess my sense of it was that, you know, "Let him talk. You know, this is a community for that purpose." You battle with ideas, but I was never invited to speak or to present a view. So I basically just sat with McGuire who, as I remember, didn't really say anything, or at least anything substantive, during that meeting. He might have had some exchanges with them later on.

I just felt so sorry for him because, I mean, it was difficult enough as it was. Here he was, a young academic trying to make his way into the profession. He had not yet gone to Washington and to Howard University. That was to come later. With all of the infighting and so on that would go on anyway just trying to get the department started because black studies meant nothing then. I mean it was this novelty. Was it a department? Was it a discipline? Nobody--none of those questions had been developed and, while he had his own, I'm sure, his own long-range interests and agenda academically, I don't know that he necessarily saw it in the Dartmouth context. As events subsequently proved, I think he was much more at home in a more urban kind of setting. He was originally from Washington, so the chance to go back there and to be involved with an institution like Howard, I think, was much more appealing to him. I don't think McGuire lasted here more than like a year and a half maybe.

But he did get the program up and off the ground. So the college, as it was then aggressively competing for minority students, could at least hold itself out as having a program that was established, although what academic weight it had, what appointments it could make, all of those were questions way down the road. This was just a fledgling effort to basically get something on the books, and I think he did about as well as he could under those circumstances of getting it started. He really didn't need this Shockley thing because it was like a--he's trying to get the department underway and here comes this thing. Of course, being one of two--I don't think there were more than two at the time--black faculty members, they turned to him. You know, that's the way it worked. It didn't matter what his discipline was or anything like that. He was an authority figure as far as the students were concerned, so they--and because he was doing black studies, they more readily reached to him than they did to Errol Hill who was in drama and the other black faculty member. So poor McGuire was on the spot and had to be the role model and all the rest of it for these students.

BURNS: That program, the Afro-American Studies Program and the Afro-American Center, those I think both were directly tied to the McLane Report in '68.

DODDS: '68. Okay. That's right.

BURNS: There's a couple of other things that happened in the later Dickey years, A Better Chance program, the Bridge Program. Also the Dartmouth Afro-American Society is organized in '66-'67, that academic year.

DODDS: As an undergraduate body.

BURNS: Right. Were you aware of these things as they were going on?

DODDS: I was aware of the McLane Report. I was aware certainly of McGuire's involvement in trying to get the program started and I guess part of that came about as a result of coming back for the reunion in '68 where there was a chance to be with him. I'm pretty sure he was here for that and to speak with Hill. I knew Errol Hill from New Haven. He was a graduate of the Yale School of Drama and, when he was there as a graduate student, I was in law school. So we knew each other and a mutual friend actually babysat--Errol and Grace Hill had twin daughters who have since gone on to greater things in the world. At that time, they were infants and my friend, who was a graduate student in history or government, did babysitting and once or twice I went along. So I got

to meet Errol Hill that way. And lo and behold, now I come back, you know, as an alumnus and here he is on the faculty. I had no idea that he was here on the faculty. So the fact that he was here and the fact that McGuire eventually came here gave me some pipeline as to those events. But I really didn't have any regular source of information and I was really quite busy with what I was doing so, yeah, I might hear things through either of them, but that was essentially how I sort of followed along with things.

But it wasn't until the opportunity came along to become involved in the recruiting process, the college admissions process, that I really then started to take more and more of an interest, more and more of a direct interest in current campus events. Even that was somewhat fortuitous. When I was at the United States Attorney's Office, a woman who worked as a telephone operator and I became friendly. She was a black federal civil servant, a black woman. And, once I left federal government service, I was still in the same geographic area of Manhattan and, one day, I'm out at lunch--she worked still at the federal court house--and we ran into each other and chatting about this and that. This would have been early in the '70s. I guess it would have been '71, the spring of '71, and she said that--maybe it was even the fall of '70, I guess, because the application process would have taken the better part of the year. She said--one thing led to another and the conversation turned to her son. Her son was this good student. Blah, blah, blah...basketball player...blah, blah, blah. And among the schools he was interested in was Dartmouth. So, at that point, my ears kind of perked up. I hear basketball--so I started chatting with her now a little more pointedly about this young man and her brother was a state judge who I knew.

What was happening was that Fordham--I think it was Fordham, Fordham or Georgetown--they were making a play for this student and, as far as the uncle was concerned, he really needed to be in an Ivy League--He needed the very best and his uncle wanted the very best for him, so the uncle summoned me, as a judge can do...[Laughter]. "Come on in. Let's talk about my nephew." The nephew was there, so I get to meet the nephew. The uncle said, "What can we do to get this guy--Dartmouth is your school. What can we do to help him along?" So—I'm trying to cut this down to its essentials--it turned out that the alumni interview--because Dartmouth was still doing the alumni interview routine. The alumni interview that--the student's name was Richard Jones, class of '75, it eventually turned out--he was slated for an alumni interview with a panel on which two of my classmates served. So I saw the names and I said, "This is a piece of cake. I

know these guys—[Thomas H.] Herb Schwarz ['57]. There was [Benjamin] Buddy Marks, class of '58. This is going to be no sweat.”

He goes for the interview, armed now with this knowledge that I know these--I don't know what happened. He, the student, says "Gee. I don't know. I'm there and they're asking me all these questions and I was a little flabbergasted." I guess, in his mind, he thought that since I knew them that the interview was just a formality now. He was just going to walk in there and they would go "Oh, you know Harry Dodds. Well then, that's it. You're accepted." [Laughter] They didn't, at least on the surface, accord him anything more or less than they gave anybody else.

So I asked Herb, I called him up. Hearing now this somewhat disturbing report, I called Herb. I said, "Herb, the judge's nephew..." I'm trying to build the guy up. "The judge's nephew came in for an interview. What happened?" So Herb says, "Well, you know, the kid just went flat on us. You know, he was not forthcoming. We gave him opportunities." I guess Rick froze--whatever happens in these interviews and he just didn't display his best and Herb says, "He just didn't show us anything. So we wrote kind of a middling thing." The report didn't damn him, but it didn't extol his virtues. I said, "How could that happen? How could that be? This is a great kid."

So finally Herb says, "Well, look, Harry. Rather than beat up on me, why don't you come and join us? Why don't you do this interviewing with us and then you can be there so when these kids, you know, who come from backgrounds where they might be shy, sitting suddenly in a business office and having to deal with these important-looking white guys. If they see you as part of the panel, then maybe that'll help them loosen up and give a better account of themselves." So I couldn't really argue with that because there we had a perfect example of how not being in an environment in which you could see something familiar might have affected this particular student negatively. Well, at the end of all of this, he did get accepted. I think I wound up writing a letter encouraging that and all the rest of it. So he was okay. He came and he had a fine career, wound up playing varsity basketball for a couple of seasons. He's now an attorney practicing in New York.

But I got now into this whole admissions thing. Now I'm attending these interview sessions and writing the reports for the admissions office and, in order to tout the college, you really have to know some of the details so that then became a spur to learn about what was going on, get a better feel for the environment and so forth. As I'm getting

more and more into this, now comes a call, so to speak, of a somewhat emergency nature, from students now in Hanover who are saying, "Hey. We need help. We're here in this environment. We're not sure what's happening with the Black Studies Program. We don't see the college hiring minority faculty and other administrators. Yet, we're just students, so we don't have, we feel, weighty enough voices to raise with them."

Now there had been protests and a lot of organized student activity wherein the students had--some of them, the more activist kind--had engaged the administration and had been debating about a whole series of demands for improving the Afro-American Studies Program, enhancing the number of scholarships, doing more by way of recruiting, hiring of faculty, bringing in more students, on and on, a whole list of things. But they were saying to us, "We're having these sessions with the administration, and we take over the occasional building and that sort of thing, but we're not sure that we're really getting anywhere. Why don't you all help us, lend your voice to what we're doing." We had a couple of sessions, hosted by Carl McCall at his apartment in Manhattan. It's a matter of record as to who was involved in those early things.

BURNS: Was it largely in New York?

DODDS: Oh, yes. Very much so. The students came down. They were undergrads. Wallace L. Ford ['70], Wally, I think, was the class of '69 or '70, Stuart Simms, who became a football captain, class of '72. There were a number of those students who were saying to us as alumni, "We need you all to help us. We know that you're out there, but we never see you. We never see you on campus. Whenever we see alumni, we only see white alumni. Why don't we ever see you black alumni taking part on campus in the meetings of the Councils and so forth that go on? We feel as though you're a resource, but we don't know who you are. We never are in touch with you. Please be more visible for us."

That then led to—I'm really compressing it. We can go back over various aspects of it, but that then led us to realize that we needed to have a coordinated approach. We needed to understand what the students were saying so there were a couple of sessions in which we heard them, questioned them, understood their concerns and then began to set up a dialogue with the administration and were very, very fortunate in that we could rely on a man who had been out of the college now for--I guess at that point it would have been over twenty

years, twenty-five years or so--and that was--he was then a judge in the New York State system--and that was Fritz Alexander II ['47], who was of the class of '47 or '46.

So he, to our great delight and relief, was willing to take the leadership role. I mean you couldn't very well not negotiate with a judge. This is a sitting judge coming up, you know, driving--and he was marvelous. We would meet at his court. He's trying a case and, on a Friday afternoon, you know, he recessed the case and we'd go pile into his car and he would drive. He would chauffeur us up here to these meetings with the administration. I mean it was just that he would take that much time, and it was just a wonderful thing. Just recently, the Black Alumni Association started a scholarship fund in his name. Fritz Alexander II Scholarship Fund, a memorial scholarship. So he was our leader. He was our spokesperson.

We would have sessions, many of them in the car driving up, trying to figure out what the strategy was. What is it that we realistically could press the administration on? Where were there likely to be visible points of progress? This was all done rather optimistically in a sense because we had no army. We were just the half dozen or so of us who went up to the meeting. I mean there weren't any troops behind us. We were just--supposedly, we were representing the black community, but the black community didn't know about us. [Laughter] To whatever extent there was a black community, they were scattered around the country because, at that point--now we're into the early '70s so there had been, at least since I graduated, a good twelve years worth of classes of alumni produced. So, in the back of our minds, we did understand that we needed to galvanize this body into something that was formal because we really had no standing other than the fact that John Kemeny was willing to sit down with us. We had no greater standing than a group from Chicago who could have called up and said, "We're black alumni and we want to come in and talk to you." So at some point we knew that we had to get this thing formalized.

BURNS: Did you mainly meet with John Kemeny?

DODDS: Yes. Oh, yes. John--I mean in that sense, it was, again, another rather marvelous thing that he found or created that amount of time because we would come up and there were--I mean I can't say that we always met with him all the time. I'm sure there were times that we were meeting with others, but he was the main one. He was the president. We knew that whatever was going to be ultimately agreed upon would have to have his stamp and his approval, so we set about

it, the process of getting this thing going and that would have been, I suppose, '71. It would get fairly thick and heavy. We would come up Friday and it might involve a good couple of sessions on Saturday and then there would be memos exchanged and phone calls solidifying what had been understood. Our concern--it was really two-fold. We just knew that the student grievances had to be dealt with. We took their side simply because--I mean we had no reason to dispute the student view that they were dealing sometimes in situations where there was insensitivity, that the curriculum offerings were shallow. They saw no role models. There was a need for more of a visible presence of black alumni. These things were not really disputable in that sense. It really seemed to revolve more around how do you now address these concerns. What is the best way to go about it?

End of Tape 5, Side A – Beginning of Tape 5, Side B

DODDS: What the college really needed to do was to get people on board who would follow through on what should be matters of priority and John Kemeny would say very loud and clear, "Yes. The welfare of the minority students was his concern. Yes. Bringing in more faculty was his concern. Retaining the faculty that was brought in was his concern. Increasing staff was his concern." "Okay. Fine. If everybody agrees that those are legitimate concerns, how are we going to work this out now? What do we do? What's to happen next?"

We kept pressing for, "Look. You've got to get somebody on board who's got authority to act on your behalf. You're not going to be out there doing the recruiting and doing the hiring of faculty and all that. You've got to have somebody at the top level of your staff, vice president, who's going to be in charge of a variety of activities." I mean we even went so far as to structure what the job would consist of. We had people--part of our delegation, people like Arch Whitehead, my classmate who was in executive recruiting--people who knew something about the way organizations function and so on. So we had a series of specifications as to what this vice president--I guess for want of a better title we called him the vice president, we assumed it would be a him, vice president for affirmative action. The college did not have its first female vice president at that point. Vice president for affirmative action and this was going to be somebody who would really ride herd on the hiring process. It would be somebody who could veto searches that were not seemingly complete. It would be someone who, while not necessarily having a role in the academic side, but would be at least a force that could encourage the expansion of

whatever faculty was necessary to move that Afro-American Studies Program forward.

Well, this went back and forth. There was a lot of argumentation. Of course, Kemeny was very, very hesitant, to say the least, about going along with this thing because you're talking about a major appointment. This is somebody who would be at the equivalent of a dean, dean's level, and John, as I subsequently came to appreciate, always had a problem with goals/quotas. He never wanted to be in a situation in which something was denominated as belonging to any particular group defined by race or ethnicity or whatever. That you would create a vice presidency to appoint a black person didn't--I mean that idea just didn't jive with much of what he felt philosophically. The selection should be, and then we agreed, it should be on the basis of merit. But as far as we were concerned, you could meritoriously find a black person to do the job. [Laughter] Every other dean or vice president you've ever had has been a white person. Now it's time to broaden the—and you can on the basis of merit, you could certainly go out and find somebody who's qualified in that sense.

As I say, this thing went back and forth. It would come up later, when I was on the board, really come up in connection with the Bakke Case before the Supreme Court because there was a whole thing about whether the college would sign onto the brief that was being done by the other Ivy League schools in support of the university that was being battled by Bakke. But that's another side of John's philosophy that we had to deal with. [Laughter] In any event, this thing went back and forth, back and forth. Finally there was a meeting at which, I mean we had pretty much laid it out. There wasn't anything more to be said from our side because, to us, that was eminently what had to be done. I mean there was just no other solution that we could see and John sort of said, "All right. I understand." We broke for lunch or there was some sort of a break and when we reconvened, John announced that it was agreed. There would be a vice president in a way that we had defined and it would be a position that would be filled--he would make his best efforts. He used something that gave him a little room there. But the understanding was clearly that it was going to be a position held by an African-American. Well, we rejoiced. It was euphoria. That's what we had been after, get a black vice president on board. There was great congratulations and celebrations, amongst ourselves that is.

Well, that was not the end of the story. [Laughter] Because—and now I have to speculate because a bunch of what I'm now going to say is

based on things that others have said later on and inferences from what developed. The summary memo affirming this agreement never came from John's office or from John. There was never this definitive statement saying, "Yes. The college will have a new vice president for affirmative action and all efforts will be made to hire a qualified minority person to staff the position." What I subsequently understood--again I say, it's by inference and second-hand comments of others that were made subsequently--when John went to the board and reported how this had evolved, this set of conversations with the black alumni, he ran into a stone wall because the fact was he didn't have the authority to create a vice presidency. [Laughter] Well, we didn't know that. We figured he was the president of the college so he runs the college. You know, what do we know? But there was something called the board of trustees. [Laughter]

He goes to the board and the board is populated by these corporate types--there was Ralph Lazarus ['35], Bill Morton [William "Bill" Morton '32] of American Express, all these guys, and they said, "You did what?" [Laughter] That black vice presidency just went away, it vanished, and we were sort of left with this vacancy, you might say. We really didn't know what to make of it; but, John, you know, he came back and said something to the effect that it was just not something that the board was willing--he had a way of explaining it, budget reasons, whatever it was that this was not going to be possible to bring about at this time. It was not that it was a 'no'; but it was that it just could not be done in quite the way we had formulated.

Now, as things developed, while all of this was going on and by way of negotiation with the college, we were also in the process of formulating this black alumni organization in a more formal way and the college was more than helpful in bringing that about. They made facilities available for us to meet, to use mailing lists, to begin to cultivate interest amongst the alumni, people going all the way back to the class of '13. So we were gradually beginning to pull this organization together and the culmination was the inaugural conference weekend in May of 1972 when, with the college's blessing, this group of black alumni came together and formally constituted the Black Alumni of Dartmouth Association.

So, the extent to which there had been disappointment with the outcome of this negotiation which probably extended through '72, even beyond the time that we were formed, was tempered to some measure by the fact that at least the college had shown good faith in helping us to become constituted as a group. I drew the assignment of putting

together the initial constitution and by-laws and went forward with that as an assignment. Our first year was underway and, not too surprisingly, our first chairman was Fritz Alexander, Judge Alexander, who had done so much to spearhead the initial conversations.

Now, again, speculation and so forth--I think what happened, from what I gleaned, is that having sort of slapped Kemeny's wrist with this abortive effort to create a vice presidency, I think the board felt that something was due to happen and, if not a black vice president, because these corporate types didn't like the idea, like I intimated before, that you would create something and give it to a person of a particular ethnicity or race, I think the idea became more and more current that it's time that the board membership of the trustees reflect the fact that, you know, there is now a growing body of black alumni. "They're beginning to take an interest more now than they had in the past in college affairs, so how can we accommodate that development? Isn't it time for us to broaden the board's membership?" So by whatever internal discussions and so forth, it was agreed to do so and, again, you have to somewhat smile because, while they would not have sanctioned the creation of a vice presidency for a black person per say, here, almost by uniform consent, there was an agreement that the next charter trustee, that is to say the trustee that the board, itself, could elect, would be a black alumnus.

The mechanisms were set as to how that person would be identified and so on. Again, I can only speculate that, when told, "Okay, John. You're not going to get a vice president; but we'll, you know, give the next board seat to a black alumnus. Give us some possibilities." While I didn't really know John particularly well, I did know him. I had met him through the Sterlings because, on some occasions of these meetings, since I kept up with the Sterlings, they would invite us to come over, and John and Jean would sometimes be there as guests as well. So, in a totally back channel way, I had become familiar with the Kemenys, and I can only imagine that that was helpful, that I was somebody that he knew in some dimension other than as an adversary across the negotiating table, because I was never a spokesperson. I might make the occasional comment, but it was always Fritz Alexander who was our spokesperson and so it was Fritz who would, if necessary, be the 'heavy' or be the person doing the cajoling and what have you.

Again, it's just what you learn after the fact--when Bill Andres [F. William "Bill" Andres '29], who was then the chair, visited me in New York, he called me at home on a Sunday, this must have been the

Sunday after the vote was taken, and identified himself and said he wanted to come into New York to meet me at my office. I am working in the old Municipal Building in Manhattan. Sort of a crummy building. My office was okay; but why was this corporate lawyer coming down? He said, "I'll take the shuttle. You tell me the day and I'll take the shuttle." I said, "My God. What is this man, this corporate guy, the chairman of the board is coming down to see me!" Now I had just agreed to leave city government to go--I had been with city government for six years--to go to work for the Ford Foundation. And somehow, in my mind, I'm thinking that he's coming down to discuss some job opportunity with me because he was a lawyer and he knew I was a lawyer. So I said to him, "Well, Mr. Andres, I just took a job with the Ford Foundation." I'm not even thinking about the board. He said, "No. No. I'm not coming for that." I finally asked him, politely, "What is this about?" So he said, "Well, okay. I'm not supposed to tell you but I'm coming to extend an invitation to you to become a trustee of the college." Well, I just about passed out. Totally out of the blue as far as I was concerned.

BURNS: Any reservations?

DODDS: About becoming a trustee? No, but I felt very unworthy, not that it was a reservation that made me doubt that I would accept, but having witnessed the role that Judge Alexander had played in all of this--I mean, to me, it would have been so logical that he would be the one. You know, he was class of '47. He would have been in the age group of a goodly number of the trustees at that time. After I'd finished speaking with Andres and had a chance to kind of recover, I called him [Alexander] on the phone and it was the most, one of the more difficult conversations I've ever had, because here I am, who was just a spear carrier, I'm telling the leader of the black group, the guy who had really gotten this whole thing off the ground and who had done so much, that they had called me to invite me to become a trustee. And he, always gracious and ever supportive, he congratulated me and wished me well. He said everything that one would hope that he would say, but I just cannot imagine that personally he didn't have some disappointment that that honor didn't go his way.

BURNS: Was he really the most visible?

DODDS: Oh, absolutely. He was our leader, because the only other black alumni of that era were people who were supportive, but they were not around physically. There was Lisle Carter ['45], who eventually became a trustee; but Lisle was the vice president at Cornell, so he

was all involved in that academic institution. And a lawyer in private practice in Washington, Charles Duncan ['46]--both of whom are still alive and are still well, we hope, knock on wood. Charlie Duncan was I think class of '45, '46 or so and, at some point after all of this, he became the acting dean of Howard's law school, a very, very prominent attorney in Washington. I believe he's retired now. But they were not active in the sense that Alexander was active. It was really the New York cohort of alumni who were spearheading this and Alexander, he was the leader. After his initial role in hosting the meetings, Carl McCall, who was an elected official in the state, didn't really take an active role with us. It was basically people who could spare the time. It was Garvey Clarke, Arch Whitehead, myself and some of the younger alumni. But Alexander was it. He gave us credibility because of his age, his stature, professional accomplishments and, fortunately for the college--I mean he subsequently played a role in the Hopkins Center. I think he was a member of the visiting committee of, not Hopkins, Rockefeller Center, and was recognized posthumously last year at the Black Alumni Biennial event for his founding role. In fact, the conference was dedicated to his memory. His widow was given an award and so on. Oh, no. He was it. He was clearly the...

BURNS: Do you feel he was passed over?

