

**Edward J. Shanahan
Dean of the College**

An Interview Conducted by
Daniel Daily

Wallingford, Connecticut
March 27, 2002

DOH-47

Special Collections
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: Edward Shanahan

INTERVIEWED BY: Daniel Daily

PLACE: Wallingford, CT

DATE: March 27, 2002

DAILY: I'm speaking with Mr. Edward Shanahan, formerly Dean of the College at Dartmouth College and now at [Choate] Rosemary Hall as headmaster. To begin, I'd like to kind of pick up at the point in your life where you are in graduate school. If I understand right, you were working on a doctorate in English, is that correct?

SHANAHAH: Yes.

DAILY: And from what I understand, you became involved with student life administration in that time period?

SHANAHAH: That's right.

DAILY: Could you kind of discuss how that focus evolved?

SHANAHAH: Yes. I went to graduate school after a break, to study English literature. I got a master's degree at Fordham University and was pursuing a doctorate at the University of Wisconsin. At both of those schools I backed into responsibilities, modest responsibilities, for undergraduate students in terms of the residential life programs that both of these schools sponsored. So I was a full-time graduate student in literature while providing some income for myself and some tuition relief by working in residential life. And I was two years in each school on a full-time basis as a graduate student, and went from being something analogous to a resident advisor to a management position at school one and the same thing happened at school two. And it was suggested to me that I might have some ability in this area which suggestion I eschewed. I wasn't particularly interested in this. I was interested in working as a teacher, but that's where my interest in residential life was seeded.

While I was at the University of Wisconsin, however, I was offered a position as a dean of students at Wesleyan University which was an administrative appointment with the possibility of doing some teaching. Because I had some untimely deaths in my family out east, I took the position for a couple of years and wound up staying for ten years at Wesleyan University. I managed to teach some at Wesleyan, but ninety percent of my time was spent doing student life administration.

DAILY: How did you come to Wesleyan's attention while you were out there?

SHANAHAH: I was good friends, very good friends, with Paul Ginsburg who was the dean of students at the University of Wisconsin, and he maintained contact with other graduate students, historians, who had

left Wisconsin a couple years before I got there. One of those individuals happened to be chair of the search committee at Wesleyan and she had gone through one cycle of searching for a dean of students and they were unsuccessful. So she called up Paul and asked whether there was anybody on the Wisconsin team who he would nominate. He approached me at a Christmas party and said, "I put your name in the hopper for Wesleyan University."

DAILY: And it started. As things kind of rolled along at Wesleyan were you happy to find yourself in that track versus teaching?

SHANAHAN: As I said, it was a temporary move for me until the family front stabilized. But after a couple of years, my wife was enrolled in graduate school herself and we had a baby. All of a sudden life was more important than a particular vocation in life. And the administration managed, at Wesleyan University, to move me along nicely in terms of responsibility. I'd say every three or four years I got a major increase in responsibility, was on the president's staff, and was relied on in ways that were very rewarding for me. So I was quite comfortable thinking of myself then as a senior administrator at a university, more than as a professor at a university. Though I still had the academic fire in my belly, I could only satisfy it every once in a while. So I was happy with that.

DAILY: What kind of things did you teach down at Wesleyan?

SHANAHAN: I did not teach in the English department. As a matter of fact I taught in the sociology department. I'm self-taught in the area of sociology, but I had enough to persuade the department chair that I could teach an introductory course in group dynamics. And since I was practicing what I was studying in my residential life work, she thought it would attract a number of students; and as it turned out, it did. So it provided me with the occasion of being in a classroom with fifteen or twenty students on a regular basis.

DAILY: That's neat.

SHANAHAN: Even though I didn't have a degree in sociology, I managed to teach courses in sociology.

DAILY: Were there other responsibilities or... Your responsibilities at Wesleyan, did they... Looking back to see how they prepared you for Dartmouth in any specific ways?

SHANAHAN: Oh, sure. This was the first time... I mean I had responsibility for undergraduates and for the training of undergraduates, just not as extensive as when I was at Fordham and when I was at Wisconsin as a graduate student. But this was the first time I was responsible for a large community. And a significant staff of students and junior level administrators. And I was thrust into it. I had never had that breadth of experience before. And it afforded me an opportunity to grow fast, to learn quickly how to manage that, and eventually how to manage it successfully.

So in terms of hiring personnel, hiring student personnel and professional personnel, training them in ways that were specific to the needs of the school, developing a vision for residential life and for school life and, over several years, trying to effect that vision with the cooperation of the faculty and my colleagues. That was all wonderful preparation for what was important I think for Dartmouth at that time. I also managed. . . and you're probably going to hear me border on self-congratulations periodically in our interview. I don't mean to suggest an arrogance on my part because I can tell you plenty of things that I blew. And you'll probably go after some of them. But I managed to win the respect and confidence of the president and the faculty for the way I improved the lives of students. Such that it complemented what they were trying to do [inaudible] and I think that served me well when I transitioned to Dartmouth.

DAILY: How did you... How did the deanship come to your attention up at Dartmouth?

SHANAHAN: Believe it or not, it was an ad in The Chronicle of Higher Education. One of those things that infrequently happen. But it is unusual that somebody will get a job like that without being headhunted or tapped by somebody.

DAILY: How much did you know about Dartmouth when you decided to apply?

SHANAHAN: Virtually nothing. I mean, I knew what everybody in general knows about the school -- its quality, its "league" identity, its unique characteristic within the Ivy league. So a generic sense. Nothing specific to the culture and lore of the school, which I managed to glean over the years I was there.

DAILY: Okay. After you applied, was there any... If you want to talk about that process of how your candidacy went along.

SHANAHAN: As I recall it was a rather quick process. I think I might have been at the tail end of several interviews. I remember those interviews as very exciting opportunities to meet with faculty, alumni and students. I think there was an administrator or two on the committee as well. They weren't actively interviews; they were really conversations about transformation of communities. I tend to get energized and the more I got energized, the more they got energized and it wound up being a very exciting, very rewarding time for me.