DODDS: Well, I can't believe that they would not have considered him because he was playing the role that he did. One could certainly say, from a standpoint of years of service down the road, it would be helpful to have a younger alumnus simply because, you know, the years that that person would give would more likely coincide with the periods of some professional growth that they would be experiencing. But in the end, I think it was the serendipity of being someone that the Kemenys knew. Lu Sterling... To this day, I will always believe that I knew Lu made a very significant difference. And, when Bill Andres did come down to visit, he said that, as they were looking around--he gave me the impression that they had a list. He didn't really say that specifically, but he said that as we were considering possibilities that he had gone to, he, Andres, had gone to John Dickey and, you know, explained what they were looking to do and that John Dickey had told him that I was the man. Since he and Andres were classmates, I mean, that would have been all Andres needed, that John Dickey had given his stamp of approval. That would have been fine by Andres and, as chairman of the board, that would have obviously had a lot of weight. And if Kemeny is coming with a similar recommendation, then that would be pretty persuasive.

BURNS: And was Lu Sterling working for Kemeny by this point?

DODDS: Yes. Yes. She was, I don't remember the exact title, Special Assistant or something like that. Yeah. Oh, yeah. Very much so.

BURNS: Now had there been anybody on the alumni council, an African-American on the alumni council by this point?

DODDS: I'm not sure. If there had been, it would have been Charlie Duncan because Charlie had kept up a fairly steady level of activity and certainly, as we galvanized this alumni group, he was one of the banquet speakers during the early years as was Lisle Carter. They lent their support in that fashion, but I'm not sure about that. As I say, if there had been, more likely than not, it would have been Charlie.

But that was a very, very moving thing that Andres did and he did it across the board. I mean a new trustee coming on under his watch, it was a personal invitation. He would go wherever that person was, California, it didn't matter. He would get on a plane and go and give a personal direct invitation to join the board and with it went his little speech, his encouragement to accept, of course, as well as the concept that you were there to represent the college community as a whole. That it was not a board made up of constituencies or people who had special interests that they were there to promote. Everybody was there to represent the college and not--things were to be done in confidence; but that they were to be done with the college's interests at heart.

He was just a very dedicated--I mean you just couldn't have a conversation like that with him for twenty minutes, half an hour, whatever it was, and it wasn't much longer than that. He came in, he did his number and then he was gone. He was back on the shuttle to Boston. [Laughter] A really remarkable thing that he used to do, but you just had the feeling, which certainly bore out, that you were about to take on an assignment of major proportions. Just the fact that he had come personally to ask you to do this was very overwhelming. And to be as relatively young as I was, it was really quite an experience because, at that time, I was thirty, thirty-five, about thirty-five, making me the second youngest member of the board.

End of Tape 5, Side B – Beginning of Tape 6, Side A

BURNS: Today is May 20, 2001 and I am speaking again with Harcourt Dodds, class of '58, trustee of the college from 1973 to 1983. You had mentioned that you wanted to go back and look at a couple of social issues.

DODDS: I did want to just touch on a couple of things. One, to correct something. I guess, as a lawyer, I am always concerned that the record be as accurate as possible. When we were talking about social activities of the black students, I mentioned that informally some of the men who were upper classmen when the class of '58 arrived in 1954 had something that they called the 30--and I mislabeled it the 301 Club as it related to Topliff. What it actually was--I just happened to be speaking with Garvey Clark, class of '57, last night. They had originally been living in the Middle Mass dormitory on Massachusetts Row and a couple of the black students had been in 302 Middle Mass, so that was where they used to congregate. They called that the 302 Club. They then relocated to New Hampshire Hall on Wheelock Street and I think fortuitously also wound up in Room 302, so the 302 carried over. But by the time we got to the campus, it was actually 302 New Hampshire. So that's where we would occasionally go for parties and so forth.

The other thing that I had wanted to mention which is really more of a personal note, but it sort of fits in with the theme. I had said that while my first year on the campus was not particularly active socially, that when I would get home, to New York, my school mates were, you know, helpful in inviting me around and so on. And it was really as a result of an invitation from Arch Whitehead, my 1958 classmate in White Plains, that led to my then meeting, although neither of us knew it at the time, the woman who was to then become at a later point my wife. She was Barbara Arrington from Queens and she was dating another classmate who had been invited to that--there was a college dance in Westchester--and that was Peter Eccles [Peter Eccles '58]. They had been friendly before he came up to the college, so she was his date and we had all agreed to meet at Garvey Clark's house in Brooklyn because Eccles had a car, so we needed a way to get up there, so he was going to give us a ride. So by us meeting and driving up together, I wound up meeting Bobby, as she was called, and a friend of mine from Fordham who lived in my apartment building in Harlem was also with us. But, as the years went on, we both were involved with other people. She went on and dated others, as I did. It wasn't until years later, as a result of a whole other set of circumstances, that we wound up meeting again and starting to date and so on.

The other thing I wanted to underline with respect to Lu Martin--it really is just illustrative, but I may not kind of have a chance to get back to it. And it ties in with the whole role of Fritz Alexander in getting the black alumni group started and that is, when Judge Alexander died--he had retired as a member of the New York Court of Appeals and had joined the administration of David Dinkins in New York as a deputy mayor because he and Dinkins went way back professionally and personally as friends. Dinkins hoped that he would be helpful. Alexander was a sitting judge at the highest court, so it just seemed unlikely that he would give that up, but he did. He resigned as a member of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York and joined the Dinkins administration as deputy mayor. So he pretty much wound up his active career that way and was of counsel to a law firm at the time of his death. But when he died last spring, April of 2000, plans were made to have a memorial service for him in New York at the Riverside Church.

When I heard that this was taking place and that people were being asked to participate, it occurred to me that it would really be very appropriate or very symbolic if the Dartmouth president could take part. Now this was on rather short notice. It's springtime and there are a lot of activities going on. I knew that, if this were to happen, it could only happen if somebody like Lu Martin could stage-manage it. So I didn't try to call President Wright. I didn't try calling any of the assistants in his office. I just called Lu. I said, "Lu, this is the situation. This thing is going to take..." I mean it was like maybe as many as ten days from the point that I called because it was only at that point that I had gotten the family's okay to see if the Dartmouth president could come. I mean I couldn't very well try to get him to come if the family didn't want him. [Laughter] But, no, they were very eager that such would take place if it could. So Lu got on the case and did whatever it is she does and, lo and behold, there was President Wright at Riverside Church with a marvelous set of remarks. I mean it was really very, very touching and it just elevated not only he personally, but the college in the eyes of what was a sort of a blue ribbon New York City audience. Really a very, very impressive performance.

BURNS: So Lu Martin's still a very effective power broker.

DODDS: Oh, for sure. [Laughter] Absolutely. Well, I mean, to take it even more recently than that, there was a dinner a week ago, I'm sorry, two weeks ago tomorrow in New York--two weeks ago tomorrow wherein all of the trustees emeriti are invited. It is a biennial event that John Rosenwald, who eventually became chairman, has done and I guess

this is the second or third of these events. Basically what he does is issue an invitation to all the Emeriti and their wives. He books a room at a private eating club in midtown. Arranges for the president to come and it's an opportunity for the Emeriti to socialize once again with each other and to hear the president just speak informally on the current state of affairs at the school. Issues that he knows will be of interest to them, what the plans are for the future, and in a very subtle way, it's a way to cultivate their continuing interest and support. No problem with that at all. [Laughter] Again, just to give you a sense of it, he's speaking at one end of the room and Lu gets up from her table, there are only about five or six tables with maybe eight people each, eight or nine. She gets up from her table and moves out of the line of vision of most of the people dining over into a corner and, from there, she's giving him signals to either speed up or to cut his remarks because she knows what the time table is and that this thing is expected to end at a certain time, etc.

BURNS: This is Jim Wright speaking?

DODDS: This is Jim Wright speaking to the trustees emeriti and Lu is over in the corner flashing him signals. And he acknowledges. He says, "I see Lu Martin giving me the cut sign. So, as you all know, Lu runs this." [Laughter] Everybody laughed. But it's true. I mean I can't think of anybody who is not an alumnus who has had more of an on-going role in the involvement with the college and, of course, soliciting major gifts as she does. She's always involved with the heavy hitters. It's really quite a story, quite a story indeed. So those were the things that I wanted to just reflect on before we got into the trustee side of it.

BURNS: I guess one thing I want to cover before we get into the trustees is John Kemeny's election.

DODDS: To the presidency?

BURNS: To the presidency.

DODDS: Right. Well, I was not on the board at the time nor was I involved beyond the Black Alumni, and whatever I might have been doing with my class. So, it was of interest that it happened, since he was someone I knew personally as a result of the Black Alumni activities. I was pleased that it had happened.

BURNS: Were you surprised?

DODDS: Wait. A correction. I did not know him at the time because this was 1970. I'm sorry. I was fast-forwarding. No. All of my getting to know him took place afterwards. No, because, I mean, my focus was elsewhere. I just was not as involved with the college as I was to become later. And of course, I was actually involved in the McLaughlin search as a member of the committee. No. I mean the news came out and it was interesting. I don't even know that I was aware at the time that he was Jewish, which made it noteworthy in the sense of it having been a first and that he was also, of course, a non-alumnus was of significance as well.

I only can say that, in later years, it was a topic that he would raise every now and again, usually in the context of, oh, maybe some general remarks about how you never can expect things to happen in life as you might necessarily predict, or how thrilled he was with the selection that was made. The thing that he would say, maybe not that he would say it publicly too often, it might have been just to groups of trustees informally--was how he and Jean would, almost like a parlor game, as the search was going on, and obviously he knew he was a candidate, they would list all the reasons why he would not get it. [Laughter] He said there were about fourteen reasons why he would not be chosen, foreign-born; not an alumnus; he was Jewish; he smoked; he was not an outdoors person, he had all of these reasons why the trustees would not pick him. Then, lo and behold, they did. It was a big surprise, big relief and obviously great elation and so on. No. In terms of the search process and all of that, I just wasn't on the scene. I was not really involved.

BURNS: Were you surprised that Dickey decided to resign?

DODDS: Again, no. I mean it was...

BURNS: He had been there for 25 years.

DODDS: Yeah. He had been in for a long time and, in those days, presidents had long tenure. My commencement featured Father [Theodore Martin] Hesburgh of Notre Dame, who I think at that point had been in office a good twenty years or so, you know. So it was not unusual that somebody would have served for a long time and, having served for a long time, it would not be unusual that they at some point would step down. But again, I was in New York. I was involved with the Lindsay administration. I really had a whole other set of things on my agenda. I wasn't really focusing, I don't even think I was involved with the admissions process at that point. I had come back for the ten-year

reunion, and I had come back because Professor Eldredge had invited me. But those were forays of limited duration and they really did not involve the college administration in any significant way. So, that Dickey resigned--I wished him well and so on; but, no, it didn't come as a big surprise.

BURNS: Then I would guess this next one is going to be in that same category. Which is right after Kemeny takes office, there is the Cambodia invasion and the Kent State shootings. My terminology may be off, but Kemeny essentially calls a strike, shuts down classes for a week. Were you aware of what was going on?

DODDS: It was a teach-in or something like that?

BURNS: Yes.

DODDS: Yes, I was aware because we were getting the reverberations in New York; but you know, the things that were happening there were a lot of street protests, demonstrations and I'm involved with both the police and, at some point, I moved over to the New York City law department and we were dealing with issues that were of parallel nature. For example, a lot of the churches in New York declared themselves to be venues for sanctuary for draft resisters. So anyone who, as a matter of conscience, did not want to serve in the military could seek safe haven in these--a lot of prestigious churches, on Park Avenue, and all these places. And they importuned Lindsay as well as the police to recognize their right to give sanctuary. Basically, they were saying, "We want to be treated as the medieval monasteries that granted sanctuary to people who had gotten in trouble with the king" and so on. And "Would you recognize our right to do so?" Well, I mean, this is not the medieval period. We're in the twentieth century. [Laughter] So there was a lot of that back and forth.

That was what I had to contend with and the fact that this was going on was--I guess I saw it as predictable because it was happening at a lot of other colleges as well. Since I had no particular involvement personally here, I didn't really have as much of a reaction to the fact that it happened, except I guess looking back on it, I was glad that the administration was at least sensitive enough to the student concerns to have taken such a step. Beyond that, I really didn't have any point of view.

BURNS: One other issue that comes up before you come on the board is obviously a big one in the history of the college and that's the vote to

go coed. Were you, as an alumni--was there much debate in the New York alumni circle about this?

DODDS: There might have been. I don't remember any and I don't remember that I was involved particularly. I would suppose that there might have been some presentations at the Dartmouth Club at the time. The Dartmouth Club, I'm not sure if it was, I think it was probably only an eating club at that point. There was a time way back when there was actually a facility that was the Dartmouth Club and it sort of got reduced to an eating club once a week. But I guess I was aware of it through the alumni magazine, the various issues and so on. I didn't participate in it myself. I didn't, as I say, I really didn't recall anything particular.

BURNS: Do you remember your impressions?

DODDS: Yeah. I think my sense was that we were, it was probably time to make that step. I had been at a junior high school, and my public high school in Manhattan had been all boys, all male, at the time I had gone, and in subsequent years, they both became coed. So, I mean, it didn't strike me as being anything that was against the order of nature that the college would go coed. Having gone from here to law school that was coed, although the Yale undergraduate had not gone coed at that point, law school, graduate schools were coed. You know, it was nice. Suddenly there were women in the classroom. I had no problem with it at all. [Laughter] Thought it was a good idea.

BURNS: No reservations about the changing character?

DODDS: Again, I just wasn't so involved as to have a stake in what the old Dartmouth had been because I knew what its limitations had been and then you have aspects... No. It really didn't faze me at all.

BURNS: Where we sort of left off yesterday was Bill Andres had come down to see you and asked you to join the board and given you a bit of orientation.

DODDS: Right.

BURNS: I think we were talking about the commencement.

DODDS: The first commencement. Basically it was an opportunity to come and I probably sat in on some meetings, maybe some of the committees. I really don't recall now; but certainly for the dinners and the public

events, I was there and had a chance to meet the other trustees socially. Not being technically on the board, I did not march in that commencement of '73, but I'm sure I attended it and then the events afterwards. So it was fine. It was a way to get started. In those days, there was no summer retreat. That came later, so my first official meeting was in the fall of '73 and it was fairly quickly apparent that we were still very much dealing with the coeducation issue because it was, or had produced any number of campus issues that continued through those years of the '70s and ultimately culminated in changes that were made both in the administration, itself, and in the way the admissions process was managed. Shortly after, maybe it was contemporaneous with my joining the board, Vice President Adams [Ruth Adams] was-- well, I guess she was something of a consultant initially.

BURNS: Ruth Adams.

DODDS: Ruth Adams. Then she is appointed a vice president, maybe by '74. I just don't remember the sequence; but it was fairly soon, I know, after I joined the board. That was certainly helpful because it gave a visible presence in the administration, senior ranks of the administration, of a woman. And it was an opportunity for Kemeny to have somebody who could go out and deal with the various concerns at the ground level that the women students had. What had to be dealt with were issues of equity in the way the admissions process was administered as well as issues of acceptability or attitude as reflected by significant elements in the remaining male population. And much of this was related, on both sides, to this quota formula that had been worked out that Kemeny felt was necessary in order to sell the idea.

John was--it always seemed to me that he was haunted in a way by this mythic Dartmouth figure, this historic Dartmouth figure of the outdoors, the hail fellow, well met, the traditional fraternity type, all of that. All of which was not anything that had to do with his background. [Laughter] He always was concerned about playing to that audience. I mean he never wanted to be owned by that audience, but he was aware that it was out there.

Since I wasn't around, I can just imagine that moving forward with the idea of making the school coed, which you had to do for competitive reasons, I mean everybody else in the Ivy League was. Some were already coed to begin with; but those who weren't, they had their companion schools to turn to or, you know, it was not too difficult in the case of Yale to start siphoning in the Vassar and the other Connecticut College types that would have qualified for admission. I'm sure at

some point somebody agreed or suggested to him that, if you could hold the number of males at a fail-safe level that would sort of guarantee you enough diversity in the male population so that you could still have strong athletic teams, you could still populate the fraternities. You could still do all of the things that were of historic importance, such as that might be. Then you could still make your play for competition by having a significant number of women, twenty-five percent, whatever that number turned out to be, if it was a 3:1 ratio, and carry it forward.

I can't believe that he or any serious thinker of college admissions and administration believed that that would always be the case. So I think what he had to do was sort of sell the idea that, "This is the way we're going to do coeducation and Dartmouth's historic strength will always be preserved, because there will always be a significantly larger number of men here than women and we'll do year-round operation so that we won't have to build new facilities. We'll make use of the place as it is. Obviously we'll have to expand to some extent to accommodate the women athletes, because we don't want to drop..." See, a part of it was we're not going to drop the male strength. So, if you are going to add the women and keep a 3:1 ratio, something's got to give. "We're not going to have money to run around building new buildings, so we'll run the place year-round." I mean that was a brilliant stroke. You could increase the population, bring in women, change the character of the place, not build any new buildings and keep chugging along. Wow. Only a mathematician could have figured it out. So, on paper it seemed okay and obviously the board approved.

When I come along now, this thing is in place, but it was not too long--I just can't remember when we began to really catch it with the women who were here starting to say, "We're being treated like second-class citizens. All right, we're coed. But what's this thing with the continuing harassment and the way we're treated socially? We don't have social outlets. There are all these fraternities. We don't have anything that we can rely on. They're making fun of us all the time." It culminated, I mean the worst of it was--I think I alluded when I was talking about our various fraternity competitions that there was, every spring—maybe they still do it, on the steps of Dartmouth Hall, fraternity singing competitions. Each house will make its presentation, usually singing its own fraternity song and then a medley of other songs as well. One of the popular songs turned out to be this "Ode to Cohogs" I don't know. It was some takeoff on something in which...

BURNS: "This Old Man"?

DODDS: Right. McDonald's Farm. That's right. It was a takeoff on "Old McDonald had a Farm." Then the whole thing about cohogs, which was a send up of coed and then these cohogs were part of McDonald's farm and on and on it went. Well, let me put it this way, it didn't get any better. That the nature of the lyrics got worse as you got into it. So I mean the women were just absolutely devastated by this thing. They were threatening to leave. I guess some did leave. I mean it was bad.

BURNS: Do you remember, I think part of the story was, I'm pretty sure this is correct, that Dean Brewster was actually in the form of a judge or in some capacity?

DODDS: I was getting to that because, with some reluctance, I have to report that Carroll was found to be an instigator and supporter of this parody and I don't remember, as you say, it brings back some distant thing about his involvement with The Hums, which was what the competition was called, and Kemeny did report that to the board that one of the things that made it so difficult for him to deal with this thing in some decisive way was that the dean, his dean of the college, was somehow involved and was singing along or was encouraging all of this. In addition to also being seen periodically, now I'm only reporting this, it's pure hearsay, but that the dean was seen to be on fraternity row in some of these late night partying events and so on.

End of Tape 6, Side A – Beginning of Tape 6, Side B

DODDS: Yeah. That sort of an administration-student contact was beyond the bounds that one would normally expect. So that created a very difficult dilemma for Kemeny and it sort of limped along for a while. But it became clear. He basically said to the board, "Look. I just can't continue to try to be positive and supportive and to ask Ruth Adams to be positive and supportive and so forth of our efforts with coeducation if, right within the administrative family at a very high level is somebody who seems to be working in the other direction. What kind of a team is this?"

BURNS: And Brewster had been hired by Dickey?

DODDS: Oh, yes. Well, that was part of the thing. Again, John [Kemeny] always seeming to play politically to this traditional Dartmouth thing, saw Brewster I guess as a continuation of the Dickey tradition and the Dickey years. And Carroll is that hail-fellow type and would have been up at Moosilauke. He was into the mold. The only thing Carroll didn't

have was a Dartmouth degree. He was a--because he went to Yale undergrad. I met him in law school. I mean he was "to the manor born", except that he hadn't been born here. He was born in New Haven. But he was like a Dickey reproduction. Here he was, the only thing that he didn't have, as I say, was a little green blood. So John, I think in a sense of carrying on tradition, link to the past--"I'm not shaking things up too much here. I've still got the old team on board"--went along with it. It just really began to disintegrate around this coeducation thing. So it came about that, lo and behold, a presidency emerged down at Rollins [College], I think it was, or wherever. Carroll was off to do that and so that then freed John to turn to Ralph Manual and bring him on and begin to really move things. At least when you go out to the campus, the tenor of things on the campus--to try and really improve things.

Now, unfortunately, while all this was going on, the black students were also saying, "Hey. All right. So we're here. Now what? We're in distress." Whatever we, as alumni, had been able to do had only gotten them so far. Errol Hill was the affirmative action officer, but it was a part-time assignment. He continued his role in drama. And the black students said, "There are some very serious problems here. We're losing students. People just come here for a year or two and it's so unsupportive and it's so difficult for them socially. There are problems of academic transition, problems of lack of role models. I mean the whole gamut of things. This is just untenable." Three of them, three women, put together a very detailed analysis of the situation. It became known as the Redding Report, named for [Judith Redding '76]--I forget her first name. But she was one of the three undergraduate women who did it, all black women. Karen Turner ['76] was another of the authors. I can't remember who the third woman was, but the woman whose name was affixed publicly--the popular title of it was Redding, whose father was a very prominent civil rights attorney, Saunders Redding, a man who had been involved in the desegregation litigation leading up to the Brown case before the Supreme Court. So, this thing was coming with some weight behind it because it was apparent that when you read it, that they had been helped along the way. Not that they couldn't have done all that themselves, but I mean it was clear that they had consulted widely and were able to fashion issues in a way that was reflective of a lot of the current thinking, civil rights and so on. So this lands on our laps as well.

BURNS: On the laps of the trustees?

DODDS: Yes, because it was presented to the administration. "This is our set of grievances. This is our list of concerns." Kemeny was looking for some way to move to the next step. When I say "landed on our laps," I mean it was something that was reported widely and obviously he would report it in his reporting of things that took place between meetings. So what he did was, I thought constructive. He enlisted the dean of the Tucker, the William Jewett Tucker Foundation, Warner Traynham, class of '57, who was now the same Warner Traynham that I had looked up to as an undergrad and who had, as a matter of fact, taken part, as I may have mentioned, in my wedding ceremony because he became an Episcopal priest and my wife and I wanted to have a black clergyman take part when we got married. So here's Warner now--he had eventually moved to Boston. I think he was an Episcopal parish priest in Boston and, when the search was going on for the Tucker Foundation, college chaplaincy, myself and a number of others had suggested his name. One thing led to another and so here was Warner on campus.

And he was given the role of basically looking to see what could be done to implement this Redding Report. What is it that they had presented that's valid? What then, assuming that this validity is documented, what do you then do to implement changes to deal with these conditions? So he--I think he had some members, a committee who worked with him, faculty, students, and staff. They held hearings. They did a variety of things to build a record. He produced a report now to the trustees as to what--where do you go next? What do you do next? The Redding Report had made many references back to the McLane Report of the late '60s as did Traynham's eventual report. So you now had sort of a sequence of three major documents, McLane, the Redding Student Report, and now Traynham's report of his committee's findings and recommendations.

With that, I guess that might have been '77, '78, somewhere in there, there were a number of things set out having to do with recruitment. How would you upgrade the admissions office? What needed to be done by way of the Bridge Program, a program during the summer that would help students who were academically deficient so that they would be ready for the September. I mean you'd recognize that they had the potential, but probably didn't have the study skills and so forth to really succeed at the college level. What could you do to support that? What cultural, social and other supports would be helpful in making their initial years welcoming and supportive in a way that would encourage them to stay because the attrition was a very serious

problem? The school was doing a good job of attracting people, but was losing them, just losing lots and lots of students.

So all of those were addressed and, you know, somewhere along the line, I am sure there was a set of recommendations to continue support for the alumni efforts, organization and involvement. So those were all positive steps. Unfortunately, by the time his report came out, the authors of the Redding Report had graduated and moved on. I mean that's the nature of college generations. They're only four years in length. But I do know that Karen Turner [Karen M. Turner '76] has remained active over the years as a member of the Black Alumni and so, to that extent, I'm sure she's been able to take note of changes, positive changes that have been made.

BURNS: Were these two reports exclusively regarding issues affecting the African-American population or were they looking at minorities, Native Americans, in general?

DODDS: The Redding Report was concerned with African-Americans and, because of who they were, they also highlighted some issues of particular concern to the African-American women. But it did not go beyond that. There was no Hispanic population to speak of at the time and the Native American concerns, there may have been tangential allusions to them, but it had been so much the focus of the commission that Kilmarx [Robert Dudley Kilmarx '50] had headed. No one believed that the problems were solved, but they didn't think it was necessary, I'm sure as they looked at it, to address those concerns again, because they had already been looked at by the college in some depth.

And following on that, the work that Traynham did, again, was focused on African-Americans. I am almost certain that he dealt to some extent with the particular issues that would have affected the women, but nothing of any originality in regard to Native Americans. If anything, there might have been some discussion of the symbol issue as an illustration of how difficult the climate was. The fact that the college had taken steps to discourage use of the Native American symbol, but still you had elements that were fostering it and continuing to stir that up as an issue meant that there was something dealing with color that was always out there in a negative kind of way. I'm sure both reports might have made reference to it in that context. It was just part of the environment that was making things difficult for other students of color.

BURNS: I want to take a half step back and ask you, when you came on the board, were there specific issues or things that you wanted to see accomplished by the board?

DODDS: Well, I was very much concerned about the status of the African-American student population, faculty hiring--in other words, the issues that had been part of the discussion of our Black Alumni group were very much in my consciousness because those were the things that I had dealt with and had, you know, a fair amount of familiarity with in terms of how the college was moving. I was very concerned about faculty recruitment, staff recruitment, and it was helpful along the way that appointments at the senior level were made that I thought were very positive for the school.

In other words, at some point, we had LeRoy Keith join the administration as, he might have been an associate dean, initially, of students. He basically worked for Manuel or was it initially Brewster? I don't remember when he started. But LeRoy was out of the southern education tradition, a professional administrator. He had--I forget where he was before he came to Dartmouth; but he was very, very effective and, in our early activities as black alumni, he was very helpful. He was like the campus contact that helped us set up some of the early association meetings and really helped us in many concrete ways to get started. So the fact that he was here was a great positive. There was a woman in admissions, Candy Cornelius, another person to whom the black alumni could turn, and I felt comfortable in relying on as a trustee, just for feedback, for information on how things were going on the recruiting front.

But, yes, those were issues of concern and then, while it wasn't foremost on my mind joining the board, I mean I quickly developed an interest and a concern in how the college was handling its role as an institutional investor and what we were doing on the matter of proxy votes on social issues as a result of our stock ownership. So it wasn't too long before I wound up being involved with the Trustee Committee on Investor Responsibility.

BURNS: Was the main issue there the South African divestment?

DODDS: Not initially. Not divestment, initially. The main issue was, with regard to South Africa, with regard to environmental concerns, with regard to employment issues, in regard to anything, "Would the college, in fact, vote its proxy?" Because there was an attitude on the board, especially among its corporate types, which said in effect, "Look.

Management is hired by the shareholders to run the company. The managers are the professionals. If a proxy issue is presented and management says, "We recommend a no vote because we'll clean up the environment on our own. We don't need shareholders, through a proxy resolution, telling us that we should be environmentally sensitive. We'll do that. We're managers. We'll take care of it." And the people on the Dartmouth board who held those kinds of positions in real life said, "Yeah. That's right. We don't want these people telling us what to do...these people with their beards and their sandals and stuff. We're the managers. We know how to run..." So the whole attitude was that we don't vote these proxy resolutions. We go with what management recommends.

A bunch of the early efforts that the investment committee was involved in was just securing the idea, just advancing the idea that it was all right if you hold shares to vote against management. Management is not sacrosanct. That there may well be issues raised by shareholder groups, the churches, the convents, the people who are out there trying to raise social issues that management may not have thought of, that present issues from a different perspective and that really reflects a sense of public concern about the well being of workers, the well being of communities where the plants are located and so forth, that is more correct and more proper than what management has advocated. Well, these corporate--it was the attitude of the Investor Relations Committee, which was made up of faculty, staff, and some trustees--that's the way the trustee committees were populated--that it was better for the college to use its leverage as an investor to help advance concerns that were consistent with the college's mission. I mean it wasn't that we were advocating that capitalism be abolished or that, you know, these plants self-destruct or anything like that; but, consistent with the desire to make profits, to provide goods for customers and all that, that you could still agree to pay your workers decent wages, that you could agree to keep the environment clean and so on. So that was really the kind of concern.

South Africa was part of that mix because the issues that were raised by some of those early proxies had nothing to do with divestment because it was shareholders who were saying to the corporations, "We hold shares in stock and we want you, the corporation, when you deal with South Africa to agree not to sell tanks to the government. We can still be there. We can still be profitable, but we don't want you dealing with the military. We don't want you supplying arms to the police and that sort of thing."

BURNS: More along the lines of constructive engagement?

DODDS: Exactly. You use your position within the organization to foster change and to get the organization to do things that are consistent with human rights objectives and concerns. So divestment was not really an issue for us at the outset because our investor responsibility role assumed that we would be trying to exercise our role as a shareholder to influence the company's behavior. Obviously, if you divest, you surrender your citizenship, so to speak, so you're no longer in the game to try and make those changes. So it was really more a matter of, "Can the board agree that it will take a position by voting these proxies?"

And a complicating factor throughout all of this was John Kemeny's attitude, because John had the problem of--I shouldn't say he had the problem--his view of the institution as an institution of higher learning was that it is, in its finest tradition, it is a community of ideas and a community of positions and a community of attitudes, so that it is inconsistent with that view of the college to say that the college would take a position. I mean how could you say, even if the position was one that he agreed with, how could you say that "It is the position of Dartmouth College that apartheid," let's take apartheid since we started with it, "that apartheid is wrong when it is the view of a variety of people that historically there may be reasons for it. That there are opportunities that can evolve over time that might justify a separate development philosophy for the different populations in South Africa?" I'm not suggesting that he would have believed that, but I think his attitude was that others might believe it so "How can you, the college, shut off that point of view by announcing that you have taken such and such a position and presume to speak for everyone in the college community."

So he was not an easy supporter of the idea that the institution would take a position, be it by way of proxy votes or not. In fact, he even produced a monologue, I'm not even sure if it was published, but it was a paper of some length that discussed why the college should not take a position on issues. I mean he said, "Fine. Look, I'm the president and I can stand up before an alumni group or a public group. I can speak as me, John Kemeny. These are my views; but I can't presume to speak for the college and announce that Dartmouth College is opposed to apartheid or is opposed to the war in Vietnam or whatever because that would be trying to speak for the entire institution and I don't have any authority to do that, nor does anybody else have that kind of authority in an academic community as he would view it." He

saw voting proxies as being in that same vein. So it was a tough call and we would have proxy resolutions that would come up that were supported by the--there was a group in New York, the Institution, I can't remember the exact title now, but they're a research group...

BURNS: The I.R.R.C.?

DODDS: Yes. The Institutional Research something or other. I don't remember...

BURNS: (Investor Responsibility Research Center)

DODDS: Something like that. Right and they would scope out the different positions on proxy resolutions and sort of lay out the pros and cons on different positions and so on. So their work was very valuable to the committee. We were a subscriber for all the time that I was involved. Then our committee would take its vote and recommend how the college should vote its shares and we'd come to the trustee votes and it was not a slam-dunk. Some of those votes did not survive. The board would not go along with committee recommendations, which created a lot of disappointment because there was a lot of hard work done. The faculty and the students would really dig into it. They'd do their own research in addition to the research that was done by the I.R. R.C. And then to have the trustees not adopt the recommendation, it was sometimes very demoralizing.

So we kind of struggled along like that and then, increasingly, South Africa would be on the horizon more and more and more until we got to a point where it was the position of several of our sister institutions, I think Amherst might have been one of the very first to do so, that they would adopt as a standard for their investment decisions and continued investment holdings in corporations that were doing business in South Africa, whether or not those companies adopted the Sullivan Principles of corporate behavior. Which pledged non-discrimination in the hiring, fair treatment for workers of all races, providing appropriate accommodations and educational support and community outreach and so forth--not complying with any apartheid directives of the government, a whole range of things that sort of defined what a responsible corporation would do in an apartheid context.

So our investor committee got into the discussion as well and, at our meetings, more and more of the attention focused on whether the college should adopt the Sullivan Principles as an approach. And the initial conversations at the board level--because I'm the chairman now

of our Investor Committee and I realized that the board really had to be sensitized to this. So, even before a resolution came, I tried to at least put on the agenda for discussion the fact of these Sullivan Principles, what they were and, you know, at least to get the board thinking and aware of that. It was an educational process because there were again the corporate types who--it was very interesting. They had almost, it was almost like denial. They had--which is not a term I particularly like to use. Here they are in the corporate world themselves. They sit on all kinds of boards and the Sullivan Principles was widely discussed. I mean it was stuff you would see in the *Wall Street Journal*. Leon Sullivan was a board member of General Motors. So I mean this was not, this was no fly-by-night board member. This guy has got some prominence. He comes up with these principles. General Motors is part of the process, so they're buying into the principles; but yet, the corporate types feigned, I shouldn't say feigned, they really didn't seem to know anything about it. "Oh, yeah. I've heard about this Leon Sullivan. What's this about again?" [Laughter] So you sort of had to bring them along.

All right, so now it's a matter in the consciousness; but, again, the attitude is "I don't like people telling management what to do." These Sullivan Principles are sort of telling management, "Okay. When are you going to do this and you are going to do that? Who are these shareholders to come along..." It was that old argument about the need to leave management alone. Let them do what's best. Let them do what they know to do professionally. Well it all came down to--I mean there were lots of intermediary steps along the way--but it basically came down to a vote at a board meeting in New York--held in New York because I think there had been a particularly bad stretch of weather that February or January, whenever it was, the early part of the year--and...

End of Tape 6, Side B – Beginning of Tape 7, Side A

BURNS: We left off at a meeting at the Federated Stores.

DODDS: Right. This was a board meeting. I don't remember the year, but it would have been late '70s.

BURNS: The rough winter sounds like '78.

DODDS: It may well have been. The issue was then joint because, on behalf of the Investor Responsibility Committee, I had advanced the resolution and it was seconded that the college adopt the Sullivan Principles as

our standard for determining whether we would continue holding investments in companies doing business in South Africa. The ensuing discussion pretty much went along party lines. The corporate people, and by that I mean, I don't know that specifically they were at this meeting, but the point of view would have been one held consistently by Bill Morton, George Munroe and Ralph Lazarus, of course, that it really was not the college's place to issue these kinds of edicts and to set these kinds of standards. That management was well suited to make the best judgments as to how companies should run and institutional investors should be content to support management. If you didn't like what management was doing, then you get rid of management. But you don't try to tell management how to do its job. And on the other side, the—I'd say the consistent support for a position such as was being advanced by the resolution would have come from people like Kilmarx and Berl Bernard ['51], Don McKinlay [Donald C. "Don" McKinlay '37], an attorney out of Denver, Dave Weber [David R. Weber '65]...

BURNS: It sounds like the lawyers were, other than Dave Weber...

DODDS: Other than Dave Weber. Yes. Although I don't think simply being lawyers is what governed it. I think it probably had more to do with political inclination and attitude. But, if Kemeny had been consistent--I mean just the way the numbers fell out at that meeting--there were only ten trustees present. I do not, aside from Lazarus and Kemeny, I don't specifically remember who else was there at that particular meeting. But the way the numbers were running, if Kemeny had held to his off-stated view, we would have been five and five on that resolution, which would have meant it failed. So the vote was called and [Laughter] I was looking at Ralph and, out of the corner of my eye, I see that Kemeny, with I think a little bit of a hesitation, but he voted with the 'ayes.' So--without comment--so that carried the Sullivan resolution six to four because the four negative votes stayed that way. They weren't about to change.

I never really discussed it with him afterwards, but I think John might have just weighed the political consequences because, if we couldn't have adopted the Sullivan--I mean this was so middle of the road by the time we got around to it. The rest of the Ivy League, I mean everybody had adopted the Sullivan Principles. It was like *de rigueur* among forward-thinking institutions and for Dartmouth to have not done it--I know that John would have caught all kinds of hell when he got back to Hanover, so that resolution carried.

To that extent, it bought us some time. The political groups, the advocates for divestment would not have been placated. I mean we all knew that; but at least this was a way of saying "Okay. We now have a way of keeping companies in line, measuring what they do and we can then make a judgment. You know, if it's obvious that X Y Z Corporation is not promoting it's African workers fairly; if it's not providing adequate housing; if it's not doing what the Sullivan Principles indicated—and I.R.R.C. and others were setting up monitoring mechanisms to see how companies were doing because so many institutions had adopted the Sullivan Principles as their standard. There would be others out there to pretty much do the work for us. "Then we can visit the question again and decide company by company whether to withdraw our investor support."

I'd say to the majority of the college community, it seemed like a reasonable outcome and was accepted as such. There was an element for whom even that was not satisfactory. But, there was just no way to placate that group, short of divestiture. And it pretty much stayed like that through the rest of my time on the board. I mean there were always questions—and some terrible thing would happen in South Africa, people would be killed and then it would come up again. "Shouldn't we be getting out of this?" But our trustee investor committee basically stuck with that Sullivan Principle model so, you know, it went through '83 anyway, my time on the board.

The other thing, it kind of relates back to the matter of coeducation because one of the things the board had to confront was the fact that, as the college had gone coed and as issues were being raised about staffing and about the attitudes of the majority of the campus population towards the women, in its own membership, the board itself had not changed. I mean it was still all male. They had taken on an African-American, but that didn't do anything on the matter of gender and it was brought up in a very interesting way. I don't know that any great deal of attention was paid to it after it happened.

One of the college's honorary degree recipients, an author, a black woman author by the name of Pauli Murray--she had gotten her honorary degree in the mid-seventies ['76]--was made aware during her time, the weekend she spent in Hanover before the festivities, of some of the issues as the women of the college were raising them. So the following year--that is to say, during the year after she received her honorary degree--I assume she was approached. I don't know how it came about, but she appeared as a petition candidate for the board of trustees because half of the board is elected by the alumni council, at

least the way it was then, half of the board was elected by the alumni council and it was usually a done deal kind of a thing, in the back room. I mean, as I understand it, the alumni council people would sort of contact the board quietly, "What are you looking for?" "A businessman from California?" Whatever. Then they would go back and find the appropriate person in the alumni council and elect them. You know this would then be the nominee of the alumni council, who would then be voted in by the board of trustees. So it was all a kind of a controlled process. The board would elect its own charter trustees and then, through informal ties with the alumni council, it would pretty much influence who the alumni council would elect, so that you always had a board that was congenial, to be sure; but also one that was reflective of whatever the board chair and, you know, the close players wanted. If they needed a heavy-hitting fundraiser, "Capital campaign coming up, we need somebody with deep pockets." [inaudible]. It was all accepted, it was all kind of above board, but it was, none the less, a very inbred kind of operation.

Now Pauli Murray comes along and energizes something that was on paper all the time; namely, that if you, as an alumnus, could produce I think it was a hundred signatures or something of alumni, then you were entitled to a contested election amongst all the alumni. That they'd all have to be given a ballot and a chance to vote. And I don't think, up until then, anyone had ever done it, or at least it had not been done in recent memory. So along comes Pauli Murray, without a prayer in the world, she wasn't a bona fide alumna in the sense of an earned degree. She had this honorary doctorate; but, however it was worded, you know, she qualified because she was a degree holder, I guess, from the college. So the election goes forward and she was up against George Munroe ['43], the chair of Phelps Dodge. He had been an All-American basketball player and he was Harvard Law School. He was sort of in the mold type. Nice guy, a very nice guy out of New York. So she never really stood a chance.

I did something that was a little parliamentary, whatever. Since Munroe won the election and was the alumni council nominee, he still had to be voted on by the board of trustees. So, at the meeting at which this was to take place, he was in the wings, awaiting his election, it was a done deal. Everybody knew what was going to happen; but I had arranged with Andres in advance, simply as a consciousness-raising thing, that I would nominate Pauli Murray when the floor was open for nominations. What would normally happen is the alumni council nominee would be nominated. No other nominations. Closed. You know. Vote taken. Boom. He's in. So I nominated Pauli Murray

and I had worked it out that I would just do so, and I'd gotten somebody to second it so that it would be on the floor as a legitimate nomination. I said, "What I'll do is just make a statement for the record and then ask that the nomination be withdrawn so that the vote for Munroe could be unanimous." When it came time, I basically said, "Look. We have to address this. Obviously this is not the time because the alumni council has voted for George Munroe, but we really have to listen to the voices out there. We're being told that we are behind the times in our own composition, in our own membership, and we need to take steps to address it." So, with that, I withdrew and the seconder agreed and so Munroe was elected unanimously.

But it came about, and everybody agreed, we were just sitting ducks really. Sixteen men at a time when you're going through all this agony about coeducation and here was sixteen men sitting on top of this institution. So shortly thereafter, whether it was the next time around or the time after that, we got our first woman in Sally Frechette [Priscilla "Sally" Maynard Frechette], who was the widow of an alumnus. From that point on, the female membership has steadily increased. Ann Fritz Hackett ['76] joined even before I left the board, so I'm pretty sure at some point we had two women on at the same time.

BURNS: Yeah. There's been four or five at this point.

DODDS: Oh, yes. Right.

BURNS: Now, this petition process...

DODDS: Yes. Right. See now...

BURNS: That opens the door.

DODDS: Exactly, because now the alumni got educated. So they said, "Whoa. Wait a minute. That's on the books? Ah, ha." Now this whole *Dartmouth Review* crew--and that had been simmering in the background as well because, while all this other stuff is going on, these people over on the right were lobbing their verbal stuff. You know, the various attacks and on and on it goes. So that was a nettlesome situation as well. But what it did was, it educated them that there was another way to get trustees on; because this "clubby" thing with the alumni council, they knew would never produce any representative of a very conservative stripe. In a sense, the fix was in because the way it was set up, the existing leadership and the leadership for as far as

anybody could foresee would be of a mind to very much continue what the college had started. Nobody was going to end coeducation or bring back the Indian symbol or any of these other things that so many of the unsatisfied alumni were calling for; and, clearly, there would be no representative advocating that who would be voted in in that old cozy process.

But, with this petition thing now exposed, lo and behold, there was a way to now advance the cause, so to speak, of more traditional values or a return to, however they phrased it, to bring the college back to its original mission and things of that nature. That then led to John Steel's [John F. Steel, Jr. '54] candidacy and his eventual election by the alumni body. I imagine it was probably the most contested election in the sense that there were just sort of clear positions, diametrically opposed to each other, that sort of thing with campaign strategies. I mean it almost took on the coloration of a political campaign for an elected office in the civic world and in public government.

Ray Rasenberger [Raymond "Ray" Rasenberger '49], I believe, was the candidate for the alumni council and then John Steel was the petition candidate. Rasenberger was a Washington—is, he's still around—a Washington attorney and sort of in the alumni council mold. He had been involved in alumni council affairs for a number of years. I think he'd been its chair at one point. So he was a known quantity to that body of the alumni who followed alumni affairs closely and took an interest in things year to year. John Steel, on the other hand, was out of California, medicine was his field, and he was really part of the dissatisfied who had not been part of this inner group but who had their own concerns for what was happening by way of curricular changes, composition of the student body, all of the issues that they were raising, and so it went.