I also had an opportunity to spend more protracted time than the interview might otherwise allow with some individuals: Ed Scheu [Edward M. Scheu '46 TU '50] who was, I think, the chair of the committee at the time or a member of the committee; Kristen von Summer [Kristen P. von Summer '89]. (As a matter of fact, I just got a letter from Kristen who is a graduate of Dartmouth College.) She was on the committee and she gave me a tour and filled me in on the real story of what was happening. Ag Pytte [Agnar Pytte], an extraordinary man whom I have a great deal of affection for. I spent

some good time with him. So I remember it being a very happy process and a very quick process before I got the appointment.

DAILY: Were there folks on the search committee that you have particular recollections of?

SHANAHAN: Scheu and Kristen I think were principal among them.

DAILY: So Kristen was a student?

SHANAHAN: She was an undergraduate student at that time. Yeah, a wonderful gal.

DAILY: What did they... You spoke about being energized in terms of transforming the communities of Dartmouth. What was their vision and how did that meet your own vision up to that point in life?

SHANAHAN: One of the priorities of Dave McLaughlin [David T. McLaughlin "Dave" '54 TU '55] coming in clearly was to do something about the residential experiences of students at the school. I think it was a dominant priority. A disproportionate priority. Not unlike what Jim [James Wright] faced early on. But I don't think it was a mandate for Jim. I think Jim took it on. I don't know, because I obviously wasn't there. I'm not sure to what extent that was board-driven or to what extent it just happened to him.

But it was clearly Dave's agenda to do something about this; and to do something about it, as I subsequently learned, in two ways: to build something that wasn't there and to transform, to fundamentally change, something that was there. I think his primary motivation was to accomplish the latter; to transform the fraternity system which was, when he got there, abysmal in every way except perhaps for the camaraderie that it created among students. Which was a huge element of its success even when it was, from every adult vantage point, an abysmal experience for groups of men and to a far less extent groups of women. So he had that -- this residential life -- as his agenda and that came across in the interviews.

I will say however, that in the interviews... [He] said nothing about the abysmal condition of the fraternity system. This was his positive spin. We wanted to add quality, culture, conversation, camaraderie, fellowship to the residential experience. We needed to do something with dormitories that were, in effect, barracks, that in effect were places where people went to bivouac. But there were no opportunities, except within your room, to entertain, to have casual conversation, to study outside the context of a blaring stereo in a room. There were no social spaces or academic spaces outside of the rooms. That's what they wanted.

I subsequently learned what I suspected from the interview... I asked, "Why do I sense that the hidden agenda here is to eclipse something that is really bad?" And it did come out that it was. There was a nodding acknowledgment that that was the case. But I think from Dave's point of view... I don't think he knew where he wanted to go

on the positive side; that is what he, I think, was hoping to get from me, because I had that reputation at Wesleyan. I think he knew clearly where he wanted to go on the negative side, that is correcting the fraternity system side; and it would be easy for any person to know where it had to go. You know, clean it up, straighten it out, create some socially acceptable moral communities.

So in preparation for my arrival, there had been a number of studies that were drafted. David Kastan [David S. Kastan] was a faculty member who was chair of the residential life committee. As a matter of fact, I believe he was an applicant for the position too and a very able young faculty member, and he had drafted a report as to what needed to be done. And David had taken some initiatives himself. As a matter of fact, I think that is when they paved, or repaved and re-lighted all of Webster Avenue, got the trash out, and more compactors and all that. So he took care of the outside presentation of the "row" and he wanted me to take care of the inside. So some work had been done.

DAILY: And you mentioned that you felt like the emphasis on dealing with residential life was kind of disproportionate. Do you want to kind of flesh that out a little bit?

SHANAHAN: I only know that with the benefit of hindsight. Because I don't, although David certainly knew the college well and had served it extraordinarily well and impressed everybody at every level of the school with his devotion and the quickness of his wit and his grasp of issues... I'm not suggesting that he didn't have opinions about things like the role of graduate education in an emerging university with all the research; that he didn't have opinions about how to evolve to a more complex community. (Dartmouth had a mixed reputation at the time.) How to manage faculty, how to support faculty, faculty development. I'm not saying that he didn't have passing opinions about that, but I don't think he had the feel for it that somebody like Jim Wright [James E. Wright] obviously has, having come from the faculty; that Jim Freedman [James O. Freedman] had having somewhat come from a faculty, but more from an administration at another institution, at Penn and at Iowa. Dave didn't have that, so I think later on in his years, I think he had some obstacles that he had to overcome. But he knew, he knew how to take care of this other problem because he was... At least he felt that he knew how to take care of it. So that's what he, I think, threw himself into wholeheartedly; and he tried to learn on the job -- some of these other aspects of his work

DAILY: That's really interesting. I like that perspective because it sounds like he was almost tapped as, for the given situation.

SHANAHAN: Right. And other issues eventually...

DAILY: And came back.

SHANAHAN: ... came back and caught up with him.

DAILY: That's interesting. I've never thought about it that way. So they get you to campus. What was it like when you first kind of got to Hanover and you got your feet wet with the job? What kind of issues and problems emerged?

SHANAHAN: Well, I have to tell you here, it was a heady time in my life. Wesleyan is a nationally renowned university. And I loved my years at Wesleyan dearly. I didn't have a bifocal perspective on Wesleyan because it was my first major appointment. So it was easy for me to fall in love with it, because I didn't have anything to compare it to.

Having gone to Dartmouth College, I had a different perspective on Wesleyan that emerged at the time and it taught me that as wonderful as Wesleyan was, it had some real limitations. But at that point, leaving Wesleyan which was a place I loved, to go to a place like Dartmouth, was extraordinary. The stature of the dean of the college within that community. The history of it. I'll never forget when I was appointed, I got a letter from Ralph Manuel which said, "Welcome to the Laycock Succession as the eighth dean of Dartmouth College." This was something special. This was almost ordination.

I remember shortly after being there Dave took me on a tour and we went down to the 1902 Room and he said, "One of these days, your picture is going to hang in this room." [Laughter] This was the ceremony that Dartmouth is so good at -- the lore, the ritual. It was very heady.