The campaign was quite closely contested. I supposed one might even say bitterly contested because of the emotional level involved. With John Steel being elected, I guess there was probably more wonder and apprehension going into this thing because, once he prevailed, I know my thought was "Does this mean there's going to be an endless succession of these kinds of elections with this kind of result? Are we always going to wind up with this kind of a process with its divisiveness and what have you?" I would say that John--he came on. He got the same spiel as everybody else did about not representing constituencies and so on. He seemed to agree to that. I think everybody's concern was "Is this guy going to come on--is he going to be the sword bearer for the dissatisfied and only surface on

those kinds of issues?" But I would say, and I don't remember what year it was...

BURNS: He came on in 1980.

DODDS: No. It had to be later. It must have been... Oh, no. Wait a minute. You said 1980? Yes. Right. 1980. That's right. Okay. So, for the three years or so that we were there together, I don't really remember that there was anything untoward about his votes or his statements. His statements were reasonable. Well, maybe he might have voiced some reservations about things every now and again. I do remember during the search following Kemeny's resignation that he had been rather pointed in observing, which I didn't agree with it--I wasn't quite sure why he had voiced it, but he made the rather pointed reference to Lisle Carter's candidacy. Lisle Carter and Lloyd Weinreb ['57], a Harvard Law professor, were the other two names advanced to the board and interviewed by the board in addition to David McLaughlin. They were the three names that were advanced. Were any others interviewed?

BURNS: Was Hennessey [John W. Hennessey, Jr.] one of them?

DODDS: No. No. I don't remember whether they were all interviewed; but, in any event, John Steel made the point of saying that it was not time for a Lisle Carter candidacy. The alumni weren't ready for that, meaning that the college would have a black president. So I mean it wasn't a matter of debate really because there was no widespread support for Carter anyway, so he wasn't going anywhere. He didn't get more than two votes as the final tabulation took place. I guess they were. They had to be interviewed because there was a vote that was taken on all of them and McLaughlin got the overwhelming majority, with Lisle Carter getting two votes. He was, you know, affable. He was involved.

BURNS: When the campaign was going on, did you think he had any chance of winning?

DODDS: Oh, yeah. Sure. That was my concern because they were very well organized. I mean there were mailings. They obviously had put money into the effort, so there were any number of mailings and they framed things in ways that, if you were an alumnus who, a typical alumnus, you get lots of stuff from the college and you pick up the magazine and you might get a chance to read an article or two. You look at your class column, and you go on with your life. You're not

really paying attention in any consistent way and to have people suddenly lay out for you all the concerns about what's happening on the campus and who are these faculty people who are coming in now and how qualified are they? There was a big issue about a member of the music department who had come up for tenure whose behavior was not considered to be consistent with what you would expect in a college environment, much less in a Dartmouth environment, and he had been given tenure. There was just a lot of stuff. There was a whole thing about how *The Review* had been attacked, physically, by a member of the college staff who had intercepted some delivery of *The Review* and had destroyed the papers and supposedly beaten the delivery person and then the lawsuits involving that incident. There was a whole lot of stuff like that.

So, to have all of that portrayed as an indication that the college is losing it. That there are forces at work in Hanover that are tearing the place apart, that its standards are falling. That there's all this student unrest, and nobody's dealing with it. If you just pick up a mailing that's laying all of that out and you haven't really been paying attention, you'll say, "What's this? This is Dartmouth? This is where I'm sending my hundred dollars a year, or whatever my contribution is. Whoa, we've got to get a grip on this thing." So I think a lot of people were just sort of "educated", you know, for the first time about these issues that had been simmering and so on, and saw Steel as a way of at least putting another voice at the table, not that they necessarily agreed with all of the points of view; but that, at least, it was another way of engaging the debate and, you know, bringing some other perspective into the picture.

BURNS: Do you think it was also connected to the sort of popular conservative tide that put Reagan [President Ronald Reagan] in office around the same time?

DODDS: It may well have been. I don't know that I spent any whole lot of time speculating about that; but it may well have been. You know, it may well have been.

BURNS: The next sort of trustee area I want to cover is the--one part of it is the Committee on Student Affairs [COSA], which starts I believe in '76, during your tenure. In relation to that, I guess also your experiences as a trustee with students. I think we had talked about it a bit yesterday about how your impression as a student yourself of the trustees was just kind of this body...

DODDS: Right. They were just never really a factor. Yeah. The COSA did get underway then and I think what prompted us to get it started was a number of indications that there really needed to be more of a channel to the student population that would give a direct route for hearing what their concerns were. I don't know that the Redding Report was necessarily an important trigger in that regard. I think the thinking might have been moving in that direction anyway; but the fact that you could have undergraduates, you know, voicing that level of concern and that there were wide dissatisfactions among the women students I think made it apparent that we really needed to be spending more time listening to student concerns, directly expressed by them, and issues as they affected students as the administration and faculty and so on were formulating plans for the present as well as the future.

On a somewhat different track, I personally tried to maintain as many ties as I could, even before COSA came into existence, and I used the vehicle of student breakfasts as a means of doing that. What happened was, during my first year, part of the trustee meeting, usually as part of the chairman's report, was his discussion of a breakfast meeting that he had had with students. After a couple of meetings, I began to think to myself, "Why is the chairman the only one having a meeting with these students? Why aren't more of us meeting with the students? Why don't we all meet with the students?" But it just hadn't been done that way. You know, these are busy executives and I guess, for many of them, the chance to have breakfast with their spouse at the Hanover Inn was part of the benefit of being here and there was enough of meetings that they didn't necessarily think of that breakfast time as being one to add to the calendar.

But I asked if it could be worked in that students would be able to sign up or they would be invited, however the president's office wanted to do it, to have breakfast with me also. So I began that as a tradition. So, every trustee meeting, I would have a breakfast in one of the rooms at the Hanover Inn and five or six students would come and we'd just talk generally. There was no set agenda. It gave them a chance to talk about whatever was going on, concerns that they might have had. What was their reaction to whatever the issue of the day might be? It was great. It was a chance to meet students, to see up close some of the fruits of the admission process because they were of all classes. It gave a number of them a chance to mix and mingle with each other because it was not unusual that even classmates in junior or senior year had never met each other with the attendance pattern on the campus being what it is. Some of them...

End of Tape 7, Side A – Beginning of Tape 7, Side B

BURNS: Did you have a particular connection with the African-American student society during your trustee years?

DODDS: Not particularly, no. There may have been events that they held during trustee meetings that I might have gone to simply because I knew-- maybe one of the faculty people had said there was something going on at the Am that you might be interested in. I might have just dropped by on that basis; but, no, not any particular affiliation. For the period of time that I was on the board, at whatever point our biennial Black Alumni meetings would take place, I would take part in those and, of course, those were designed to involve the alumni with the black students, so I was doing it more in that context, as a member of the Black Alumni group.

I did have a role, but it was just a one-time thing, as part of our--my class set up a lecture series that was sponsored by the class of 1958 and it was designed to link us with the class of '78. It was called the '58-'78 Class Lecture Series. Our thinking was that it might be useful for them, the class of '78, to just get a chance to see members of our class were doing different things and who had different life experiences, just so that they could get a feel for what college life was like twenty years or so after graduation. So, I was one of the presenters. We did a series of lectures and, when I came up for one set of trustee meetings, part of an afternoon when I was not involved in board meetings, I gave a presentation to the class of '78 who attended.

But beyond those kinds of things, the contacts with the students were really through committees, through the breakfasts that I would have and I never even pursued the fraternity side of it at all. During the entire time, with the possible exception of one or two reunions when there may have been something down at my old fraternity house, I never specifically went there to tie in with those students as fraternity people. At least, compared, as far as I was concerned, with the way that the trustees had functioned when I was an undergraduate, we were immeasurably more involved and more available. During some of those investor responsibility sessions, we had made public forums out of them so that the members of the community could comment on the Sullivan Principles and the divestiture issues in that fashion. So, there we were as trustees and open to questions and to comments and so forth from the audience.

BURNS: The COSA would have been one place where the trustees would have addressed fraternity issues during the '70s.

DODDS: Yeah. Right.

BURNS: What was the fraternity situation as far as the trustees were concerned? Did they feel that things were under control?

DODDS: Well, I think the general sense was that it was not under control and that it was difficult to control, in part because it involved, again it was almost, as far as I was concerned, a replay of the way I saw it back in the '50s. You were still dealing with what was basically the only game in town. Come down hard on the fraternities, then you really lose a social option that plays a fairly significant role in this kind of a small community. So the approach that was worked out, and it was really pretty much up to the dean to carry the ball, was that you've got to have standards that everybody will buy into that set a floor for physical safety. Because you're sanctioning residence in these places of college students, and I guess there'd been some incidents of fire on other campuses and the danger all that would pose, antiquated sprinkler systems and so forth. You just couldn't have a circumstance in which people would suffer serious injury or loss of life in situations for which the college really had responsibility, even though a number of the fraternities existed in an independent environment. Namely, their houses were actually owned by trust organizations or holding companies consisting of alumni-dominated corporations and so forth and it wasn't really college property. So how do you kind of get your arms around this conglomerate of semi-independent entities that are just sort of sitting there housing your students, entertaining your students, being places of student recreation and so on, and you have overall responsibility; yet you don't have the legal authority to tell them what to do and so on?

Well, that was sort of the framework, that you've got to be able to work around this. And the college began to work around it by saying, "Okay. These are the standards and everybody's got to hone up to these standards. If you don't hone up to these standards, we won't recognize you. By not recognizing you, you won't be sanctioned to be a place of residence, and then your membership base will begin to suffer as a result." So it was just trying to get a grip on that situation of quasi-independence and, once it was understood that that could not stand in the way of a program to upgrade the fraternities physically, to make them safer, then I think the trustees were at least satisfied that there was some minimal control being asserted that could avoid liability and

that would at least begin the process of dealing ultimately with the behavioral side. Nobody was so naive as to think that simply modernizing the sprinklers and eliminating fire traps, and whatever else was going to make people behave better. But you had to start someplace and enforcing those uniform standards was one and then gradually codes of behavior and those kinds of things became more and more part of the mix.

These fiefdoms just had existed like that, and it just wasn't--dealing as he was with the Native American issue and all the uproar that that created and coeducation, I just don't think John Kemeny was about to, at least early on, take on the fraternities as a battleground. I just don't know that he felt he had the goodwill capital to expend in that direction, given everything else that was being done with increasing African-American presence, trying to deal with affirmative action issues, issues around coeducation, the Native Americans, *The Review* rising up on the right and creating all the discord that seemed to be emanating from their activities and the activities of those aligned with them.

BURNS: Was the board pushing Kemeny to do more on fraternities?

DODDS: I wouldn't say so. I would say that there came a point where he was certainly encouraged to do so and I think it emanated out of the realization that we were dealing with a potential disaster if you've got-- and the reports would always come back about these houses, and they're falling into such terrible disrepair, the sprinklers don't work. Can they even pass the Hanover--I think that's what happened. That the town of Hanover had done some inspections that had been failed in terms of fire safety and so on. "Hey, what are we going to do about this?" That was the direction from which I think the pushing came because, whatever was happening on the behavioral side was anecdotal to the board. I mean there wasn't--it wasn't reported even in *The Dartmouth* or *The Valley News* that "last night there was so many trash cans that were upset, urination in the streets..." and all the other things that were supposedly happening on fraternity row. I mean it would filter in in stories and in accounts that you would hear, but it wasn't something that was given to us as a factual report by anyone.

But we understood that there were problems and that there was unruly behavior and that it was creating things. I suppose it really came to us more in the context of the complaints that the women were making. Part of the dissatisfaction of the women students was that they couldn't walk down fraternity row on a Saturday night. You know, they had things thrown at them. If they happened to go, even as someone's

quest, to a fraternity party, there would be all the raunchy behavior and all of that. So we became aware, I would say primarily of the fraternities as a problem, because the women were complaining about the behavior that was so closely associated with fraternity life. I think it kind of came in primarily in that situation, that context.

BURNS: The faculty also--Jim Epperson leads...

DODDS: Jim Epperson, that's right.

BURNS: ...a movement to abolish the fraternities.

DODDS: Correct. To abolish them. Yes. Yes. That's right and it would have come--thank you for reminding me. It very much came up through the Epperson Report or resolution proposal. Right. That's right. That was the other telltale indicator that something was wrong. James Epperson. Jim Epperson. That's right.

BURNS: And the board just didn't feel that that was the right tact to take on the issue, to abolish the fraternities.

DODDS: It did not. It did not. I don't know that it ever came to a vote per say, but I know my own view was, "bad as it may be, what else are you going to do? I mean if you eliminate the fraternities without having something else in place, I mean you'll create a morgue. You have to make some allowance for people to recreate, to socialize, to have entertainment." Since my own fraternity experience had been a very strongly positive one, I just didn't believe that the system couldn't be salvaged.

Now, in all fairness to Epperson, I mean what he was about had as much a philosophic base to it as it did matters of safety and behavior. I mean his was of the view, as has been the case in a number of other colleges that have abolished the fraternities, that there is something inherently inconsistent in the open educational environment that you're trying to promote to have societies that are basically closed. These are separate groups that self-define themselves and limit themselves so that you are working with a sort of closed system that tends to inbreed and tends to promote less than the highest of values and aspirations amongst its members, might be the more charitable way to put it. To really succeed as an educational institution, you really need to open everything up and that you really ought to have interest groups, yes, but interest groups that reflect what people think and how they care to associate on the basis of ideas and academic concerns and social

concerns and what have you and not sort of the quasi-arbitrary way of selecting members and excluding other members, which was really so much a part of the fraternity selection process.

I never really knew Epperson and I don't know what, if any, experiences he had, you know, as a student himself with fraternities or whatever; but I just had a sense from some of the things that he wrote on the matter that, even had the fraternities been pristine in their behavior, and even had they been up to standard in terms of fire codes, safety codes and all the rest, that he would still have wanted them abolished. It went beyond what was happening. It had more to do with what the fraternities stood for, as he viewed it.

BURNS: But certainly support for the proposal probably was somewhat tied to what was going on?

DODDS: Oh, no question. Yeah. I mean that's what gave it impetus and credibility.

BURNS: So one outcome of all this talk about fraternities and social life is the Collis Center?

DODDS: Well, that was then a way to at least, I think you would have to say that fraternities or no as an issue, the lack of social alternatives was so apparent that it was just always a crying need for something to be done. Again, you know, whether the fraternities were well behaved or not, not everybody is going to belong to them. That's a fact of life. That had always been the case because, by their very nature, they can only accommodate so many members, space limitations being what they are in any given house. And, if you're expanding the student body as you are necessarily with an increase in coeducation and year-round operation, you will have more students in need of decent social alternatives. That would be true even for the people in the fraternity. I mean you don't always want to simply be in the fraternity. You want alternatives, too. So the entire college needed more to do and College Hall, the old College Hall was woefully inadequate. A couple of table tennis games and there was a canteen there at one stage, but nothing really organized. Nothing of any programmatic nature was going on there. So a Collis was very much needed. I am sure the impetus was there, you know, in any event. We made a very important addition.

BURNS: In your years on the trustees, the chairs were Bill Andres, followed by McLaughlin...

DODDS: Dave McLaughlin...right.

BURNS: And Richard Hill I guess was the last one while you were there.

DODDS: I see. That's right because, when David became president...

BURNS: I wonder if you could sort of briefly characterize and kind of compare and contrast their styles as chairs.

DODDS: Well, I suppose the biggest contrast would be, and really the only ones I can comment on comfortably, would have been McLaughlin and Andres because Hill and I were contemporaries.

BURNS: Did you come on at the same time?

DODDS: We came on at the same time. Yeah. Until you just said so, I didn't even remember that he had been the chair; but, logically, somebody had to be the chair after David. Yeah. That's absolutely true. At that point, I guess I had changed jobs. I had gone to work for Champion International, partly as a result of my having been an Amos Tuck overseer during this period. Because, in addition to being a member of the board of trustees, I was appointed in 1974 to be an overseer of the Amos Tuck School, and got to be involved in some of the policy discussions there and the very important decisions that were looked at, or I should say proposals looked at to expand the school and so on. But the point of it is that, in the course of that assignment, I got to meet Andrew Sigler ['53, TU '56], who was the chair of the Champion International Paper Company, chairman of the international corporation, which was a forest products company. One thing led to another and there came a point where, in the early '80s, I was leaving the Ford Foundation and was in touch with Andy and he created a situation for me at Champion International. So I, in 1982, became a member of the corporate establishment once again. I had earlier worked for the Pfizer Pharmaceutical Company in the '60s. So I was pretty much involved with getting into that assignment and becoming familiar with the corporation and my work in promoting corporate responsibility programs. So I was probably paying a little less attention to things at Hanover during those years. I mean once David was elected and in place in those early '80s, as I was suggesting, probably for reasons having to do with the change in my professional life, I probably had less focus here.

But let me go back to try to answer you. Andres was a consensus builder. He was not a very assertive chairman, but he was an effective

one and would be open to suggestions, and pretty much ran things with a view to coming to a conclusion that was a supportive one for the president. I would say that he was a pretty strong backer of the presidents with the caveat that he wanted to always make sure that the board was on board; so, if the board seemed to be having a little difficulty with something, Bill had a way of pulling an issue back, "We'll talk about that the next time." [Laughter] He wasn't about to have a situation in which anybody looked bad. You know, if an idea was floated by the administration and it just didn't seem to be generating the enthusiasm and getting anywhere, he would say, "All right. We'll look at it again." It would suddenly slide off the agenda. Nobody would lose face. [Laughter] There'd be no losing votes. He was good that way. It all held together. We went through some rough times certainly with this whole coed business and *The Review*. I mean it was just seemingly one thing after another, but he was a person of great calm and lots of confidence in the process, certainly confidence in us. I think he really felt that the college had assembled very dedicated and talented trustees and that somehow we would work it through, that we would get to the right result.

Now I have to say that, at some point--there are, even in a small board like ours, the fourteen leaving aside the president and the governor for the moment, there are inner circles within that circle and I was not really of the inner, inner circle. At some point there was a view taken that this presidency of John Kemeny's was not quite what the college needed just now. The only evidence that I have of that is, and it's pretty strong evidence, is that I was visited by a colleague on the board, and it was during the time I was at the Ford Foundation and it was before Kemeny left. So it obviously has to be some point in the late '70s and the person who visited me is someone who was elected after I was, so it sort of narrows down to the late '70s as to when this happened.

I'm visited at the Ford Foundation by this colleague on the board who says, "We need a change." And I'm listening to this. I'm astounded really that a member of the board is coming to me with this because I mean what he is telling me is that, "It is time for a putsch. We've got to move this guy off the stage." I'm listening to this and he's going on about, "He is just not in the mold of what we need. He doesn't relate to the basic tradition in the sense of when the freshmen come and they go on this freshman trip to Moosilauke, the president ought to be out there walking with them. He, John Kemeny," I forget how he put it, "He takes a room in some motel not too far away" or whatever... "He does that rather than staying at the college lodge with the campers. He

doesn't hike there. He has the college car driving him up." So I'm listening to this, and there were a number of other things of a more substantive nature as to why John should step down. I'm listening to this, "Gosh. This is heavy stuff this guy is laying on me." And the meeting ends. I didn't even want to ask what was supposed to happen next because I couldn't imagine what was going to happen next. To this day, I just don't know what it is that had motivated that, because I would have to imagine that he went to see others.

BURNS: This person was sort of the driving force behind...

DODDS: Well, he's the one who came to see me. Whether he was a committee of one, I personally have difficulty imagining that a trustee could go to other trustees without the sanction, or at least the knowledge of the chair; but it was never...

BURNS: And this would have still been Bill Andres?

DODDS: Yeah. But he never said, you know, "Bill asked me to come to see you." I want to make clear that that was not the case. I'm only speculating; but he was there and he spent the better part of forty-five minutes or so going through this litany of why John had to go. This is no slouch, this is a major player over the years.

BURNS: Essentially trying to get a sense of how you felt?

DODDS: No. He was pitching, he was pitching his point of view and trying to enlist my understanding of his point of view and support for the notion that John should go. That's why I say, at the end of it, I didn't ask what was to happen next, because it wasn't clear whether I was supposed to signal that, "Yes. I agreed with him." Was there going to be something said at the next meeting? I just didn't know, nor did he say. He just said, "I want you to understand that I feel that way" and, by intimation, that there were others who felt that way; but he didn't mention any other names. I never really sort of got the whole picture. I suppose part of it was that I was not of the inner, inner circle. But that was all that there was. I mean there was no other visit. There was no other communication. No one ever said anything else about that.

End of Tape 7, Side B – Beginning of Tape 8, Side A

BURNS: So, the Three Mile Island...

DODDS: I think the sequence was that shortly after this visitation that took place, you had the Three Mile Island blow up and then John's involvement in that, which clearly was not the time that you were going to go about changing horses, although I suppose there might have been some logic in his asking for a leave of some sort. But he didn't. So, if anything, that's when the president needed more support, that you really needed to rally around because everybody understood that he was doing this national service and so on. That was the last I ever heard of it and then, a few years afterwards, John stepped down.

BURNS: Around the time of the Three Mile Island is when it switches from Andres to McLaughlin?

DODDS: Probably. Yeah, probably so. I would think that--I think that when Three Mile Island happened and when John took on the assignment, I seem to think that Andres was still the chair and then it may have been while that was going on or shortly after it ended that David became chair. I know that--when is it in terms of years, when does McLaughlin become the chair? Is it '78?

BURNS: It's right around there '77, or '78.

DODDS: Right, because I do remember that I was up for my first five-year review, re-election and I remember it was David who came to me and said, "What we're going to implement now is a..." with regard to the charter trustees, "we're going to implement a two-term limit...two terms of five years each." And he said, "You know, that's sort of an accepted thing in the corporate environment and I really feel strongly that way because, in my experience, it's usually the case that, if people are going to make a contribution in board service, they'll do so within a ten-year period. If a person hasn't made the contribution in ten years, that it's probably not coming and, if you've basically made your contribution, I mean given your best service and your best effort and so forth, then, after ten years, we give somebody else a chance to come in. We keep renewing in that fashion." And it made sense to me. Because the pattern up until then had been that the charter trustees did, in fact, serve for life, even though there may have been terms. I think it was just honored in the fact that they were just always re-elected so long as they were willing to serve and able to serve.