There was a tremendous staff in place and great professionals. The faculty were excited about my coming. The students were interested in the new dean. They were very... They weren't stand-offish but you know, they were, "We'll reserve judgment." So it was... and Dave was wonderful. Dave was... I was a young man at the time. He took me under his wing. He supported me early on and he had high expectations of me which I found daunting and complimentary.

In my first two years there I was responsible for proposals that went to the board of trustees for the expenditure of significant dollars without a campaign. The entire renovation of all of the dormitories at Dartmouth College. I think it was in the neighborhood of 15 million dollars, 15 or 20 million dollars. Plus the renovation of the athletic center and the construction of the Berry [Sports Center], a portion of that. I had never written a proposal like that in my life. But he stated, "You can do it. I want you to do the research. I want you to contact the people. I want you to get the committees together. I want to get a proposal before the board fast." He knew -- and I learned from him -- that when you're new you have to move. You have a board behind you when you're first appointed and he knew he needed to get these things done without a campaign. These monies were going to come directly from the accountant and I provided him with the text. It was persuasive.

His passion was persuasive and all of a sudden I had my agenda in terms of building. And they didn't both happen at the same time. I

mean, the residential life improvement initiative happened, I think one year and then a couple years later the athletic building. So he was a great supporter of mine and enabler of my setting the stage to be successful within that community. And I will be forever grateful to him for it.

DAILY: Beyond David, when you first arrived on campus, were there particular trustees or other administrators who maybe mentored you or kind of brought you along?

SHANAHAN: Well, Ag Pytte and I hit it off quite well. We were friends until he left to be head of Case Western Reserve. Hans Penner and I established a friendship. I always liked Hans. He didn't stay around long. A couple or three years before Dwight Lahr came in. But there was, at least from my point of view and I sensed from both of their perspectives, an affection that I appreciated. Edward Lathem [Edward Connery "Ed" Lathem '51], as formal as he is and was at that time, had that way of just... I don't know, he just... First of all, how he would address you as "the dean" as opposed to... Ed reflected his respect for the position and his respect for the college but beyond that there was always a twinkle in Ed's eye that told me that he was there for me if I needed to have somebody to talk to. Though I always knew he would be circumspect and a gentleman and never betray loyalty and all that.

Early on I got, I developed a quick friendship with Paul Paganucci ['53 TU '54] and with his right-hand man, Cary [P.] Clark ['62]. So there was a constellation of people there that were helpful to me in giving me all the encouragement to push ahead, push ahead. "This is the time to effect change at Dartmouth and you're the man to do it." They were good people. It was a great couple of years.

DAILY: Now, from what I can gather the responsibilities of the dean changed as you came on board. Is that correct?

SHANAHAN: I don't have that sense that they changed. I think the dean's position as I had it, with the exception of things that I created, such as the residential life program and some other programs that we can talk about later on, but essentially as I inherited the job I passed it on to my successor. What was most attractive about the dean of the college position at Dartmouth was that it was historical and quintessentially an academic appointment. It was a faculty appointment. I was on more standing faculty committees, I believe, than any other senior commissioner at the college. And important committees. Executive committees [inaudible].

The history of that position was such that it was thought to be the second most important position at the college. I didn't know that when I was applying to it but I learned that from what I read and from what I was exposed to which is extraordinary when you think of the dean of the Tuck school, and the dean of Thayer and the medical school. The dean of the faculty was not in any contention for one of those top spots at that time. That's a shift that occurred after I left. It didn't occur at the end of my tenure. I would present the class to the

faculty for graduation. I awarded the degrees with the president at graduation.

So it had a stature that was enviable within academic circles because it had that wedding of the academic, the core mission of the school, academic enterprise and this growing supplement or complement to that what are we doing with the moral and social lives of students outside of the classroom. If it was just the dean of students position which is what I had at Wesleyan, I wouldn't have been attracted to it at all. It was the combination of these two that was attractive to me. And I think it was the combination of those two that has for years established that position as a very, very powerful position.

I sense that has changed quite a bit. The only additions that occurred... The residential life program was an addition, the oversight of the fraternities in a more aggressive way than ever before, the Women's Resource Center, the student union, those I guess are the... the Hillel, those are the major programs that I helped bring about and so that side of the job grew a little bit more.

DAILY: What was your vision for student life when you began the position?

SHANAHAN: Well, I had an ironic vision that... That kind of touched on my sense of David's sense of a residential life having to do with fraternities and what they could be. I actually believed and I preached this gospel in my early years, that the fraternity system could represent and should represent the high watermark of the residential experience at an Ivy League school. Because I believe firmly in the words of a 19th century educator, John Henry Newman, that more education occurs as a result of the impact of useful mind on useful mind. Education occurs in the classroom to be sure and that's a powerful part of academic enterprise but there are other kinds of education. Perhaps he overstated it -- other kinds of education are just as profound and just as long lasting as what happens between teacher and student. It's what happens among students and by extension what happens between teachers and students when they are not in the classroom. And a fraternity system -- the fraternity houses -- because of their size, because of the spirit that they can create, because of the quality of their facilities as potential dining facilities as well as living facilities and socializing facilities, they could be wonderful crossroads for faculty and students to really take the classroom, take the content of the classroom out of the classroom and weave it into the lives of students. Not great academic houses, they needed to have their pool rooms and perhaps they need to have, you know, their social room in the basement and have their parties on the weekend. But there was another piece that they could far more effectively accomplish than a dormitory of 200 students can accomplish.

So that was my model. And that got me pretty far with the fraternities and helping them to reform. But on the residential life side, my objective was to break the units down from 200 – 300 student dormitories to manageable groups with the RA program, head resident program and a lounge for this group and a lounge for that group to make in effect fraternity-like spaces within these large

barracks, barracks buildings. It was a priority of mine and Dave's and David Kastan, who wrote the early report, to weave the faculty into these spaces. It was an ambitious... That last piece was a very ambitious piece of my vision and Dave's. I think it was fraught with difficulties and I don't think they'll ever accomplish it for reasons of architecture and history and the changing nature of the faculty of Dartmouth.

Dartmouth's faculty has gone through a sea change over the last thirty or forty years. I would submit [inaudible] but I knew the older faculty and I knew the younger faculty and the older faculty were quite different from the younger faculty in terms of their being invested in the lives of students outside the fence. The younger faculty were far less interested in that and more interested in their research and that sort of thing. The older faculty were more intrigued with what I was proposing than the younger faculty were. So I don't think that ever quite matured the way I wanted it to. I had some wonderful support from faculty. Don Pease was principle among them and others. But we accomplished a lot. We had faculty fellows in the dormitories. We have some faculty residents in the dormitories.

So to summarize, my vision for the place had to do with breaking down the boundaries, the artificial borders that were created at Dartmouth over time. They include barracks to sleep in, fraternities to drink in, athletics to play in, classrooms to study in and you did intensely each one of them without any horizontal relationship with one to the other. My vision was to try to cross-fertilize these so that the classroom influenced what was happening in the dormitories so that the dormitories could have, they could [inaudible] and have athletics in the dormitories so that the faculty would leave the classroom [tape goes blank].

DAILY: We were talking about your vision for student life at Dartmouth. You said there were some difficulties in terms of going that way, but first ...

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

SHANAHAN: To give you an anecdote, I was asked when I first got here whether I would have my then two daughters attend Dartmouth College to which I said no.

DAILY: Why is that?

SHANAHAN: I got the "Why is that?" as well. And I said, well, I don't think it is ready to be the kind of place that women have as much a claim on as men do. This was ten, fifteen years after coeducation. A lot had been accomplished but it still wasn't quite where it needed to be in my judgment. And so that became an issue for me. I guess I like to describe it as trying to create more space for those who historically have not been part of the history of the place as redundant as that is. Who haven't had a claim on the place. Women fell into that group, Jewish students were common to that group, to some extent Native American students fell into that group, though that was coming along nicely as a result of both John Kemeny's initiative and Dave

McLaughlin's continuing support for that initiative. So there were, I won't say disenfranchised communities there, but there were communities that didn't have as much access to the trough of excellence that others had.

DAILY: Right.

SHANAHAN: And so I perceived my role to be to try to provide that and at the same time along the way try to deal with some of the prejudices, small "p", that kept certain members of the community away. Whether it was Jewish students, whether it was gay and lesbian students, whether it was female students or students who were more intellectual than you thought Dartmouth valued, the prevailing student [inaudible] I wanted to be a defender of those who were marginal, not marginalized, just marginal. I wanted them to be protected. So that was part of it.

DAILY: What were some specific ways you went about trying to kind of bring those students into the mainstream?

SHANAHAN: Well, the first thing or one of the first things ironically I did after working with fraternities to improve them is I had to confront an issue or a question. Is it better to not have a fraternity system or to have a fraternity system? And I concluded that whether it was better or not we were going to have a fraternity system. If we were going to have a fraternity system one of the important balancing elements in that was going to be [inaudible] sorority system. So I immediately increased the number of sororities on campus. Ironically, here I was having some problems with the exclusivity in the fraternity system and here I was going to create an equally exclusive system for reasons of having to create a more balanced social experience. So that was one thing that we did.

With regard to Jewish students, there was not a space for Jewish students. There was not a place for them. And I founded the first small Hillel down by Thompson that served the school very well for five, six, seven years until... It brought Jewish students together until they were able to get some property from the school and to build what is now a handsome facility of their own.

In terms of those who were pushed back from the table, I found myself a protector of Native American students before the onslaught of The [Dartmouth] Review, minority students before the onslaught of The [Dartmouth] Review came, lesbian students, whether it was through public statements, visible support, being at their meetings with them, or decisions that I made as chair of the Committee on Standards. Whether I was going to accept intolerances or abuses.

All of that of course had its costs for the school and for me. But I'm proud of those contributions. The Women's Resource Center was established when I was there. The residential life program in and of itself was envisioned, designed, and implemented by me. One of the purposes of that was to create, as I mentioned before, a context or a place for the practical living and learning. I feel that if men and women are talking to each other more, if faculty and students are

talking to each other more, if gays and straights are talking to each other more, if blacks and whites are talking to each other more, there are going to be less opportunities for the harboring of prejudices or ill will. And so these spaces, these lounges, these study areas, the programs that we ran in the residence halls, and the fraternity system, were all meant to have these places open up the windows, you know. John Paul said in the II Vatican [inaudible]. "Pick up the windows, let's let the air flow through this place." So that was one of the ways I tried to enable those marginal communities.

DAILY: Were the... Sounds like trustees and faculty and the administration was right in step with you on this. Was most of the resistance coming from the students?

SHANAHAN: Yes. Not on the developmental side of it. Not on the residential life part. There was a lot of excitement about that. The building was positive and the like. There was the constant suspicion on the part of the fraternities about that. [They thought] that the real purpose of that was to kill by siphoning off students and opportunities for social life -- siphoning off the recruits for the fraternity system. That was always there. But by and large there was a lot of excitement about that on all fronts. On the fraternity side there was kicking and screaming.

DAILY: Did Wesleyan have fraternities?

SHANAHAN: They have fraternities but they are a fraction of -- maybe fifteen percent or twenty percent of the communities as opposed to sixty or seventy percent.

DAILY: So you were used to fraternity life when you got to Dartmouth?

SHANAHAN: Right. I had some sense of it.

DAILY: Were you in a fraternity yourself at all?

SHANAHAN: As a matter of fact, I didn't have the traditional undergraduate experience; I was a seminarian. I was studying for the priesthood so we don't have... It is a fraternity by definition, by definition [laughter] so I did have it as an undergrad. But when I was at Wesleyan I, there was a Beta Theta Phi Chapter there that had gone defunct. And I, as a young dean of students, was approached by the alumni who wanted to revive it and I helped them reacquire the property and I helped them recruit a class. As a way of thanking me for that they pledged me as a member of Beta Theta Phi. So I am a card carrying member of Beta Theta Phi at Wesleyan University.

DAILY: [Laughter] Yeah. I guess we'll kind of keep following this thread with the fraternities here for a bit.

SHANAHAN: Sure.

DAILY: I wanted to ask a set of questions on how the fraternity system related to both residential and social life at Dartmouth. In your view, how were the fraternities when you arrived, as well as during your

deanship... How were they affecting either positively or negatively campus intellectual life?