So, if that's the case, then it would have been sometime during that '77-'78 year, up until my first term had expired. So I guess more likely than not, David was tapped to come on, maybe we had elected him, and he was due to come on in '78 or had started in '77; but it would

have been just around then. And David was a little more rigorous in terms of how the meetings ran. They tended to follow time allotments. I don't even remember whether Bill did it that way; but, with David, each agenda item had an allotted time that would be devoted to it, roughly. Obviously, if something needed more time, it was given more time. It wasn't a matter of things being cut off or anything like that. You just had a sense that it was moving in a way that would have been his experience as a corporate C.E.O. He was well understanding of the issues, having been there. He was as well versed as anyone. I don't know that I can really signal, other than what I've just said, that there was any particular change in style; but that was change that was noticeable, and certainly it was a change that everyone could relate to.

BURNS: Did he have a comparable ability to sort of smooth things over as it seems that you described Andres had?

DODDS: Yes. I would say so. I would say so. I don't really remember that David would do the behind-the-scenes things as much as Bill did or, if he did, it might have been on issues that didn't affect me directly. But I do remember that he was very supportive. For example, on the matter of some of the corporate responsibility votes, I remember very distinctly David Weber and I were in my room at the Inn, sort of commiserating one day after one of the meetings. He stopped by, David [McLaughlin] stopped by and sort of said, "You know, do the best you can. That I appreciate that you are wrestling with these issues and, even though you might get knocked down every now and again..." Because I think what had happened was we had lost a vote that to us seemed like an obvious thing that the college should support, but it had been voted down. So we were sort of commiserating with each other. David dropped by and said, "Look. I appreciate what you're doing. This is a very useful thing anyway, even though we didn't support what you would have wanted us to. Keep it up." He was good that way. He knew how to keep a team afloat and spirits buoyed.

BURNS: He had a pretty high level of energy.

DODDS: Oh, yeah. Very much so. I mean you had to wonder, this guy is running a company back in Minneapolis and here he is back and forth and everything. Of course, Judy brought, his wife Judy, brought more of a presence to the meetings because Bill's wife, a wonderful, sweet woman, was more of the very traditional housewife, supportive-type spouse. She would be at the functions and so on, but in the off-hours, she was really much more given to her own recreational pursuits around the campus and things that she would just do to relax. I think,

as the chairman's wife, Judy really was more visible and much more engaged and they had, what was it, one of their kids was still here? I should add, that in terms of student relations, many times we had the most contact with students with the offspring of board members who were on campus at the time as students. Berl Bernhard's son, for example, was the punter on the football team so, going to the games in the fall, you're rooting for Pete, I guess it was, Peter Bernhard ['77], to get off a good punt and some of the sons and daughters would appear at social functions so you kind of got to know who they were.

BURNS: John Kemeny's....

DODDS: John Kemeny's kids were involved as students as well. Bob Kilmarx, I think, had a son and a daughter, I think Elizabeth went to Dartmouth, too. Yeah. So, from various points along the way, there were several situations. In fact, the Smiths, David Smith, I think he had a grandchild or a couple of grandchildren who were alums, or students who became alums during that time. Yeah. But I mean that was another part of the contrast. Clearly, it was a new generation. That was probably the other change that was obvious when we switched to McLaughlin. You now had somebody from the '50s and a person who was more identified with the relatively younger alumni.

BURNS: And certainly Andres may have been identified with John Dickey more.

DODDS: Clearly. Yes. Very much so. Very much so. Yes. As classmates and so on. Absolutely. And it was during those Andres years, too, that the Dickey Endowment got off the ground and, of course, Dickey was still around. He was bed-ridden. He had had these strokes, I guess it was, but he was still a presence. You'd go to the football game and they wheeled in Dickey or at the commencement, there would be a hospital bed over on the side. And that was John Dickey still taking in the graduation and stuff.

BURNS: How would you characterize the sort of working relationship between Kemeny and McLaughlin when McLaughlin was chair? Did you have much of a glimpse of that? Was it much of a change from his relationship with Andres?

DODDS: I really didn't--nothing really stands out during that time. I mean let me put it this way. David, being the kind of corporate person that he was, probably had more of an expectation of things moving along. I must confess, I'm probably blurring the lines somewhat between his role as board chair and his role as president. We had a real set-to with the

faculty. There were a couple of times when we had these things with the faculty where the board corporate attitude would emerge and be very evident in the way in which the matter was handled.

I'm thinking specifically of the R.O.T.C. issue, which involved the decision that had been taken prior to my joining the board, to cease the college's affiliation with the R.O.T.C. program, I guess with all of the branches of the service. I'm not sure that they were all active at the time the decision was taken; but at least the Army was probably still involved on the campus. And the college said, "Okay. There are all these protests and all these issues about the academic time being taken up with these military courses and questions about the quality of them, etc. We're ending our affiliation with the R.O.T.C." Which, of course, had generated a bit of annoyance with the alumni who had been R.O.T.C. people and who had a sense of the importance of the military tradition and all of that.

So as things moved along and the environment starts to calm down somewhat, the board says, "We want to start up our relationship with the R.O.T.C. again." I mean that was the board's position. "It's now time to re-establish the links to the R.O.T.C. and we direct the president to bring about it happening." Well, it all became very convoluted and so on and a faculty panel is commissioned to work through the ways in which this could come about. "How would you structure the academic requirement? How do you assure that the courses that are being taught for the military are consistent with the college's educational offerings and consistent with the college's mission and so on? Work out the most feasible way and get back to us as to how it's to be implemented."

So the faculty spends a year considering this and then comes back with the report that they have examined it in depth and that it's not feasible to re-institute the R.O.T.C. So the trustees said, "But we told you to put it back in. What do you mean it's not feasible?" [Laughter] This is what the faculty has reported. Well, the board blew up. They were pounding the table. They were looking to cut off somebody's head. They couldn't believe that this faculty had, in effect, defied what they told them. They told them to put the R.O.T.C. back in and here's the faculty coming back and saying that it can't be done. "What do you mean it can't be done? We told you to go do it." So they proposed a resolution that, in effect, said "You find a way to make it feasible." It was a really nasty, at least as I saw it--saying to the faculty, "You'd better go back and fix this thing." I voted no. I voted against this. At

the end, it was twelve to one, or whatever it was. But, nonetheless, the board had spoken.

So eventually what happened was they worked out a--I guess John Kemeny finally had to step in and make this happen. They worked out a deal whereby Norwich University of Vermont made ten or fifteen spaces available in its program, so the Dartmouth people who wanted to do so would go and basically do their drilling and take whatever the courses were at Norwich and then it was agreed that that would be accepted and whatever. So it worked out. What I don't remember is who, whether it was Andres or McLaughlin who was in the chair when that...

BURNS: If my memory is correct, I think it ultimately gets resolved after McLaughlin becomes president.

DODDS: Okay. Then that would be consistent with what I was thinking; namely that he would have shepherded a way to solve it without it getting any more out of hand with these broadsides going back and forth between...

BURNS: It's often cited as one of the issues that he expended some of his capital on.

DODDS: That may well be. That may well be; but, of course, that resolution, coming about when he was president or when he was chair of the board?

BURNS: As president.

DODDS: As president. Okay. Then that would be consistent then. Because, to be honest, the faculty was really browned off. They just didn't buy into the idea that you could do this. I mean, I don't know that they were uniform, but they presented this uniform front. That it was just not something that they wanted to get back into. It had been done away with. That everything was now fine. If the military wanted to establish relations with the University of New Hampshire, that was fine. There were plenty of other institutions. They just didn't want it done here and so, as far as they were concerned, they put the kibosh on it. Only to have the board come back with this rather tart resolution, telling them, "You didn't quite understand what we told you." [Laughter]

But I will say that it illustrated to me the importance of dissent because, after the vote was taken and recorded and made public, Leonard

Rieser said to me that he was personally very grateful that I had voted no because it gave a signal to the faculty that at least somebody had heard them and that, you know, it wasn't a monolithic response to their position that was totally negative.

BURNS: I guess the question I have, kind of off of that point, is that you often hear that the reporting of trustee votes was often done so that it looked like it was a unanimous vote. Did that change somewhere along the road? Is that not an entirely true representation?

DODDS: No. I'd say it was not entirely true, but it was often done in a way to soften what might have been the implications of dissenting or negative votes. In that particular instance, I don't remember how it was treated; but I'm sure the wording would have been something to the effect that, "the board voted overwhelmingly to direct that the R.O.T.C. program be re-instituted." The vote on the presidency was reported as being near unanimous when twelve to two, I guess you can interpret that as "near unanimous". Others might have said "a strong vote" or "an overwhelming vote".

But what didn't happen there, which often happens--it was really just I guess a philosophic position of the other person who voted for Lisle Carter--was that he did not choose to change his vote. I was prepared to make the vote unanimous. You know, we'd had our say. We cast the votes and so forth. What usually happens in that situation is that the vote is then retaken or those who vote for other candidates then rescind those votes and vote for the winner so that you do come out with a unanimous vote. But it did not happen that way so, as it was reported, it was said to be "near unanimous". So it was honestly reported. No one could misunderstand it.

In fact, I had a colleague at the Ford Foundation, who was a Dartmouth parent, who, upon seeing the way it was reported said, "Gosh. You know, that's so unfortunate that you all couldn't have made it," speaking to me as a trustee, "It's just too bad that you all couldn't have made it unanimous." And I said, "Well, it was. I agree with you, but it just wasn't to be. The other negative vote was not to be moved." But beyond that, I don't know that there were any other votes that I recall where the reporting of it would have raised an issue. There may have been, but I don't really remember any.

BURNS: Well, maybe one of the biggest votes in college history that was before you were on, was the vote on coeducation, which—I'm not sure that's ever leaked out who voted which way. But it is something you hear a

lot about trustee votes. That process, after the initial vote is taken to redo it and that's probably a common occurrence in other boards too.

DODDS: Oh, I have no doubt. Oh, sure. But that's different, that a trustee would agree to change his or her vote to create unanimity is different from a vote that's not unanimous that's portrayed as being unanimous, which is I think what you asked me. Votes that are not unanimous that are portrayed that way. As to that, I'm not familiar with any votes that were packaged to appear to be something other than what they actually were. The presidential vote was said to be "near unanimous". They didn't give any numbers, but anyone reading it would have to understand that there were people who did not vote, or at least a person who did not vote for McLaughlin.

BURNS: You had talked briefly about your experiences as a Tuck overseer and I guess I'm interested in, first off, how that came about.

DODDS: Yeah. I was wondering myself. [Laughter] Because I had absolutely no business acumen. You know, I had been for a year with the Pfizer Corporation, but purely as a member of the legal staff. I had nothing to do with sales or manufacturing or marketing or any of the basic corporate activities. But what they were trying to do at Amos Tuck was to begin to project a concern and an involvement with the not-for-profit sector. They had a number of students who had gone to Amos Tuck for the express interest of building up their business skills, their management skills, to then transfer those skills to work for arts institutions, for philanthropic organizations and being a part of the independent sector that's non-profit. And so, with my being a member of the Ford Foundation, senior staff, as they were looking around for someone to take the trustee representative seat on the Amos Tuck overseers--because all of the boards of overseers of the college usually have a trustee representative, I guess they must have discussed it with Hennessey and so forth and my not-for-profit affiliation I think was critical there.

So I, you know, joined the board and, true enough, there were these students, and they became increasing in number, who were interested in the not-for-profit world. And as an overseer, I would occasionally meet with them and we would discuss my own experiences in foundation work and so on. The real concerns that Amos Tuck had, and I suppose they continue, really, is how big should a small school get in order to maintain a degree of competitiveness because you have to be able to attract a faculty that's large enough to continue presenting the ever-expanding world of disciplines in business. In order to do that,

you have got to have a student body that is large enough to take the elective offerings and to provide the tuition revenue, basically to support in a large structure. But yet, you're within the context of a small university which prides itself on being small and you have certain physical limitations and all the rest.

So they always had to deal with how big is big enough and Amos Tuck, in those days might have been--oh, each entering class might have had maybe a hundred and twenty. I don't even know if there were that many. Maybe it was more like eighty, eighty student in a class. The question was "Do you add another section? Do you then take it to a hundred and twenty, which would give you an additional student base and give you additional revenue? You could then build the faculty and, at some point, you want to be in a position that your faculty is able to draw on some graduate students."

The thing in the business world is you've got schools like Amos Tuck that do a very excellent program teaching at the Master's level, your Masters in Business Administration. The heavy hitters, the Whartons and the Harvards and the Sloans have Ph.D. programs and, what the Ph.D. program does is it gives you graduate students who can help with the research of the faculty. So then you can attract these preeminent research types who then add to your school's allure. They create the publications and the books and so on that give you your top-notch academic recommendation. So Tuck has always been dealing with, "All right. We're great as an M.B.A. grantor; but do we go to the next round and become large enough to play with the big dogs in this Ph.D. level, at which point we're going to have to be quite a bit larger and, you know, can we really accommodate a school that size?"

And then there was a lot of back and forth, "Well, if you expand the school..." There was this wonderful phrase that used to be bandied about. "The students would engage in invidious comparisons." That is to say, if you had two professors teaching organizational behavior. If you've got eighty students in the entering cohort, you could have two sections of forty each, who would be taught organizational behavior by one professor. If you go to three sections, then you're going to have two professors teaching organizational behavior to three sections and then there'll be an invidious comparison by the students of the two professors. [Laughter] So the faculty didn't want to have that. They wanted to just keep it...

End of Tape 8, Side A – Beginning of Tape 8, Side B

DODDS: ...those events as a serious argument as to why the school shouldn't expand. But then, Tuck had to be fit into the overall context of the college, "How large was the college going to get?" It was a very interesting period of time to deal with those issues because they really defined so much of Dartmouth as a 'university.' If you're only dealing with the undergraduate matters and things as they relate to the faculty of arts and sciences, you really miss the whole picture because the graduate schools have a lot to do with the character of the place, even though it refuses to call itself a university for historic reasons. And only presents itself to the world as a college.

But it was very instructive and, I must say, it put me in touch with both, well, the students I've already mentioned, but the faculty. A very, very talented group of individuals. The business professor Quinn [J. Bryant Quinn] was involved in any number of the planning activities and so forth at the school. Wayne Broehl, another professor of business, was very, very active with our Investor Responsibility Committee. We really needed to draw on the expertise of someone who knew the corporate environment for a number of issues that came up. And Wayne Broehl was very, very good in that regard. And of course, John Hennessey as the dean was a real tower of strength, not only at Amos Tuck, but on the campus as well.

When he stepped down, I was involved in the search process for his successor and that was an education in of itself because I, not being of the business world, didn't know who the players were and so on. So, in working with our chair, David Dance [W. David Dance '40 TU '41] and Bob Field [Robert E. "Bob" Field '43 TU '47] I guess was chair also at one point of the Tuck overseers board. He eventually became a college trustee. We got that search underway and I got involved in interviewing the candidates and so forth. We eventually chose Richard West, who was, I think, dean of the school of business out at Oregon and Richard came in and did a good job. He carried the ball there for several years and I guess moved on to, well, eventually he went to N.Y.U. He might even still be the dean. I guess he's moved on even from there, but he was eventually the dean of the N.Y.U. Stern School of Business. But Richard did well. He projected much more into the public arena than John Hennessey did. He would publish articles in *The Wall Street Journal* and so on. Various aspects of finance were his specialty.

I had one truly memorable meeting at which we were meeting in Boston. I think one Tuck meeting a year, there were three scheduled a year, and one I think was usually scheduled in Boston to avoid the bad

weather, as was often the case. This was a mid-winter and I guess I was somewhat mid-way in my tenure, because there was two three-year terms for Amos Tuck. In any event, I show up for the meeting. My shuttle flight had been delayed and finally it got there and I walked in and the meeting had already started and they tell me that I'm the chair. [Laughter] I said, "What?" What had happened was that David Dance, whoever the chair and the vice chair were, couldn't get there with the bad weather. So they said, "Well, the only other person who should run the meeting is the trustee." I mean that would be like the next senior. This was all ad hoc. There's nothing written down that says this at all. [Laughter]

So, in any event, I walked in and I became the chair. So I conducted-- I'm loving this because here are all these corporate guys sitting around and I'm chairing the meeting. [Laughter] From the Ford Foundation no less. We got to one point where, I forget what the issue was, but we agreed, or it was agreed--consensus of the discussion was that it needed a further exploration, that the smaller group of the overseer board should examine this question and so I said, "Yeah. That's a good idea." I went around the room and I appointed three of these fellow overseers of mine to be on the committee; one of whom was Rodman Rockefeller, who was class of '54 and a Tuck overseer. So I got to tell Rodman Rockefeller what to do. [Laughter] It was a great day. I gave Rockefeller an assignment.

BURNS: Some of the other committee assignments that you had while you were a trustee were--a significant amount of time with Committee on the Budget.

DODDS: Right.

BURNS: About six years on the Committee on Educational Affairs.

DODDS: Educational affairs. Right.

BURNS: Including, I guess, you were vice chair on the last two years, two or three years. And the Committee on Alumni and Public Affairs was really just one year.

DODDS: Right.

BURNS: So, why don't we talk about the Committee on the Budget?

DODDS: Sure. Much of that was, you know, the college's vice president for finance and the provost were usually the main presenters. It took me a while. I must confess that I was a little mystified when I joined the board and once confessed to Paul [D.] Paganucci ['53 TU '54] that I could never understand why the budget came up at every board meeting, there was some discussion of the budget. I mean we'd pass a budget at one meeting. Then the next meeting we'd talk about preliminary figures for the next budget. Then the meeting after that would be a review of the budget that was in place and whatever mid-course corrections were necessary and then, on the anniversary of the first budget being passed, we'd pass a second budget. Yet, the very next meeting, we'd be talking about the budget that was up-coming. I once said to Paul, "Paul. Why do we always talk about the budget?" He sort of broke it out for me that the budget is your basic planning tool for the institution and, unless you are on top of how the current budget is being spent and what the projections are for the future budgets, you could very easily be in trouble and not know it. If you just sort of looked in on the budget every six months or so, something could be getting out of whack in a hurry and you could be really caught off guard." So with that very helpful explanation from Paganucci, I was a little more tolerant about what we were doing.

But it was--for me it was I would say a wonderful education. I'm not sure that I necessarily brought anything that was, you know, particularly unique to those discussions; but I began to really appreciate the budget as a planning tool and as a management tool and to realize that you could talk about all the wonderful ideas and the great suggestions that are floated around and people send up trial balloons, "Isn't this a wonderful idea? Wouldn't it be great if we could try this and that?" But unless it was in the budget, it didn't exist. The budget was the real world, you had to make provisions for staff. You had to make provisions for facilities.

So, if you were talking about a recruiting effort--I mean, what became apparent to me is that the things that we had talked about with the Black Alumni and with trying to make coeducation more realistic and better for the women students, unless those things were translated into budget items, it was all fluff. Unless the idea of better recruiting meant additional personnel in the recruiting office. "Where in the budget have we translated the desire to do a better job of recruiting into the concrete bodies and the extra travel money and whatever else is needed that the admissions office is going to need?" And once I began to make those kinds of connections, then the role of the trustee more often than not is just to raise the question and point out through

questioning that things may not be as adequately staffed or as adequately planned--which is, I mean, it's ultimately the administration's decision. We weren't trying to micromanage at all; but I just would use whatever those conversations were to see how the college was actually translating it's stated goals and so forth into things that were concrete.

BURNS: Now the '70s was a difficult time...

DODDS: Sure was. Oh, boy.

BURNS: ... for the college in terms of finances.

DODDS: Well, not only for the college, but--and the Ford Foundation, who took a major dive in terms of it's endowment. It had budgeted into the future for several years on a total-return concept, which basically said, "We will spend x amount of dollars and we will also spend x amount as a percentage of the appreciation of our endowment and use that as grant money." Well, that's fine if the endowment is increasing because you can then say, "Well, we expect the endowment will increase by ten percent, so we are going to spend ten percent of that for current programming." Well, if the endowment stays the same or reduces, your commitment to a total-return concept means you're actually eating into capital because you don't have any growth any more. You are eating into the reserve, which is a major no-no. So we had to cut grant budgets and basically pull back a lot of new ideas.

What was happening at the college was a mirror of that. Plus, when you're trying to run an institution that is subject to the variables that you can't control, the major one of which is the price of fuel, you can just get caught in a very, very difficult position and that's what was happening. The oil embargo, shortages of fuel, high fuel prices. So it became critical to have accurate projections on fuel costs and this is where the corporate people were really invaluable because they knew from the kind of planning they were doing in their business lives what was likely to come down the road. Inflation as a factor was also a very, very big item because you had to be able to anticipate how your costs were going to rise and that, in turn, would generate what revenues you needed by way of increased tuition, fees and so on. But tuition would be the biggest one, to cover those increases, which would, in turn, drive what your needs were through fundraising and all the rest. It was a very intricate process and one that, as you correctly point out, the college was under a lot of pressure in those mid-seventies years. So

the capital campaigns then become very, very critical and were, fortunately, successful as they were conducted.

BURNS: The charter trustees--was there an attempt to go after more corporate charter trustees at this point, to try to react to the budget and finance issues?