SHANAHAN: Campus intellectual life? If you asked the question campus life -- I would -- you would give me more latitude. Can I answer the question campus life?

DAILY: Sure.

SHANAHAN: I'll touch on intellectual life. I think their benefit, what they contributed to the campus life was to create these communities of men and women who supported each other, who had a genuine, deep abiding and, in many respects, lasting affection for each other. And at a time in young people's lives when they are still trying to figure out who they are and where they are going. And their insecurities are not on the surface, but they're there. They're all buried. For them to have communities of men and women to be open with and candid with and to get support from, it's incredible. It's a wonderful part of that system. And one of the wonderful things about, at college, that those relationships that were formed over the years have been enormously formative in those older lives [inaudible].

In my later years when I became convinced that the fraternity system was bad for the school, I was convinced that one of the real liabilities associated with the current system would be the loss of this kind of opportunity at Dartmouth. You'd never be able to replicate that in even the most successful, in my judgment the most successful house or college system such as exists at Harvard and Yale. There is something magical about what happens to men and women when they are in these organizations. On the negative side of the campus life, they became, many of them, certainly not all of them, and I've got to be very careful about generalizations about fraternities because fraternities... There were fraternities, there were sororities, there were co-ed houses and there were, in my judgment, healthy communities in each one of those categories and unhealthy communities in each one of those categories.

I have to say that the dominant group, which was the male fraternities, was disproportionately negative socially. Because that fellowship and that affection simply did not prepare them well enough for dealing with social pressures that they were feeling. Dealing with women effectively, dealing with some of their own, with the sentiment and ideas of the least common denominator of individuals within there. People who had negative feelings about groups of people, individuals, exploited individuals who would gain access to an audience and were being generally supported by it. The quality of the social experience was in some cases abysmal, in many cases fun but not really contributed to growth. I mean, I played a fair number of beer pong games in the basement of houses and I enjoyed that. Did that contribute enormously to who I am as a person? No. Did it contribute to my intellectual life? No. Did it help me connect with some students? Absolutely. Friendships I have to this day, sure. But by and large, they were negative places. They were hot beds of prejudice. Many of them, many of the social experiences provided

opportunities for the abuse of alcohol and that abuse of alcohol often enough, I wouldn't say often, but often enough, led to the abuse of women and led to the long term consequences of alcohol abuse.

So some positive things on the social side and some real negative things on the social side. But the negative things are so strong, the risk that that college still has to this day of serious damage to individual lives and groups of students lives is enormous. And there were kids who died when I was at Dartmouth College and things went on. I'm sure that there are confirmed alcoholics and their alcoholism was created at Dartmouth College but because of the span of time nobody is going to make a causal connection back to it. But it has been and I think it still is pretty bad.

I applaud the board and Jim Wright for trying to do something and they were on the verge of doing it and stepped back from doing it, regrettably. I was ready to testify. Not because, as I said at the top of the hour, I think they potentially can be the best, but there's... It takes an enormous amount more than I could have brought to it to get it transitioned to that. On the intellectual side, virtually no contribution. Nothing positive. I'm sure fellows discussing ideas as... Not just talking about sex, drugs, and alcohol, there are opportunities within friendships to talk about things. As the fraternity programs evolved there were more opportunities. There were more opportunities for boys and girls to get together, for faculty being residents and sure, there were contributions that they were making then and it's been ten years since I was at the college. I hope that that has continued. And to the extent that it has, please qualify my general indictment of their contribution to the intellectual life. It may be contributing enormously or at least a lot more now than it was in [inaudible].

DAILY: In terms of the residential program, was it siphoning away students from the fraternities?

SHANAHAN: Yes. I wouldn't say siphoning away students. I might have. What it did was create a social alternative to fraternities. And that's what they knew was going to happen. It did. There were students who could have a successful and happy social life and never go to a fraternity or a sorority and that did happen. Whether the numbers, I don't recall whether the number declined as a result of that. I think in some cases it may, in some years it may have.

I put another crimp into the fraternity system by saying you couldn't pledge a kid in their freshman year. You had to wait until their sophomore year. That was brilliant on my part. [Laughter] I think it's kind of backed up a little bit each time. By now I think it is the spring term of the freshman year they can go after them and not sink them until the fall term. So it did slow down. But anybody who wanted to leave a fraternity or a sorority was now able to do that and have something, have a social life, have a community they could be part of. So I think it did have an effect. Many did both. And that was good too if you felt like, you know, going to a fraternity basement with what all that that often implied -- not always -- often implied, you could do that. But if you were sick and tired of that in a given week and you wanted

to hang out in the library of a dormitory or a study room of a dormitory and catch up on some work or talk to somebody, it was a more balanced set of choices.

DAILY: One of the things that struck me during my research was the minimum standards program for the Greek societies. Where did you come up with that idea?

SHANAHAN: Well, as a matter of fact, if truth be told, it wasn't my idea. It was part of the... I think it was part of David Kastan's report. The notion of minimum standards, it was only a notion. It was, "We should have a set of minimum standards for houses that are formally recognized by the school." So the term was not a Shanahan term, though it's my term. [Laughter] I fleshed it out. And after seven or eight categories from plan through to program to finances and all of that, but that had been there before me. Quite frankly though, I launched it and played what I thought was a strong role in shaping its direction and made sure I brought the standard up to a level that was going to be acceptable in the long run. Others played a far more noble role in getting in there and slugging it out with the fraternity system. The principal among them was Lee [M.] Levison, who was then an assistant dean who worked for me. A young man, a good athlete, a great relationship with students -- had been a freshman dean, I believe, for a while. He was the advisor to the fraternity system. He had the trust of the fraternity system. If it weren't for Lee we would not have been able to turn that corner without a lot of damage. But he really kept their nose to the grindstone and came up with what I thought was a respectable, workable document. He deserves a lot. But he's now the headmaster of Kingswood-Oxford School up here in Hartford.

DAILY: Okay. I want to circle back and this kind of pulls in co-education as well. You said you didn't want your daughters to go to Dartmouth.

SHANAHAN: Right.

DAILY: Now they did.

SHANAHAN: Right.