DODDS: I was trying to remember who then came on. After McKinlay, and Steel--well, let me put it this way. I don't remember that there was a specific thing. I mean, clearly, we elected Sally Frechette as a charter trustee. I am drawing a blank as to who—I'm just trying to go around the room to—well, Ron Schram [Ronald B. Schram '64] came on. He was an attorney, but I think Ron was an alumni trustee. Ann Fritz Hackett came on, but she was not corporate, particularly, and, again, I don't remember whether she was charter or alumni, because until, or I should say right after the election takes place, that distinction no longer had any meaning. It was only significant in terms of how they got to the board; but, since everybody was serving a maximum of two terms under the policy that McLaughlin put in, it really was not a distinction that made any difference. Oh, Bob Henderson [Robert "Bob" Henderson '53]. Bob Henderson came on. Yes. He would have been of the financial side, clearly, an investment banker. Bob Field who had been the Amos Tuck chair. Yeah. He came on as well, although Bob Field, at that point, was more a retired Price Waterhouse, that had been his firm, he had been out of the accounting rather than out of the business side. He had been a Price Waterhouse senior partner. But at least they were all of the business community. Henderson, Field, they would have had those corporate contacts and so on.

BURNS: Were there major issues that you remember from the Committee on Educational Affairs and Facilities?

DODDS: Yes. There would have been the question of the year-round operation as it impacted the residents on campus. The sense was that year-round operation gave too many attendance patterns for students. So we had a situation in which, literally after freshman year, you could be in a program that was language study abroad or one of the foreign study programs. You could be on campus for a summer and then, with an attendance pattern that was at variance with what most of your classmates are doing, you could basically be away from most of your classmates for the balance of your college career, for a good portion of it.

What became more and more apparent was that the classes were losing cohesion and this was observable. It was being commented on. The students, themselves, were saying, "You know. We just don't know who our classmates are. We're just never here at the same time." Year-round operation means that we've got, I forget what mathematically it would have been, but it was over a hundred different attendance patterns. You could be on one campus for your fall sophomore year, then off for the next two semesters, back during the summer before your junior year and then maybe on for two semesters and then off for the next two. It was all this back and forth and it was creating some havoc with the housing because, once you had a room and then you were going to be off for two semesters, you had to give it up. Then when you came back, there may not be room for you at the college and you'd have to find a place off campus and it was dizzying. It was affecting morale. It was just creating a sense that there was just too much choice out there.

So there was a lot of discussion about how do you sort of bring this into a more manageable framework without compromising the basic choice. People recognized that the choice was fine, that there were a lot of educational benefits that came about because students could do an internship in Washington in the middle of winter when Congress was in session and not be limited to times during the summer, which had been traditionally the way or the time that you would do those when, you know, there was less going on in the way of legislative activity, as an example. What eventually—of course there were the usual faculty committees and there were studies done, reports made; but educational affairs and facilities would have been where a lot of that was the topic of discussion and focus. Student affairs, I'm sure, got into it as well as the student aspect of the residential impact of year-round operation became more and more a concern. Basically, what came out of it was the idea that you would limit the choices available through year-round operation and one very significant change was to require residence during the summer after freshman [sophomore] year so that everybody in that freshman class would have a summer in Hanover, a summer in Hanover was required of everybody anyway. What the modification did was it said, "Okay. Your summer will be the summer after freshman year." So everybody could plan on that. Everybody knew that they were going to be there for the summer. You'd make the appropriate accommodations and financial aid, and housing would then be adjusted as necessary and that was a major step forward.

We also did something with regard to senior year. I think we required that, for the last two semesters, or two trimesters, of senior year, you had to be in residence or the term before graduation? I don't know, but something was done to try to at least bring the class back together for the senior because the feeling was that that was when at least this cohesion aspect could be re-energized and help--I mean, to be really blunt about it, the sense was that we were losing the unit of support, the class, that was so critical for sustained alumni giving over time. Classes would often make it a point even before graduation to begin fundraising and to make some gift to the college, even as they were leaving as a class to sort of start that tradition and to have something to build on as they extended their time into the alumni years. There was a real sense that that just wasn't happening, that governance had fallen away. Class officers, you know, really didn't seem to have the authority and the opportunity to perform as class officers. Student government had all but disappeared. I mean there really wasn't anything like the undergraduate council and Palaeopitus and all of that that had existed in such a formal way when I was a student. So where was the cohesion? Where was the pulling together? The sense was that the calendar was really working against those kinds of positive developments taking place. So the calendar was changed, fixed. There was less choice and you had your summer in residence after freshman [sophomore] year.

And of course, the facilities issues went along with that. "What do you do to provide more and better housing? Do we now use the dormitory facilities consciously to create social alternatives to bolster academic offerings?" The dorm in which German language is encouraged was on the drawing board at that time and approved. The concept of faculty residency as advisors also was developed at that time. And always within the overall sense that you've got to be mindful of the surrounding environment. This is part of the town of Hanover. It is not the town of Hanover and you can't just generate a whole lot of extra traffic and housing and so on without being aware of what impact it will have on the town environment. Those were major, major concerns and then the fraternity aspect of it would have been there as well on the facilities side. I mean I don't specifically remember that we were charged with that monitoring of how the houses were going to comply, but I'm sure it came to the board in some way and, more likely than not, it'd come in through the work of that C.E.A.F. at some point.

BURNS: Did the beginning of the Hood come during this time?

DODDS: Probably. I just don't remember specifically.

BURNS: And facilities improvements--but more and more, the new facilities were obviously hampered during the '70s by, again, the budget.

DODDS: Yes. That would have always been a constraint. But that was then the impetus for the capital drives. You usually would have as a major component of the capital drive that some addition to the plant or rejuvenation of the plant was necessary, besides your scholarship, and endowed chairs and the other traditional components of a capital drive.

BURNS: One issues that comes up, and I'm not sure which committee it would have fit into, is the equal access admissions policy, which I believe was finally passed in '78 or '79.

DODDS: Right. That more likely than not was C.E.A.F. because it was, again, a matter of equity and increasing faculty concern because faculty always has had an oversight role in the admissions process. They began to increasingly signal that we were turning away more qualified women applicants than some of the men who were being admitted simply because this ratio was skewing how the pools were being treated. I mean the women were kept in a separate admissions pool and nobody was happy with it; but it was what was being done to keep that ratio pledge that had been out there to placate people who were concerned about the switch to coeducation. But it was just a charade after a while. You just couldn't keep that thing up. I do remember that it came to a point where you just had to say, "People who are equal should be treated equally." It was just as simple as that. You just couldn't argue against it and, by this point, coeducation was a reality and the thing about the ratio was--I mean I'm not sure to whom that pledge was of any enduring validity because, as Kemeny and many others would point out, the positions on coeducation went through a miraculous transformation as alumni suddenly saw their daughters and granddaughters as viable candidates. [Laughter] "Oh. I see. You're admitting women? Okay." [Laughter] "Okay. She can wear green." So, a lot of that, what had been thought of as being, I guess, opposition that would be forever out there, I think just began to melt away. The women came and they performed and they started representing the college...

End of Tape 8, Side B – Beginning of Tape 9, Side A

BURNS: I guess I'd like to start this section with maybe some summary remarks on John Kemeny's leadership style and how he worked with the board during the time you were on the board.

DODDS: Well, John was very much the engager of the board and by that I mean he, not coming from a background of being an alumnus, saw the board as a very, very important resource and ally for his gaining continuing approval and support from the alumni body at large. In that sense the board was always something of a bellwether, a way of taking the temperature, of getting a sense. If the board was very strong in its support, I think John would have a pretty good sense that he could look forward to, with whatever sales techniques that were necessary, to getting that kind of support eventually from the alumni body at large. I think he was able to in the main ride a rather difficult horse through some tough terrain. Just to be able to take on the whole matter of coeducation meant that you had to obviously have the courage of conviction and the resoluteness to see it through because there would have been no way that anyone who knew anything about the college could imagine that bringing about a change of that magnitude would not create some difficulties.

It probably was something of a surprise, I know it was to me and I can only image that it was something of a surprise to John, the extended nature of the reaction to the college's encouraging discontinued use of the Native American symbol. So much so that it almost became a mantra amongst us, as it would come up from time to time informally and so on, that the symbol and the reaction to it as an issue was in and of itself a symbol. And that what it was was a symbol of disquiet and discontent with the nature and the extent of the changes that were taking place. Because you obviously had the change with regard to coeducation, the substantial change implicit in a more diverse population of Native Americans as well as African-Americans and the sense that somehow even the venerable symbol, for that to be changed, too, meant that "Well, you know, what's left? If you're changing all of these things, then we're really dealing with a different institution entirely." And that was sort of the nature of what we read to be what was behind this very strong reaction to the discontinued use of the symbol.

Now, as a matter of college policy, it turned out to be almost a stroke of good fortune that, in point of fact, the college had never adopted the symbol. I mean there was nothing official. I guess at some point somebody had gone back to try to find the resolution or the enactment that had made the Indian the symbol of the college from the standpoint of sports teams and so on and no such thing existed. It had been the creation of a sports writer and had caught on, I guess in the Boston press, and had just become used. It had been adopted I suppose by

quiet consent since there was no protest about it. It had just tacitly been assumed and took on the status of an enacted college pronouncement. But once that was clear, then it became not a matter of legislation, but one of persuasion that the college would discourage its use and, since it had never been adopted, there was nothing to undo but the custom and the habit of utilizing it. Of course, the college could do clearly whatever it wanted with regard to the things that it controlled. With that in place, you know, then the battle lines tended to be drawn thereafter.

But I think everyone who looked at those things with any time and attention was aware that this was really a code, that it was a rallying point, but it was really a way that dissatisfied alumni were finding something to galvanize their displeasure and using it, in a sense, for that purpose. I mean we had--in a sense it almost got to somewhat comic proportions when there was a mural in the basement of the Hanover Inn [Thayer Dining Hall], part of something called the Hovey Grill. And this mural, I'm sure I saw it because I was in the Hovey Grill, but, after a while, these things are just in the background and I didn't really pay that much attention to the detail. But apparently it was a depiction of Eleazar Wheelock and I guess some of the early officers of the college in a scene in which they were surrounded by Native Americans, some of whom, at least one of whom was a female who was bare-breasted. And it was not a caricature. I mean, it was a portrayal that was done with some seriousness although in its overall nature, I suppose it was a caricature because it was the barrels of rum. It was a depiction in that vein and somewhere along the line, it was decided that the grill would have renovations done to it. I think that was supposed to happen anyway and then what was supposed to happen was this mural, and the details become a little murky now, but in the course of all this discussion, it turned out that the model for this rather well-proportioned Indian woman was the wife of Bill Morton. [Laughter] She had posed for this thing. And so the whole issue of the--what to do with this mural--suddenly took on another dimension. [Laughter] Eventually, it was moved to some--I don't even know. It wasn't destroyed. It was put into the archives--I just don't know how it was finally handled.

There were things like that that would emerge every now and again. But John, to get back to the matter of his style, he was, I'd say, very willing to bring in strong people to carry things out. Leonard Rieser was provost for a number of those years. It took him a while, I suppose, to really move beyond the Dickey appointments. I think, if anything, there was probably a hesitancy to chuck the old guard. You

know, a new CEO comes in and, in business and even in the not-for-profit world, it's not at all unexpected that a new chief will bring in his or her own support and staff and what have you. But John, certainly with respect to the dean of the college, I don't even know who was the provost when he took over, whether it was Rieser or not.

BURNS: I think it was Rieser. I think the last couple of years of Dickey, Rieser was provost, and dean of faculty. And then there might have been somebody who took over for provost for the first year or so of Kemeny [Lou Morton]. And then Rieser, I think, took the two duties over again for the bulk of the Kemeny years.

DODDS: But there was a man who was, I can't think of his name. I can almost see him, but I can't, Morrison? Not Morrison. Jensen [Arthur Jensen '46], Jensen was...

BURNS: Jensen was...

DODDS: Dean of the faculty. Maybe that's what it was. You see, for a while, there was no provost. Provost was a title that came along later. I know Jensen was dean of the faculty and he would certainly have been a Dickey person.

BURNS: I believe he was done with those duties by the time Kemeny came.

DODDS: I see. Okay. Certainly, with regard to the dean of the college, the vice president for finance was John Meck [John F. Meck, Jr. '33] I mean that was clearly a Dickey holdover. He had--I don't think he was ever fully comfortable with those members of the organization. Although I mean I can't, aside from what we've discussed already about Brewster and his not really being all that helpful on the matter of coeducation--I think it was just perhaps a matter of style of operation with regard to Meck. It just seemed as though it fell more and more to Paganucci to sort of pick up and do the laboring on some of those budget assignments. I can't remember now, I assume at some point, Paganucci became the vice president and treasurer.

BURNS: I want to say '76.

DODDS: All right. Maybe around then. Right. But you had the sense that Meck was sort of tolerated. He didn't seem to be sort of fully operating with everyone's confidence. So, in that sense, I guess you'd have to say that John was cautious with regard to the holdover people that he inherited; but a man of prodigious productivity. I mean he taught--I

mean, that was always a matter of marvel and wonder to us that, you know, you'd be having these discussions and he's, of course, all involved in everything and then, at a certain point, maybe the board would be about to go into executive session anyway or there would be something that Rieser or Paganucci, of whomever else might be involved could take over and he would say, "Okay. I've got to go to class now. See you after lunch." And he would take off. [Laughter] And that was great, because it meant that he had this on-going dimension of a working faculty person who could be there and who could really speak to faculty issues, not simply as the president of the college, but as somebody who was actually out there carrying his own weight on the academic side.

BURNS: Did you get much of a sense of his working relationship with Leonard Rieser--who essentially would have been the top two academic officers of the college?

DODDS: I mean I had a sense that Rieser was very much a working number two, and an involved number two. He was, I think, given a lot of the responsibility for trying to upgrade the sciences, which would have been a natural, given his background. They seemed to be a good match in style and temperament. I don't really recall anything that was unusual during that particular partnership. I can't really say anything...

BURNS: I would guess that a person of John Kemeny's staff that you worked the most closely with was Alex Fanelli [A. Alexander "Alex" Fanelli '42].

DODDS: Alex, definitely.

BURNS: He also served as secretary for the board?

DODDS: He was. Alex compiled all of the minutes and he was the person who would handle the logistics for the board meetings and was the basic assistant that John relied on and was, in himself, an historian of some dimension. Of course, being an alumnus, he had a particular tie to the institution, to his class. If I am not mistaken, I think he and Rieser were classmates or they were both in the '40s.

BURNS: They were both in the '40s.

DODDS: Yeah. For some reason, I thought they were in the same class. Alex was very, very good and he was very, very helpful in many respects. He--when I talk about the logistics, it always comes to my mind that he had asked me at one commencement if I would give a lift back to New

York to one of the honorands and it turned out to be Toni Morrison, which was just a great thrill. In fact, somewhere in the recesses of my slide collection is a photograph of myself and Toni Morrison at the president's reception. But after I had accepted the assignment--because he wanted to make sure that I would be driving and it was convenient and so on, because she actually lived--it was in the same general direction, but it was a little bit out of my way, but it wasn't a big deal. I mean certainly, to spend that time with Toni Morrison, it was not a big deal at all. [Laughter] But it then dawned on me that I'd better re-read these books. I was going to be in this car for six hours with Toni Morrison. So I went back and, whatever I didn't have, I got from the library. I read "*The Bluest Eye*" and "*Sula*" and all of her novels, everything I could get my hands on I read. It was great. It was a wonderful, wonderful experience to spend that time with her. That, of course, all came about through Alex's doing.

BURNS: He was a Dickey holdover who very much...

DODDS: I guess he would have been.

BURNS: He very much became a big part of John Kemeny's...

DODDS: Yes. This is true. You're absolutely right about that. I hadn't thought of Alex in that connection. That's quite correct.

BURNS: A couple of the comments we often hear about John Kemeny with this project and you read elsewhere is people's impression of just his sheer intelligence and his persuasiveness.

DODDS: Yes, on both counts. He was a master of detail, phenomenal in that regard, and the ability to recall facts, figures, all kinds of minutia almost, from prior discussions--was truly remarkable. He also, in addition obviously to his intelligence which I didn't mention because it is just a given really; but he--the thing I guess that always impressed me was his ability to, even though he, himself, was a scientist--I don't mean to imply that scientists are not capable of this in any way--but he would invariably relate issues and in his own pronouncements to the alumni and the students and so forth, whatever was then involved or the particular issue was, to a larger philosophic vision, to a set of values, to a set of cultural norms, beliefs. In other words, he could lift a conversation to a different plane and did that, I think, very, very effectively in his speaking assignments and, in that way, he could kind of spin a sense of Dartmouth having a philosophic and cultural mission, spiritual almost, even though he was not, I would say in any way a

religious person. But you could certainly glean from his writings and his speeches a sense that he really had a spiritual side, even as the calculating mathematician and so forth that he was, that there was a larger set of beliefs and so forth. Again, not that he was religious or even a theist really, I don't even know where he was in all of that; but he could really do very, very well in raising a conversation and lifting it to a different plain as I suggest.

The mathematical strengths or capabilities were invariably drawn on as a way of helping the board to analyze issues where maybe a different quantitative perspective was helpful. He, for example, developed, as far as I know he developed and he often used, the analogy of the cost of education--the price of tuition and the extent to which it had risen, as compared with the model of a Chevrolet or some other car from whatever the base year was, 1950 or whatever. And he did the research and showed that the price of the car had actually increased to a greater extent. I mean people were always, "Oh, my. The tuition is going up. The tuition is going up." But he had this analysis of the price of the automobile as compared with the price of tuition and was able to make the case that, for the value, obviously, of what a college education is, its price tag had actually increased at a lesser rate than the price of a new car. He would always talk about having gone down to the car dealer in Lebanon, you know, to check..."Just last week, I checked with a car dealer in Lebanon. What is now the price of the Chevrolet?" Invariably, it had gone up at a greater rate than the tuition. You know, just something like that would kind of make the point that you're still getting great value for your education dollar even though, unfortunately, it's going up and has been going up.

Being the architect as he was of the year-round operation and the utilization of that quarter system was a master stroke in the implementation of coeducation. While I wasn't there, I assumed he had a large part to do with putting it together. Whether he originated the idea or not, I don't know; but I'm quite prepared to assume that he did.

BURNS: Certain people attribute it to him.

DODDS: Yes. I am sure.

BURNS: How would you rate him as a fundraiser?

DODDS: I think he was very, very good. I always had the impression that he was maybe a little uncomfortable in that one-on-one sort of thing,

although I can't say that I know that from any particular experience or involvement; but he was, in a sense, a shy person. So small talk, I mean real small talk, didn't come easily. I mean he wasn't into sports, particularly, or, you know, the kind of things that people would tend to gab about. So I would imagine that there were times when he's got this major prospect to deal with that it might have been a little difficult just to get through the initial banter and whatever to get to the point. But he certainly seemed driven. He knew that the alumni were the lifeblood of so much of the fundraising effort. I don't think he ever passed up any opportunity to be out there hitting the hustings. He took his share of trips, made his pitches and what have you.

We found that he was certainly, I mean looking at it from the standpoint of the Black Alumni group, he was certainly accessible. Not everybody was always pleased with the way some of those early conversations went, but everyone was grateful that he would take the time which he did. He carved out large blocks of time on his calendar when some of those early negotiations were taking place and we really appreciated that. It just struck people that here was a sincere effort to bring about change and, while the implementation side may have faltered at various points for reasons having to do with budget constraints, availability of personnel, competing concerns--because there's always something else out there that is challenging you for the same dollar--I think there was a sense that he was on the right side in both his beliefs as well as his efforts. So I think he came away with high marks for that.

BURNS: Very early on, he sort of recommits Dartmouth to the education of Native Americans, which is an effort that sort of parallels some of the efforts made with African-American students and certainly in terms of the issue of retention of students. How would you evaluate the development of that program during the time that you were a trustee?

DODDS: I'd say I'd rate it very positively. I think the pronounced effort in that direction really came as one of the very first things that he did. It may have even been in his inaugural address. I believe that's right. And that was good. I mean I certainly applauded it from the distance at which I was then looking at things and I was very sympathetic to it happening because, as far as I was concerned, it represented an administrative commitment that was very positive with respect to affirmative action and the kinds of policies that would be helpful. I mean, they may be crafted with Native Americans in mind particularly; and obviously the retention strategies and so forth would probably be different from one group to the next, but it still reflected a willingness to

move in that direction which I assume would only have, or could only have, a positive benefit as it would apply to African-Americans and to any other groups. And the fact that Michael Dorris was engaged I also took as a positive step because I got to know him at just about the time that he was becoming involved.

In my own work with the Ford Foundation, I was learning more about the Native American standing in the country, primarily from the legal standpoint. My grant assignments included the work that the Ford Foundation was doing with a group called The Native American Rights Fund, based in Boulder and it is, in essence, a group, a public interest law firm, that litigated issues throughout the country on behalf of Native Americans, including land ownership issues in Maine. There were two Native American tribes in Maine who had started land claims on the basis that transactions that had taken place decades ago, even centuries ago, had been in violation of federal law because there was a federal statute that prohibited trading, or I should say land acquisition, from Native Americans unless Congress approved. The so-called Federal Non-Intercourse Act of 1790. And there was a whole history of transactions that had taken place where Native Americans had signed deeds and treaties and so on surrendering land and Congress had not approved. So this Native American Rights Fund developed the strategy of first ...

End of Tape 9, Side A – Beginning of Tape 9, Side B

DODDS: ...getting the federal government to acknowledge that these tribes had status, that they were in fact the Penobscots and the Passamaquoddies in Maine and there were some other similar litigations elsewhere. Once that was done, then the federal government in effect took up the land claims on behalf of the Native Americans because they had a trust relationship to promote the tribal welfare. Well, I'm learning all of this and I'm sort of getting more and more immersed. I'm going out to Colorado. I'm meeting with people from different tribes with the steering committee of this group and eventually I come to visit reservations. I mean for, you know, a native New Yorker who had basically always lived in the East, this was a major education.

So the fact that the college was becoming more and more pronounced in its program development, I applauded and would often seek out Michael Dorris for his interpretation of some of the things that I was learning. In point of fact, I involved Michael in a project that the Ford Foundation was doing in the mid-'70s in which we were working with

Daedelus magazine to provide a portrait of where the United States of America was at that point in the status of the four major, as we defined them, minority groups, African-Americans, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and Native Americans. And what the issues were, and what the prospects were, and Michael was a contributor with respect, one of several contributors, but a major contributor with regard to the status of Native Americans. And, in point of fact, was the only Native American from the eastern part of the country who was involved in that project. So he attended seminars and contributed a published piece for the *Daedelus* issue that came out on that. That really came about because I knew him and he was willing to take part. I encouraged him to do so. So I was very much encouraged, very supportive of everything that was happening and gave it as much encouragement as I could.

BURNS: I believe John Kemeny's, I'm not sure if it was publicly stated, but his intention always was a ten-year term.

DODDS: Right. And he did say it.

BURNS: And he ends up going eleven ultimately.

DODDS: Correct.

BURNS: I assume he came to the board at some point or the board came to him and talked about the end of his tenure.

DODDS: That may well have been a discussion that took place with that inner, inner core. [Laughter] It wasn't a general board discussion. You see, the board actually had a personnel committee, which was only trustees, unlike the other standing committees that had faculty and students, and staff participation. This personnel committee was the committee that dealt with the president's salary, terms and conditions of employment and that sort of thing. It would have been like--maybe it was coextensive with the executive committee of the board. My suspicion is it was more like the chairman and two or three other of the real inner, the inner sanctum, and they may well have had such a conversation with John or he with them.

BURNS: Now, would this committee--I believe it's during Kemeny's era that an annual review of the president starts.

DODDS: Right.

BURNS: Would that have been the personnel committee again?

DODDS: Correct. That would have been the environment, the venue, where that would have taken place. That would have been discussed with the president; it's general findings reported to the board. Yes. It would have been the personnel committee that had that and, in fact, what would be reported was projections about length of service. I don't remember specific conversations on specific reports, but I think it was sort of assumed that, with the Three Mile Island assignment, that the ticking of the clock was sort of suspended, that, in a way, that period almost shouldn't count because the president was, in fact, so much absorbed with that. So that, if you were to subtract that period of time from the eleven and a half or so, you may well come back to a number that's closer to the ten that he had in fact thought about. Yeah.

BURNS: So, when he does decide to resign, that's not really a surprise to the board.

DODDS: I would say that that's correct. I think he had certainly said enough times that a ten-year period--I mean it was almost the mirror of what McLaughlin was saying about the length of service on the board for both charter and alumni trustees--that a decade pretty much gave you the chance to make your mark, to make your contribution. Kemeny was saying pretty much the same things with respect to the presidency. And as I remember it, it was also a little bit skewed by the fact that there was a capital campaign in the offing or about to begin, so that you wouldn't want to change presidencies--you wouldn't want to announce the start of the campaign and then suddenly switch. But that campaign was locked in because you just needed to build the reserves up because the '70s had been as devastating as we mentioned. So you were a bit limited in the timing for this. He basically had to be there to help push it forward. If I'm not mistaken, I think that it was the launching of that campaign that included a major dinner in New York at which--I mean and this was really pulling out the stops--they had Rockefeller [Nelson Rockefeller '30]--now this would have had to be obviously before he died, so it had to be, was that '77? '76?

BURNS: '77...'78.

DODDS: Yeah. I can't remember when he died. It was in there somewhere and John Dickey was still up and functioning, so here you had this tableau, major New York hotel and all the trustees and the spouses and all that, and here are these two champions, two Dartmouth heroes, Nelson Rockefeller and John Sloan Dickey. They were both up there at the

rostrum. It was a great moment. I forget, there was some bowl or something that was presented to Rockefeller. I just don't remember exactly what it was now; but anyway, at the critical moment, it was John Sloan Dickey handing this to Rockefeller who then accepted it and then they were both standing there before this assemblage, both holding this bowl up. Everybody was on their feet, cheering and all that. It was very, very nice. So with all of that, I think whatever John's timing was, when you threw Three Mile Island into it, it probably wound up delaying things into, I don't even remember now when the announcement was, I guess it would have had to have been 1980?

BURNS: I believe it's announced that he's going to resign in the summer of '80 and then that '80-'81 year is used for the search and McLaughlin's announcement.

DODDS: In '81? But Kemeny was still president from '80 to '81 or was...

BURNS: Yes.

DODDS: Oh, I see. He announces in '80 to take effect in '81. Right. Okay.

BURNS: Did you pretty much agree with his saying that it was time to go? Did you think there was more he could do?

DODDS: Well, I think it was--yeah. I think the timing was fine. I didn't--I don't remember, looking back on it, that it struck me that it was an ill-advised move or anything like that. It was such a demanding job and so wearying and, of course, John was not the person who was given to exercise or good habits. I mean he was constantly lighting up cigarettes all the time. So that he would at least give himself that chance to step back from the pressure and the terrible demands of that assignment to take maybe, whatever, I don't know whether he took a sabbatical or not. He certainly would have earned one at that point, and then go back to his academic pursuits. I think everybody acknowledged that he had certainly earned that. I don't think there was any sense that he really had to prolong it beyond that. It had been a tough go. He'd been through, as I was suggesting, all of these wars on all of these different fronts and that he was able to come out of it, I guess, reasonably in good health and in good spirits was a credit to him and his disposition and his dedication to it. But we then obviously had to get into the search process and that was instructive, to say the least. It was...

BURNS: The board kind of split in two, at that point? One half on the capital campaign and one half on the search?

DODDS: I never have thought of it that way, but I suppose that's pretty much what did happen. There were--well, Walter Burke was the chair of the search committee and Kilmarx and Weber, as I remember, Bernhard, I believe, were all on the search committee. Others were, as well, I'm sure. I just don't...

BURNS: I think Frechette?

DODDS: Yeah. That would make sense. Yeah. Sally would have been there. And we engaged members of the faculty and students as participants because they were technically not members of the committee. That was to prove difficult, or a source of difficulty, later on. But, in any event, we got underway. One of the people who was key at the beginning--I, in fact, was not on the search committee when it started. I can't remember what happened. Berl Bernhard was supposed to be on and something happened. Berl developed some obligation. I just don't remember what the reason was now, but Berl had to [step] down and so then they asked me to replace Berl on the search committee. So, really, the initial steps had been taken.

Berl had been instrumental in recommending the woman who had been the head staff person for the Three Mile Island Commission, who, as it turned out, was moving to New England. I think her husband was taking a position on the Vermont Law School faculty. Her name was Elizabeth Dycus and so it was, I guess, acceptable to the search committee that she would be the staff person. So she became a focal point for organizing meetings and distributing material and so on and so forth. She worked in that capacity very closely with the chair.

But all of that was done and by the time—I'm almost certain that it was Berl who I replaced. Yeah. It had to be because I don't now remember Berl being a participant in the meetings as we went along. For whatever the reason, he stepped down. I then assumed his spot I suppose two or three months after the search got underway. And we tried to identify the people who at least were, on the surface, likely prospects and decided that we would use the somewhat transparent technique of sitting down with them to seek their advice and counsel. What did they think would be an appropriate set of characteristics for the new Dartmouth president? That was in order to make certain that they could speak freely as people who were not themselves candidates, because we didn't want to get people into a sort of

defensive shell or to scare them off or whatever. So, approaching them as resources meant that they could talk candidly about what they saw in Dartmouth and what its future enhancements would be, should be, could be, with a president of XYZ set of skills. And at the same time, we could size them up and kind of get a feel for what they were all about.

So we split up and we had various task forces that would go out and seek out these folks. I remember being on a small delegation that went to Princeton and we spoke with some of the leading lights down there, a couple of them, as a matter of fact. One of whom, as a matter of fact, eventually became president of Harvard. [Laughter] He was on our list, Rudenstine [Neil Rudenstine]. Then there was someone else who was then dean of the faculty down there. But in this game of searches, everybody knows what it's about. And I can't imagine these people with this delegation from the Dartmouth search committee coming to see them, didn't believe that we were looking at them. So you were always playing a little cat and mouse thing there. One of the Princeton... I guess it was the dean of the faculty, we eventually had him come up to Minary. Minary was where we did the serious interviewing and really kind of got the candidates off from the beaten path, and could really sit down with them for an extended period and talk about issues and so forth.

And it was--of course, Kemeny had broken the mold, so we weren't in any way limited to the pool of alumni; but it did seem, as we were going through the names, that those who were alumni did kind of get a little special boost for that reason. As it eventually turned out, the three finalists presented to the board were all alumni. But we had the odd circumstance and the chairman said it best because we'd go through all these names and I guess, at one point, maybe the pool was as many as one hundred and fifty, most of whom were not really suitable and, as again, one of the mantras of these searches is that, invariably, the person you're looking for is not looking, so you literally do have to search and find that person who's totally happy with what they're doing and convince them that this is a better opportunity and what have you. So, through all of that, we're winnowing and eventually getting down to a more workable pile of names and it's getting smaller and smaller. This business about the chairman of the board keeps popping up every now and again.

BURNS: Popping up within the search committee?

DODDS: Yeah. Well, popping up within on the search committee because the search committee is the trustees, but popping up because, at board meetings, when the status of the search is being reported on, there are comments made to the effect, and maybe they were not being made in the meetings, because McLaughlin would have been there, but in the side bars and the social settings. The comments are "What's taking you guys so long? We've got the guy right here. What's the problem?' You know, you're going through all of this stuff. We've got--what about Dave?" So, we were being importuned, not too subtly, to bring this thing along and "Let's wrap it up. What are we dragging it on for?"

BURNS: Do you remember how he became a candidate?

DODDS: Well, what I was leading up to is, at one of our sessions at Minary, we're going through all these names and maybe one of the trustees said, "What about McLaughlin?" or maybe Walter Burke, himself, raised it because we were getting all these comments from our colleagues, "What about Dave? What about Dave?" We just had to deal with it and, as Walter Burke said, "It's like 'Banquo's Ghost'." I mean it's always there. Whoever we were talking about, you couldn't help but measure him up against McLaughlin because we knew that there was a coterie of the board that wanted McLaughlin to have it. I mean it wasn't that they wanted him considered. They wanted him to be anointed. "Let's get this thing over with. We've got Dave. You couldn't have anybody who was more quintessential Dartmouth. Let's get it over with." So he was a candidate simply by the force of the people who were pushing his name, who were our colleagues and we couldn't avoid it. It wasn't that he had written a letter that said, "I'm not interested." [Laughter]

So finally we just had to ask him, "David, are you interested?" because everybody else kept saying "David's the man." So it was agreed that the chair of the search would ask him because we didn't know. We didn't have anything in writing from him. This was all coming to us second-hand from our colleagues, so it was agreed that Walter would ask him, "Are you interested?" The answer came back "Yes". He was interested. Well, now it was out in the open. Now it was on the table. We now had to, in fact, deal with the McLaughlin candidacy and so it went on from there.

David, as the others had done, would make his appearance at Minary. I don't know that he came more than once. He was certainly there for a session, maybe two, and it just proceeded in that fashion. I will say that he certainly presented himself well. He obviously knew all the

issues. It wasn't that he lacked any knowledge or passion about the assignment; but the members of the faculty who were on the committee kept saying, and I just had a lot of sympathy with them in their saying so, they said, "Look. Running an academic institution is a profession. It is not that you could--I mean, you could, but it isn't that you would assume that, simply because somebody can run an army like Eisenhower [President Dwight D. Eisenhower] did or could run a corporation, that they can run the university. We have people who have been in the process of learning how to do this. They've been steeped in the academic tradition for all of their professional lives and that's where we should be looking to draw our candidate, in much the way Kemeny was drawn." I mean they would also acknowledge that it didn't necessarily have to be a professor who would do it. You might have someone who is in an administrative position elsewhere who are often alumni of the teaching side. That's generally the way it works.

So they kept this steady drumbeat of displeasure with the way this phase of the conversation was going because, not so much amongst us on the search committee, we trustees on the search committee. I mean, they sensed that, within the larger board, there would be great support for McLaughlin, so they kept saying, "When General Motors is looking for a president, they don't go to, you know, some nearby college and pick a member of the faculty. What gives us the right to assume that we can go into a corporate environment where, you know, the style and so forth is just so different and find an appropriate leader for an academic institution?"

BURNS: Was there also concern over sort of a conflict in the search process because he was chair of the trustees at the time?

DODDS: Not really because you couldn't deny him--I don't think they ever thought--I mean some people might have thought that, but that never came up as any part of our conversations. I mean certainly, to the extent that a strong candidate was a member of the board, that's been known to happen. That person shouldn't be denied the opportunity simply for that reason. No. What troubled the faculty was that it was the nature of his background, not that he was the board chair because, presumably, if an academician was the board chair, then it would have not had the problem that they had with McLaughlin.

So, as it came down to the business of actually designating a slate, it became more and more apparent that all the faculty members could do was to voice their concern, because they were not voting members. Whether it had been done that way deliberately, to make certain that

they couldn't vote against someone who would have the strength that McLaughlin did before the whole board, became a matter of some speculation, and there was grumbling and unhappiness about it. It just didn't go over well at all with the members of the faculty who--I guess there were four or six of them. And almost to a person, they were opposed.

BURNS: And were the students on that advisory committee also opposed?

DODDS: I really don't remember. The student participation was somewhat compromised by the fact that there was a lot of travel involved and they would have had exams and so on. At this moment, I can't even remember who the students were and I really don't remember how their sentiments came out. But, as we did wind it down, we had two other alumni, both of whom interestingly were lawyers, both of whom were connected with other academic institutions. So, I mean, the faculty could relate to them a lot more readily and there they were. Each of the other two had certain strikes.

It was, I think, a real concern to some of us that the pool of names had never generated that many stars elsewhere. I don't know whether that was a function of who might have been available at that time because, sometimes these searches are really a function of who's available. They're on a limited time span and that might have been the year when a number of rising stars had already been tapped elsewhere or were maybe a little too early to be approached for an assignment like this. There are always things out there that you can't control or account for. But, as it shaped up, we presented the board with what was to turn out to be a slam-dunk situation. But the thing that always mystified me and I had to ask one of McLaughlin's proponents off the record whether he was really interested because I naively did the arithmetic--when I say naively, you'll understand in a moment what I mean by that--I knew roughly what the chairman of the Toro Corporation, McLaughlin, was earning because it had been reported someplace and it's a matter of public record what these....

End of Tape 9, Side B – Beginning of Tape 10, Side A

DODDS: ...his corporate compensation, I'm sure whatever the stock options were and corporate benefits. You're looking at a package that had to be over a half a million dollars. I knew what the president of the college made and you throw in the house, you throw in the college car, whatever those things are. I mean it wasn't coming anyway near what that corporate package was. It wasn't even going to be half. If it was

going to be a third, it might have been in the ballpark. So I just couldn't understand. I just didn't get the -- I didn't get -- the arithmetic threw me, so I asked one of his cohorts who was doing a lot of the pushing. "Does he really, I mean is he really serious? Does he really mean to do this?" I didn't say what had prompted my questioning, but back came the answer. "Yes. There was no doubt about it. He was serious. He really wanted to do it. This was the time. He was ready. He was primed. He was eager to go, etc. etc." Well, all right.

And as it unfolded later on, this was where my naivete was really exposed. I guess I learned a lot from it. That gap between the corporate package and the college package began to narrow appreciatively because, within the first year of David's being inaugurated, he gets elected to the board of Westinghouse Corporation, of Chase Manhattan Bank, which is the Rockefeller thing, and there was one other of some note. Was it General Electric? I don't know, but it was one of--another biggie. Which carry with them their fees for service and attendance at the meetings. So, what was his college salary was being accreted almost month by month by these board elections. And as I say, that gap was narrowing.

Now, what's my naivete? The naivete was that his backers all along had obviously dealt with the same question that I was working on. I mean how can you take a guy from half-million a year down to this relative pittance that the president of a college makes, how do you do that? This was not a man of inherited wealth or that sort of thing. He had been a financial aid student when he was here; so I mean that was all part of his allure and they had taken care of it. It had obviously been worked out that, were he to be elected, the gap would be taken care of because these guys were tied in with these corporations. They were on these boards and they could make this thing happen and they did. [Laughter] They got him elected to these--I mean it was a wonder to watch this thing happening and I'm just sitting there. "Boy, Harry, you don't know how the game is played." [Laughter] They had worked the whole thing out clearly and more power to them. They were able to bring it about that he could make that shift with, I'm sure, a minimal dent financially and, you know, he could carry on. Now do you lose something when the president of your college is suddenly on these corporate boards and what kind of commitment does that represent? What is the signal that that gives to your faculty and the institution and so on? Does that mean that you have some inherent conflicts when you're dealing with proxy issues?" All of these things then rise to the surface, but they weren't controlling issues in the sense that the powers that be had made it happen. I mean they weren't about to say,

"Oh, gee. That's a terrible thing, David. You can't belong to the board of General Electric." [Laughter] They were the ones that created the opportunity, so it was all in the works. It was all done to his advantage and that's the way it happened.

BURNS: In relation to the size of the applicant pool, there's one story out there, a rumor, what have you, that perhaps the word was out that McLaughlin was sort of a shoe-in.

DODDS: Well, that, in a sense, was part of--I didn't really go into all of it, but that was part of what Walter Burke meant about dealing with 'Banquo's Ghost' because, yes. It was said to us actually by some of the resource people that we went to visit. "Oh and by the way, it's good that you are out looking for these characteristics; but, by the way, we understand that you have a chairman of the board who's a likely candidate. Is that the case?" So we were getting it not only from our own colleagues on the board, but the very people that we were going out to interview as resource people. They were feeding it back to us that "yes", they had in fact heard that. And I have no doubt that they did hear it, because I'm sure that the fact of his interest, was being made known. I don't think David did anything to discourage the speculation that he was, in fact, interested. It wouldn't have been to his advantage to do so.

BURNS: Did you have the sense that it was his strong desire to be president or was it more this core of trustee members that really wanted him?

DODDS: I didn't make any distinction between the two. Certainly they were an impetus. Now, whether they had to persuade him at some point to move in that direction, I don't know. I always had the sense, but not from anything he did as the chair of the board, but I did have a sense that, from the way they were relating it, it just sounded as though he had decided--that here he had had this corporate career. He had previously been with the Champion International Corporation, the same company that I eventually went to work for. He had been there. He had risen, I guess, to maybe vice-presidential level or whatever and then had gone on to Toro and that he was now at a stage in his life where--In fact, we asked him that when he came for his interview. We asked him point blank. "Why do you want to do this and why now?" His answer was that he had done all that he had set out to do on the corporate side; that he had this special attachment to the college; that he thought that there were things that he could contribute; that he could make a difference; that he saw much that was positive in the way the college was moving under Kemeny and there was a lot that he

wanted to do to further that. So I mean he had obviously been prepared for the question because I'm sure he knew it was coming. And his answer was along those lines. So we, in addition to whatever we were hearing, we wanted to hear it from him and he gave it to us very reassuringly that "yes" this was definitely a matter of top priority for him. He was very much interested; very much willing to serve, and very prepared to do so.

BURNS: You had said your vote went to Lisle Carter?

DODDS: Yes.

BURNS: But, in that phase--knowing that McLaughlin was the one that won the election, were there, what were the qualifications...

DODDS: When you say, "knowing that he had won the election", meaning what?

BURNS: Well, even after the vote. Just evaluate him as a candidate. What would you say you thought at the time would make him a good candidate or a bad candidate?

DODDS: Are you talking about Carter or McLaughlin?

BURNS: McLaughlin. It's not a greatly worded sentence.

DODDS: Okay. I guess we're getting down to the end of the tape and the end of our endurance. [Laughter] Well, I mean I saw as strengths all the things that were matters of public knowledge and public record. He certainly knew the institution. He was dedicated to it. He was a very smart man and, although I, in some of my questioning, suggested to him that he would have a difficult time in dealing--because I am now very mindful of the attitude of our faculty members, faculty cohorts, advisers. And in some of the questions or comments that I made to him during the interview sessions, I suggested that he would have a really hard time with that part of the constituency because he would be viewed as an outsider. For all of his Dartmouth Green, he was not an academician and not part of that fraternity. He had not been steeped in that tradition, not going through the rigors of the Ph.D. and all of that. His answer was that he understood that. He understood the difference between his background and that of a classic academician, but that he felt that he had intelligence. In fact, at one point, he said as part of an answer to a question, "I'm not dumb." Everybody laughed. Obviously he had honors as a graduate. He was a holder of an M.B.A. and all of

that, but he made sure for the records that he said he was not dumb.
[Laughter]

So, as far as I was concerned, it was a weakness that he did not deal in his everyday experience with the process of decision-making in the academic setting. I saw in some ways that his closeness with the institution cut both ways. I mean it was an obvious plus because of his familiarity with things and the expected positive response by the alumni; but, at that same time, would it mean that he was a little too close to things to be objective? Would it compromise his ability to look at things afresh and to bring a critical perspective on such traditional things as the fraternities, for example? So I saw it as a two-edged proposition there. Again, I was persuaded by the argument that the faculty made that you really need to treat this presidency of a major academic institution as a specialized set of requirements for which there is a really limited number of people that can qualify and, simply coming from a corporate background, albeit a successful one--and, at a later time, there was some question about how successful he had actually been at Toro. Well, that was water over the dam at that point. I mean what were you going to do? But be that it as it may, it was the sense that the faculty group had, and I bought into it, that there was a kind of sensitivity, a kind of style, that was better sought in the academic world. So, Lisle Carter's candidacy got my vote for that reason.