DAILY: From before the tape was on. Explain how that happened. Obviously your daughters had a lot to do with it. But in terms of your own thinking.

SHANAHAN: Well, I think that my daughters had all to do with it. There is no question in our family's mind that the quality of education that Dartmouth provided was second to none in my judgment and in many respects better than the so called flagship HYP (Harvard-Yale-Princeton) schools because of the nature of the size of the community, the value that was dissipating, the value of faculty being involved with students outside of class.

The sheer academic caliber of the students that they always tried to keep under a bushel. They didn't want that to be too apparent. If you

were a Dartmouth male, you wouldn't talk about all-nighters. You pulled them, but you didn't talk about them because it just wasn't manly. So we had a family regard for that.

We also had (and I can't emphasize this enough), we had an enormous affection for scores upon scores upon scores of students who were wonderful young men and young women who really shaped my children's lives as babysitters, as kids who came to the house. We had an RA program, I had fraternity presidents, we had the athletic games at the house, the captains -- wonderful, wonderful men and women. One of the ironies is that individually these students were incredible. It's when you got them together in the Greek system that negatives would emerge and become problematic. So, we had a great deal of respect for the academic quality, we had a great deal of respect for the people who went there and the lives that they affected -- our lives among them. So... But I thought they weren't going to go, to be interested in going there because they lived there. They'd want to go some place else.

DAILY: Right.

SHANAHAN: They became interested when we left. Katie [Kathleen F. "Katie" Shanahan '96] was going into her senior year when we left and so she was very happy. I think if we had stayed at Dartmouth College she would not have applied to Dartmouth College but our having left paved the way for her to apply. And the girls are two different, entirely different students. Katie, my older daughter is closer to the traditional Dartmouth student. She is athletic, she is outgoing, she's in Casque and Gauntlet, she was an RA, she wrote for the newspaper, she rode.

Nell [Helena T. "Nell" Shanahan '99], my younger daughter, had no interest in athletics, was more into literature, religion, the arts, theatre. Both of them thrived within that community. Here were two kids and that's what a school is great for and that's what Dartmouth is great for. I think now more so than when I started there -- not that it didn't happen when I started there -- I don't want to decry anything that happened before Shanahan got there -- but more so now -- Dartmouth is a place where you really can find a place for yourself, and grow and develop and thrive within that place. I had something to do with that. Jim Freedman had an enormous amount to do with that and Karl Furstenberg had an enormous amount to do with that, as well as the fact that everybody else... But I think it's a place that's lot more hospitable to "difference" than it was when I started.

DAILY: Okay. Did you have -- this is going to switch gears a little bit -- any responsibility for the Tucker Foundation?

SHANAHAN: Yes. It actually reported to me.

DAILY: That is what I was. . .

SHANAHAN: Can I take a break?

DAILY: Yes, let's go ahead and do that. [Pause]

Is there anything else you wanted to talk about in terms of the fraternities?

SHANAHAN: No, I think I've had it. [Laughter] Enough of fraternities. Thank you very much.

DAILY: I wanted to talk about the Tucker Foundation. Two things: It sounds like -- from your own set of values and academic training -- you would have had a lot of -- what's the word I'm looking for -- meshed with the vision of the Tucker Foundation. If you want to comment on how you led the foundation via, you know, in terms of the dean.

SHANAHAN: You know, if truth be told, I didn't have... Although the Tucker Foundation reported to me, I don't know if it reported to me at the end of my tenure. I think it may have worked its way away from me or I had a joint reporting relationship. I think something in the back of my mind tells me that Jim Breeden [James P. Breeden '56] negotiated a direct reporting relationship with the president and to me.

DAILY: When he was hired?

SHANAHAN: When he was hired. I think, I think, there is something in the back of mind that suggests that, as his way of establishing the stature of the foundation. Now, it may have been to the provost, I'm not sure to whom. But I certainly had some responsibility for it early on. But I was not a major player in terms of... As a result of that, I was not a major player in terms of the direction the foundation took. Did I know about it? For example, Jim Breeden was not a member of my staff.

DAILY: Okay.

SHANAHAN: I had a senior staff and he wasn't part of it. I was involved for a short period of time. Who was the dean when I first got there? What was his name?

DAILY: Traynham. Was it Traynham?

SHANAHAN: Yes.

DAILY: Warner [R.] Traynham ['57].

SHANAHAN: Yes, exactly, who was a very energetic, bright, articulate, beautifully articulate man. But his days were numbered when Dave came. [Laughter]

DAILY: Why so?

SHANAHAN: Well, I'm going to slip into a little McLaughlinism here. And maybe I should save that until we talk about... Remind me to bring that up again. But why do I think there was a dean after him and before Jim? It may have been a very short time -- a short-term dean or acting dean. Anyway, I was involved with the foundation up until the time Jim [Breeden] was appointed and then I pulled back. So I was only thereby or thereafter involved with it to the extent that we

programmatically crossed over. So I had virtually nothing to do with the foundation.

DAILY: I want to talk about divestment and the shanties. It certainly was an episode in campus life.

SHANAHAN: Of the McLaughlin years.

DAILY: Of the McLaughlin years and of your deanship. Before that really heated up to the point of having shanties on campus and stuff, how much were you involved in the discussions about the college divesting from...

SHANAHAN: In a purposeful way, I think it is fair to say that many of the senior officers were not involved. And by purposeful I mean I don't recall our studying this issue as a group of senior officers and examining the pros and cons as an administrator of the school. I think... I don't think there was much examining of it as an administrator of the school. I think as it became a public issue and as it came to be examined, we were beneficiaries of the materials that were developed to support not divesting. And we became familiar with the arguments for divestment as a result of the forums that we attended and the literature that was distributed. But I certainly wasn't at the table and asking my vote as to whether we should be divested or not. And I don't recall those samples of having been taken. And I don't recall a seminar sort of thing in which the president and the chief financial officer would come and make a two-hour presentation to us as to why one thing has merit over the other. I participated in trustee meetings. That was in the periphery so I could hear those conversations when they weren't in executive session to the extent that I was allowed to be in the room. I wasn't at even the general sessions. I wasn't at all those meetings because I was brought in for my part of the agenda. So, no, there wasn't a lot of preparation for that issue. It came upon us. It snuck up on us as far as I was concerned.

DAILY: What were your own personal views on divestment?

SHANAHAN: You know, I did not... [pause] I wasn't of the position early on that we should divest. Only because I felt at the time that I did not have nearly the grasp of information, financial implications. I had a sense of the moral issue, clearly. I didn't have a grasp of the practicalities associated with making one decision over another.
[Text deleted at narrator's request.]

I maintained throughout the entire shanty episode very good relationships with the leadership of those who were agitating for divestment, though my office was taken over and all kinds of other things happened. But one on one I had good relationships with them. But I didn't take... Towards the end, as I learned more and as I became more convinced of the moral components associated with it and as some of the half steps were proven to be ineffective, then I began to shift my point of view to be more aligned with the divestment group.

DAILY: Okay.

SHANAHAN: I was a late convert.

DAILY: Okay.

SHANAHAN: I'm embarrassed to say. [Laughter]

DAILY: I wanted to talk about your general recollections of the shanties going up and the intense period of protest as well as the attack by The Review staffers on the shanties. Just, kind of your, kind of recollect that time period.

SHANAHAN: I saw that in one of the questions that you posed to me. I'll have to go back to the [inaudible] because I have very vague recollections about that. Although it may have been preoccupying for me at the time.

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

SHANAHAN: We're up to Dave. I said, "Dave, I think they're going to be gone. This is the end of it." I forget the kid's name. A great black kid. A wonderful kid. Ozzie Harris ['81]. Ozzie Harris. He said, "Ed, great, it's done. We accomplished what we wanted to accomplish." I went up to Dave and said, "Dave, it's over. Just... Monday morning, I think I'm going take the day off." And Dave said, "I want those shanties off the Green." But he said, "Before the board gets in town and while the [inaudible] I want them off the green and I want any kids in there who resist to be arrested."

DAILY: And that's when the confrontation came?

SHANAHAN: And so I went out and delivered the word to the kids. "This is what is going to happen." By that time the faculty had [inaudible] much, there may have been one or two faculty there, I don't think so, I think they just scattered. The bus showed up with the cops, they came out, all the kids were taken into the bus down to the firehouse out south of town, whatever that street is out there.

DAILY: Lyme Road?

SHANAHAN: Lyme Road, into the firehouse where they were individually booked. I was there with the kids, supporting them and right with them. Some of them I knew, others I didn't know. Some I had good relationships with, and to others I was the administration. But by-and-large I remember it being a friendly and supportive set of relationships.

I got a call from Dave at the firehouse. He said to me, "How's it going?" I said, "Well, it's tough, you know. As dean of the college I didn't think I'd ever be witnessing my students getting booked for demonstrating [inaudible]." And he said, "Well, okay. The Associated Press was here interviewing me and they asked me who called for the arrest of the students and I want you to know that I told them that you did."

That was the darkest day in my life at the time. If I had moral backbone and more money I would have said, "Fuck you, Dave," because that was wrong for him to have done that. It would not have been wrong for him to call me and say, "Ed, I don't want to get involved in this. And I'd like you to assume responsibility for the arrest of those kids. Can you live with that?" And I'm enough of a soldier, I would have said, "You've got it, Captain. I'll take that." But for him to presume on that with the media. That was the beginning of the end for me and Dave. And I remember saying to my wife the next morning... I thought I had to wipe the mirror two or three times the next day to see if I was really there. Whether I was disappearing, whether my conscience was dissipated. That was the beginning of the end for me with Dave.

So, they were gone and ultimately the kids were... I think they were all amnestied and it was a done deal. But there was some... I think in many respects the whole thing was wonderful. The whole thing was... It was hell for me as you can imagine. And for others as well. But the whole drama of it is what an educational institution is for. This wasn't anywhere near the sixties. The sixties had moral issues to be sure. Civil rights had been done and all that. But this is a moral issue too. This was great! Were there people who did outlandish things and went over the edge? Absolutely. Were there blind and deaf trustees and others, administrators? Absolutely. But it was good stuff. People were talking about what they should be talking about. So, although there was a lot of pain for a lot of individuals, it was what should happen in an academic institution. So -- benefit of hindsight -- I say, boy, that in some respects was a wonderful learning time for everybody who was at the college.

So that's my dark story about Dave.

DAILY: Yeah. We'll kind of come back to Dave McLaughlin in a minute. One of the fall-outs or one of the aftermaths of this was the Committee on Standards. If you could talk about your involvement and any changes that happened in the rules and policies?

SHANAHAN: In the COS... I... You know, you're catching me up short here. I have very prosaic memories about the Committee on Standards. It was a very, very effective way of adjudicating students' behavior. The quality of the kids and the faculty who served on that committee were just outstanding, particularly the kids. The devotion of the faculty to put in the hours and the time was great. But the kids were just wonderful in terms of their intelligence and their measurement. And I think it worked very, very well.

The times that I recall (vaguely, because I tend to forget) were those times that were punctuated by political issues. There was the Professor Cole issue and The Dartmouth Review. There was the... What was The Review issue? That was Cole's. You're going to have to help me out here. You're going to have to trigger my thinking. But there were several political issues that came before the COS in which case... And then all the lawyers would descend on us and tell us this is what you can do, this is what you can't do, whether you're

following the procedures or not. My God, we got turned nuts by the lawyers.

DAILY: Okay. From both sides?

SHANAHAN: We were buffeted by the outside. Our lawyers would successfully stiff-arm them until we went to court which... Then they couldn't stiff-arm them.

But in terms of invading our processes, a student could have an advisor of his choice. Well, could the advisor, if the advisor was a lawyer, and if it was a lawyer could he behave as a lawyer and could he object? Was he going to be able to sit on his hands? Was he going to intimidate students who were in the room? So we managed those issues and the guidelines for the COS evolved over time. But, our lawyers were heavily involved in reviewing our regulations, updating them. You know, I don't know where they were before... Everybody is a specialist when they're making money and responding to a crisis. So those are the only times that I remember, and I must confess I forget some of The Review issues. I remember the Professor Cole one, and I don't remember how that one... What was the outcome of that?