The problem that Lisle had was that, in addition to the Steel attitude, which may have been held by others, Steel was the only one who voiced it--that it wasn't the time, the college wasn't ready for a black president--was as Berl Bernhard would put it, "the strength or fatigue factor. Was Lisle really up to another go at a major assignment?" He had been a vice president at Cornell. He was, what was he doing at the time? I don't remember what he was doing as we were interviewing him. Well, whatever. He had been with--oh, I think I know. He had been the chancellor of the University of the District of Columbia. No. I'm sorry. He had been the chancellor of the Atlanta University complex. That's what it was. In Atlanta. So he had occasion to administer a confederation of colleges and universities. And then he had some affiliation with the University of the District of Columbia as well. Maybe he was the chancellor there as well. But these were all--the knocks on him were that these were all very large-scale institutions. The District of Columbia was a public place and so on. So there was a real questioning as to whether the nature of his experience was that applicable to Dartmouth, even though he was an

alumnus. And he knew the place and had taken some role in the Black Alumni activities.

BURNS: When had he graduated?

DODDS: Lisle Carter was class of '45. So he was obviously older than McLaughlin. Those who knew him well, I didn't know him well. I certainly knew him; but those who knew him well, which was really Berl Bernhard from the Washington law firm, raised the question as to whether he was really up for a serious go-round for what might be up to ten years, energy level. That was the phrase Berl would use. "I don't know if Lisle has got the energy level to pull this off."

Then the third was Lloyd Weinreb who was a contemporary of mine. He was, is a Harvard law professor, class of '57, and really faded as the process went on because Lloyd, I don't think he really believed that we were serious about his candidacy. I'm sure he was aware of McLaughlin, as Lisle would have been. So, at the outset, he came across very well because he had questions of us. You know, "What is it you're looking for?" We just thought his questions showed an interest and an inquisitiveness and so on that was right on the target. He was raising the issues that we thought were very relevant; but, as the conversations went on, he hadn't formulated any answers. He was still raising questions. "Well, okay, what do you think about that?" Well, he hadn't really gotten around to being more positive and so on. So, the interest didn't really get generated, even among our faculty advisers for Lloyd. Whatever the backing was I think really was on Lisle Carter's behalf.

BURNS: So McLaughlin wins the vote and then it's announced to the college and the world at large. There's almost, well there is, an immediate negative faculty reaction. Did you anticipate that from your dealings with the faculty?

DODDS: Yes. [Laughter] It was not a surprise. They had, to a person, been very opposed, and it wasn't that they had anything but the highest admiration. They'd been saying, "We have a wonderful admiration for McLaughlin for his service to the college, for his dedication." I think, as one of them put it, if he could be the chair of the board for life, that was great by them. They marveled that a person of that talent was available to the college for the purposes that he had served. But, that he would be the president, was just not something that they were buying into, despite his accomplishments and record. So they would

have been the heralds of what was to come. I mean there was just no question about it.

Now, David in turn, knowing this, did everything he could at the outset to throw all kinds of goodies in the direction of the faculty. It was a remarkable thing. I suppose of his programmatic declarations in his inaugural address, there must have been at least four or five that were faculty specific. And one of the very first had to do with faculty salaries. I mean, he—"we've got to improve the economic status of the faculty, if we're going to be competitive." That was right out there. There were going to be in-house scholarships or things for people to do on their sabbaticals. It would be funded by the college. There were going to be all kinds of things, better facilities, faculty lounges, on and on. And he had started the fund-raising process already. He was beginning to line up the contributions and the contributors who would help to fund these things. They were sort of like budget add-ons that were not part of the existing budget. So he was out there doing it. And he was very solicitous. He was inaugurated in the fall, September, was it?

BURNS: '81.

DODDS: Yeah. No, I was just trying to think of the timing, because there was time over the summer—I'm pretty sure we had a Minary or a retreat and he was talking about his initial programs and presentations and was kind enough--I mean, this was not anything that John Kemeny had ever done--but he was kind enough to provide a few of us with a draft of his inaugural address and to accept comments and suggestions about it, which I thought was very--a wonderful effort at being accommodating and so on. So it was something that he was trying to gear up to deal with.

He also, I thought deftly so, brought in Bart [Bartlett] Giamatti to basically give the inaugural address at his installation. And what that did was it gave the imprimatur of your classic Ivy League academic president, because this guy--I mean you couldn't be more of an academician than Bart Giamatti was, even though he went on to become the baseball commissioner. This guy was really to the manor born, classics scholar and all of that, Yale through and through. Here he comes up to Hanover and, of course, the Yale connection was always one of sentimental and historic importance with Eleazar Wheelock and all of that. So that was supposed to provide something of a stamp of approval, the Good Housekeeping seal. And Giamatti said all of the appropriate things that you would hope that he would say

about the college, in general, and the work that Kemeny had done, “but now carrying on the tradition, etc. Here’s David McLaughlin and I salute him.” It was all very nice. So we just hoped for the best after that.

BURNS: We talked a little bit about John Kemeny inheriting some of the John Dickey administrators and one of the things that sort of causes a stir with Dave McLaughlin early on are some of the personnel decisions that he makes in terms of Rod Morgan [Rodney "Rod" Morgan '44] and Dennis Dinan ['61] and the football coach Joe Yukica. Did he work closely with the board on these or was it more of his decision?

DODDS: I don't know. I really don't know the answer to that because I'm not really aware of what went on in the changes that you've mentioned. I am aware that increasingly there was a gulf that began to appear between himself and the dean of the William Jewett Tucker Foundation, being Warner Traynham. It was increasingly apparent that that was not going to survive, that is to say, that Traynham was not going to be there for any extended period. And the way that David put it, and I don't remember whether this was a meeting or whether he and I, because he would have known that I was close to Warner--I don't know whether it was just a conversation, but what David wanted to do was to take on the use and abuse of alcohol. And he saw that as being a major need and something that had to be addressed and he was very concerned that for all of the effort to bring about fraternity standards and so forth--you would go through some accrediting process to make sure the houses were up to code and what have you--that the behavioral side was still not fully addressed.

So he really launched a very determined effort to get at this matter of alcohol abuse and was hopeful that the William Jewett Tucker Foundation would be an active participant in that. He saw that as a resource that was an important shaper of the moral attitude and an influence on the moral climate of the college and was really looking for Traynham to become engaged with the administration, with him and the administration, in this effort to deal with alcoholism and student behavior. For whatever the reason, I never really got into it with him, Warner Traynham didn't snap to attention. I mean he didn't kind of get on board with all of this. Now it may be that he saw the Tucker Foundation role as being somewhat different, as more an initiator of debate, as a stimulator of ideas, a challenger of the status quo sort of thing, much in the role that it had played during the apartheid and the anti-war demonstrations. The Tucker Foundation would be a forum where these ideas and issues could be debated and so on. I just don't

think he really saw that the foundation was an arm of the administration for purposes of implementing policy. He may have even said as much at some point.

So, you've got David saying "We're tackling alcoholism." You get student health involved and the deans and all of that and then the William Jewett Foundation isn't--I mean there are no broadsides saying "as a matter of moral certitude, collegians, you're going to shape up and not abuse alcohol." It just never happened and eventually Traynham's tenure came to an end. It wasn't eventually, it was fairly soon because I remember being here when he left. Then another colleague, contemporary of ours, came on board, James [P.] Breeden ['56] assumed that assignment.

BURNS: Did Breeden then take the tact of having the Tucker Foundation more involved in this?

DODDS: Well, frankly, at that point, as I've suggested, I was getting involved with Champion International and I really didn't give it that much attention. I can't say one way or another in answer to your question, because I really don't remember. My sense is that James came on and was satisfactory, because he remained as the dean...

End of Tape 10, Side A – Beginning of Tape 10, Side B

BURNS: So I guess we can start with...

DODDS: Let me--because it actually did just occur to me what it is was, the point that I wanted to make and that was that, from the standpoint of the faculty that we were dealing with, our advisors on the search committee, and the things that they would say to us, sometimes in the context of the meetings, but also in the informal sessions--we spent a lot of time together, especially on those Minary search weekends and we had a chance to take walks and to play poker and there were a number of recreational things that were going on as well. I do remember that one of the things that concerned them was the perception of the college in the eyes of the academic community writ large. Because they would say that they were getting from their professional colleagues, the people in English, the historians and so forth, not just their colleagues here at Dartmouth, but whatever they were hearing from people in the professional societies that they belonged was anticipatorily negative with regard to Dartmouth choosing a corporate executive as its chair.

I think one of the things that was driving them was, "What is it going to say about my role as an academic at an institution that reaches out to the corporations to bring in somebody who is not an academic and who's not out of the academic tradition, at least in terms of his career background." So that was out there. That was on the table and what it did was it really opened an avenue of observation about the college and scrutiny of what we were doing that was far broader than just our own campus community. Suddenly we became aware that, if this thing goes in that direction, it's the colleagues of the people that we've been talking to at the other Ivy League institutions, at the other places where these professionals relate to one another, that are going to have many of the same negative reactions that they're having. So it was more than that it was just our faculty people who were upset. They were telling us that colleagues here at Dartmouth and elsewhere in their professional ranks were concerned that a place like this would take a step like that. It added weight, I guess that's how it...

BURNS: And some potential outcomes of that would be felt in faculty recruitment possibly?

DODDS: Possibly. Yeah. I mean they didn't spell any of this out in any sort of a threatening way; but they just thought it would send a signal that was not helpful. That if you were trying to increase your standing as a community of higher education that was serious about its mission, that this was not the signal that you would want to send by bringing in somebody who just didn't have that as part of his or her background or demonstrated skills.

The other thing I had wanted to just observe, looking at the questions about Three Mile Island again, is that I'm sure John Kemeny talked with the board chair and whatever the inner sanctum was, personnel committee, before accepting the post. But as he, Kemeny, would often say at later dates in relating it, this was a situation in which he felt very uniquely limited in the kind of answer that he could give when he was asked because, as he would say, "When the President of the United States calls you and asks you to do something, how can you say 'no'?" So he might have said to the president, "Well I do need to check with my board," and so on; but the implication was that, when he was asked, he had said "yes" because he didn't think he could give any other kind of answer and that I'm sure he would have talked to Andres and/or McLaughlin, whomever was in the chair at the time, to get their okay and then gotten back to the president accordingly. But there was universal support for his doing that on the board. There was no one who voiced any concern that it wasn't a good idea and that he

shouldn't do it. Adjustments were made. In effect we had a back-up president, it was somebody who did a lot of the ceremonial and administrative things that you would often have to do and everybody understood that it was because John Kemeny was on this major national assignment for the good of the country.

BURNS: And this was about a six-month period?

DODDS: It seems to be. Yeah. Maybe a little more with the end of the report, press conferences and I don't remember whether Kemeny had to testify before Congress, but there were some wrap-up activities after the report, itself, came out.

BURNS: You had said that you had some comments on Judy McLaughlin's role?

DODDS: Correct. I did want to say that she brought with her a great deal of enthusiasm and dedication to what can often be a somewhat thankless role, certainly a role that has no compensation attached to it. But she really had a sense of the area, a sense of where she could make a contribution as the first lady of the college, and pitched right in. It was, I'm sure, a great help to David that she could be as involved and as outgoing as she was for providing him with the support that was very important that he have. Now there also was the episode of his having to have the angioplasty surgery and I believe that happened while I was still on the board.

BURNS: It was fairly early on in his presidency.

DODDS: Yeah. Because a lot of the initial concern was, "Was he driving himself too much? Was this a physical reaction to the demands of the job?" Because it began to become apparent that he was putting in some very hard hours. I guess he would arrive at six or six-thirty in the morning or something and start cranking out memos and so forth, and it was just speculated that maybe that was a contributing factor to what happened.

BURNS: The six in the morning comment certainly brings to mind one stylistic difference between Dave McLaughlin and John Kemeny. In that John Kemeny was known to be later...

DODDS: Later. That's right. [Laughter] That 's true.

BURNS: He worked late into the night.

DODDS: That's right.

BURNS: Did you get an impression that there were other big changes as far as administrative style?

DODDS: I did. I got the sense--but not being here on the ground, there was really no way to determine it. I got the sense that David had more of a carryover of the corporate style of management and was more given to a pattern of issuing, I wouldn't really call them directives, but memos and other things that didn't anticipate a period of discussion and consequent building of consensus. In other words, it was described as a style that indicated what the decision was; so now it was a matter of the implementation. We will now do this in order to achieve the goal of ABC, where the goal had not been part of the discussion process. So it was perceived, the way it was being reported back, that this was somewhat preemptory as compared with what would be your expected course of developing a decision on a program in the academic community where you would solicit ideas, you'd build a consensus. You'd have committees that were doing this and that. Evidently, David just didn't demonstrate sufficiently to some, I suppose, a patience with that manner of getting things done.

But this is—it's really difficult for me to speak on this because, again as I've suggested, I was really focusing elsewhere and what I tended to hear were the opinings of those who were not pleased. So, necessarily, they had a point of view that was not supportive, not objective, and rather biased, so you always had to take what they were saying with an appropriate grain or two of salt. But that was what was beginning to come through. I guess it was the real tolling of the bell when later--it must have been quite a bit later, I'm sure I was off the board at the time and maybe it was in the context of some gathering of emeriti or maybe I'd gone back for a commencement, something--that those who had been the ones pushing early on, the ones who had been telling us--"What's holding you up? What are you waiting for?"--who began to say, "Gee. I'm not so sure that this is working." When those members of the board began to express some reservation, I pretty much knew the game was up. This was, you know, before the six-year period or whenever it was that he eventually stepped down.

BURNS: In the evaluation of the McLaughlin years, some of the areas that are pointed to as strengths—we've talked a lot about the tension that was there--but some of the things that are pointed to as things that he did accomplish are in areas of development and the endowment and the

endowment increasing during that period as well as the facilities, the improvements that were made during that time.

DODDS: Right.

BURNS: And things like the faculty salaries, although it's unclear whether that was ever warmly received by the faculty, themselves. I imagine some of those developments started while you were still...

DODDS: No doubt, it did. Yes. Perhaps particularly on the facilities side. Again, I can't identify particular projects or buildings, but that would have been definitely a priority for David. I do remember that his classmate Lo-Yi Chan ['54], whose dad had been my professor for Asian studies when I was an undergraduate, was an active presenter at our meetings and had been for some time. I mean he wasn't new with McLaughlin, but he was, again, prominently featured during those early years.

BURNS: I would imagine a lot of the fund-raising actually came out of that Campaign for Dartmouth for these new facilities.

DODDS: I think that's right.

BURNS: I think a lot of them were in the area of residential...

DODDS: Residential. Right. Yeah. In fact, I'm just trying to remember whether the dormitory that I'm thinking of, the one that had the German language component as part of the programmatic offering, might have been one of those that emerged during that campaign period. I just don't remember.

BURNS: It could have been. I'm not sure.

DODDS: It's very likely that it was.

BURNS: Were there other areas where you think Dave McLaughlin was successful as president? Is it hard to evaluate?

DODDS: I think that, yeah, again... But just in the general settling down of the alumni tempest that had always seemed to be brewing during the preceding decade. I don't know that the Hopkins Institute, *The Review*, etc. were silent during those years necessarily. I can't assume that they were; but I just had a sense that the vitriol tended to get lowered, that the level of demonstrated hostility, the personal nature of the

attacks seemed to back away. I'm convinced that they didn't give David a free pass. I mean he probably had to take his lumps somewhere along the line, but I just never had the sense that he was subjected to the kind of personal stuff that Kemeny had to deal with or that his successor Freedman [James O. "Jim" Freedman] encountered. It just seemed to be, whatever it was seemed to be on the issues. There may have been a lot of doubts expressed about efforts to do curriculum changing, and there were these ethnic study and the gender study programs that were beginning to emerge. And I'm sure there was a lot of criticism about that and David was supportive of those, I know, so they would not have been happy with him for that reason. I'm sure for many others as well.

BURNS: Again, an incident that happens after you were off the board, but is related to some of your work on the Committee on Investor Responsibility, is the shanty incident in '86. Were you aware of what was going on during that time?

DODDS: Not intimately, but there was a point at which, and it may well have been after that shanty incident, that I was appointed to the board of visitors of the William Jewett Tucker Foundation. As best I can recall, that shanty incident had already taken place. It might have been that I was appointed beforehand. I'm not sure. That was initially a three-year appointment and it was a group that met maybe three times a year and it was purely advisory to the staff, to the dean of the William Jewett Tucker Foundation and to its staff. So, we certainly didn't have the level of involvement in the campus at large as the trustees did; but, at least from that vantage, it was a chance to get a sense of what the students were involved in, the various college outreach programs by way of community service and internships and so on were very much a part of the foundation's agenda, as was this role of being something of the moral conscious of the college. And it would have been in that connection, because, I think, for reasons of being a modest contributor, I was probably on the Tucker mailing list for publications anyway.

I know that Dean Breeden tried to become a part of the events, the post-shanty events, and to try to encourage using it as a learning experience and to see what could be done to heighten sensitivity and so forth. Of course, that incident, once again, put the spotlight on the investment question and I'm sure generated long nights for the successors of mine on the Investor Relations Committee. [Laughter] But it was obviously a very unfortunate incident.

One of the worse things about it, of course, was the negative publicity that it sent about the college abroad, because that became as synonymous with the college as a lot of the good things that had been done and so on. So it just became another part of the baggage that people affiliated with Dartmouth had to carry. As an interested alumnus, I was one of them. [Laughter] I wound up with--you're trying to explain. "What does this thing all mean?" It was just an unfortunate thing.

BURNS: And it had some effect on the admissions pool?

DODDS: No question. Oh, yeah. I mean that's what I was alluding to about the national publicity and the fact that there were all these negative--oh, yeah. Definitely. In fact, it was a long time because that, combined with *The Review* and its constant drum beat, is what a lot of the African-American students were reacting to and beginning to themselves report elsewhere that, "Boy. This is not the place where you want to come if you're like us?" Oh, yeah. Definitely. Very, very negative. Numbers went way down. I think at one point, if the college was able to have an entering class of thirty-five or forty, I mean from a point where it had been up around seventy-five, eighty, it was holding its own. That was a drop, a measurable drop of almost half. In some respects, it has yet to really fully recover in a numerical sense. The pools have been better. The yield, the president reported the yield for this coming fall of minority students is one of the best of recent years; but I think the incoming numbers have yet to ever get back to the pre-shanty halcyon days. That was a devastating, devastating blow. It was.

BURNS: The activities of *The Review* certainly were part of that. We're winding down and I want, I guess, to give you a chance to summarize your years as a trustee and your affiliation with the college over the years.

DODDS: Well, those years were just certainly very rewarding, very educational for me personally. I really very much appreciated the opportunity to serve and really looked on the William Jewett Tucker Foundation experience as a way of just trying to extend some form of the connection and the attachment. I really missed the involvement. It was not an easy time from a family standpoint because, when I joined, it happened to be the same year that my daughter was born and so, for the ten years, I was spending three, four, maybe five of these weekends and it inevitably seemed to be the case that at least one of the trustee meetings coincided with one of my kid's birthdays. So it was having to miss the birthdays. I'd be up there. And the January

meetings, well, I didn't mind so much, but more often than not, meant that--not a January meeting, some January event would cause me to miss my own birthday celebration. As a matter of fact, there was one year when we had something going on in January and, wouldn't you know, the weather forecast had been so bad I ended up taking the train, which then ran through to White River and it was scheduled so that, essentially, you had to ride overnight in order to get to Hanover in time for the meetings that would start the next day. And this particular train had no sleeping accommodations, so I had to sit up in the coach section and just try to grab--and it was my birthday, as well, and I remember thinking "Boy, what a sacrifice this is." [Laughter]

But it was--also on a personal level, I mean it resulted, as I suggested indirectly, in a major career change that I made. Members of the board were always very supportive in personal matters that I would occasionally have to turn to them on an individual basis about and it was just a wonderful experience. For example, I mean I have made references that might be viewed as somewhat critical, for example of Ralph Lazarus [‘35] of Federated, but there was a point at which I was making a career transition and called Ralph, explained that I was looking to make some contacts and associations in the field of law, because that is one of the things I was looking to get back into. My foundation career was rapidly coming to an end, and Ralph saw to it that I got to meet Abe Fortis and Abe Fortis was a former Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. He had been appointed by Lyndon Johnson and there had been some unfortunate financial whatever that resulted in his having to resign from the bench, some sort of a conflict of interest situation. But, in any event, Abe Fortis was a known personage in the field of law and Ralph Lazarus set it up, which was a very nice gesture on his part.

The spouses of the board, that was like a whole other galaxy of people, of talent and interest in the college even though, almost by definition, none of them were alumni because there had never been women to attend, but they were very much supportive. They were very involved and, to the extent that my wife could attend, she similarly enjoyed the camaraderie and the opportunity to share in the fellowship and to be looked upon as a contributor and a part of the Dartmouth family.

BURNS: And the summer retreats at the Minary Center start while you were a trustee.

DODDS: They did and they were very helpful and very necessary, I think, to give us--because what we began to find as I'm sure others may have told

you, is that each one of the meetings was just so laden with issues and business items, there was never any chance to just talk. Just to converse in a general way about issues affecting the college to try and develop some sort of long-range perspective, to have ideas batted around that weren't in the form of specific resolutions or business items that you could just think about. What would it mean five years from now that we were doing certain things with graduate programs in computer science? Did that have some particular implication for how we would be required to structure ourselves in terms of new facilities and things like that. So it really gave an opportunity to do more of the blue sky thinking to speculate and to really consider alternatives and issues of the college's future than the ordinary business agenda would. Plus it was a nice setting. It was the summer. It was Squam Lake. It was a chance to do things in that environment that you would never ever do. You mentioned Richard Hill before. Well, we wound up on one retreat--I don't think the spouses were always included at the beginning, but whatever. On this one Minary, Dick Hill and I wound up sharing a room and we also, during one of the breaks, went out on a rowboat together, or in a motorboat to just kind of peruse. So that became an experience that years later we would talk about, that we had been roommates at Minary and we'd gone on this little sailing expedition. He's the chair of the Bank of Boston. When am I ever going to.....

End of Interview