DAILY: The other major one was the taping of the gay/lesbian student meetings.

SHANAHAN: Oh, that's right.

DAILY: You know, secretly taping.

SHANAHAN: That's right. I remember that. I had very clear opinions about both of those. [Laughter] But the committee did too. Then it was completely, it wasn't the Committee on Standards, it was really forces that went beyond that little student-faculty committee that was dealing with drunks on the weekend and you know, fist-a-cuffs, and plagiarism from time to time. It became a whole other cup of fish that none of us was prepared for. We were all pawns to the lawyers on both sides.

DAILY: Okay.

SHANAHAN: I felt that my disposition was coincidental with the disposition of the faculty with regard to how we dealt with some of those misbehaviors that I think went to the fabric of a healthy academic community. Whether you stepped over the line in Cole or stepped over the line in clandestinely tape-recording private conversations and publishing the results of that. The bounds of civility were clearly crossed. And as we tried to prove, the expectations and regulations of the school were, in my judgment, breached. Boy, I'm glad I'm not doing that anymore.

DAILY: We touched upon Dave McLaughlin in a couple of incidences already. I'd like to hear your... how your relationship with him evolved over the, he was there from '81 to '86, so about half of your tenure.

SHANAHAN:

Right. He, as I said earlier on, he was a wonderful early mentor to me. I was a youngster at the time. I think I was in my late thirties, chronologically not so young but I'm a slow learner. I'm a late-bloomer, so to speak, and this was a whole new setting for me. So I admired how he handled himself. I admired his confidence. I admired his, how much he knew, his quickness of his ability to analyze situations.

I was grateful for the support that he gave me and helping me to realize his agenda and my agenda. He allowed me to tutor him on what residential life should be. He was a good student and he bought into it completely. He edited it a little bit here and there. But he allowed me to lead on that front. So I had... And he was very tender with me in providing personal support for me. There were times when I was being pilloried by the fraternity system and he stood up in front of the faculty and said, "This guy has done a phenomenal job for this college and I want all you faculty to know where I stand." It was... You couldn't ask for a [inaudible]; he was great. He was supportive of my family.

Just a small anecdote. My father and I were going back to Ireland. He was going back to Ireland because he was a national champion soccer player in Ireland and they had a reunion. At the airport... He had delivered to the airport some Dartmouth sweatshirts and a green scarf and my father was just... My father was an immigrant and for the president of Dartmouth College to take time out of his day to think about that, to prepare for that... Dave had that tenderness. He was an emotional guy. But he was also a man of extremes.

Judge Learned Hand has an expression, had an expression -- great Supreme Court Justice -- "The spirit of democracy is that spirit which is never too sure it is right." I think Dave did not have the spirit of democracy and in an academic institution you have to have a spirit of democracy. Democracy that talks about the importance of somebody else's point of view, the importance of processes, of conversion as opposed to following orders. That is what academic institutions are built upon. Dave came from a different milieu. My guess is if he had those qualities in his business life, he wouldn't have been as successful as he clearly was. He was a man who quickly figured out where he was going to go and as the football player he was, it was third down and one, he tucked the ball in, put his head down and went full speed ahead. And there were casualties as a result of that.

I harbor the notion that deep down Dave wanted to be a democratic leader but -- and here I'm really going well beyond where I should because I think... I saw so many elements of decency in him and goodness in him that I think there was something about his image of himself that wouldn't allow him to be unsure. That that would not be leadership. He had to be 100 percent or nothing at all.

He had to be [inaudible] and his successor was quite the opposite. Not that Jim [Freedman] did not have his convictions and has his convictions and knew where he wanted to go. But he knew where he was expert and knew where he wasn't and if you had a different point

of view there was nobody who would listen to you better than Jim Freedman listened. And changed his mind as a result of that. So... And I had an early, some early suggestions of that but the shanty episode was one that really hit me hard.

I was kind of thrown off guard when I first got to Dartmouth and we were talking about the Tucker Foundation that was reporting to me and we were talking about... I had had a conversation with Warner Traynham and I said, "Gee, what a great guy." He said, "Don't get close to that guy. He's got to go." This is in my first three months, two months on the job. So he clearly had made up his mind and wanted me to do it. Guess what? He was gone. I didn't fire him. He just read the tea leaves, right? And he was gone.

So Dave... When he... After the ROTC vote, we went back to his office, [C.] Dwight Lahr and I. Dave handled that process supremely well. The initial proposal was shot down. He accepted that. And then he put me in charge of studying all the services to see which one would have the least impact on the school and answer all the objections that the faculty had. Every one of them was answered to the satisfaction of the faculty's expectation. We went back into the faculty to present that and they voted it down because they weren't quite being honest with us. They didn't want it. These were the reasons they came up with. He answered the reasons. He was superb at that.

We went back to Dave's office. He was devastated by that. We went back to his office. I remember sitting at that oblong table he had there and he was on one side and Dwight and I were on the other side and we said to him, "Okay, what are we going to do now?" And he said, "We're going to have an ROTC." As opposed to, "Let's think about several, well, that could be one option. Are there any other options that we should talk about? Anything else?" And he said, "Damn it! We're going to go ahead with the Army ROTC!"

So it's that need to be expert that he has, that he's learned or feels he has to have, he had to have in order to lead well. I think in many instances it has served him well in his career, even at Dartmouth. His residential life initiative, he knew where he wanted to go. He allowed me to steer it after awhile. The whole hospital move -- he knew where he wanted to go and tell me that town and that college and that medical center hung out wonderful legacies for him to look back upon. So it served him very, very well in some areas. But in the faculty community area, and students [inaudible], it didn't serve him well at all.

So I have... If I saw Dave tomorrow, I would greet him as a hail fellow well met. We've never had conversations like this where I've been able to say to him some of the things that I've shared with you. And I don't even know how he would hear it. There have been times when I have wanted to pick up the telephone or go have a drink and say, "Let me tell you what you gave me." I learned a lot from him about good administration, a lot! But how much hurt I experienced along the way... I don't wear it as a badge, I shuffle it off. But when I heard

about your coming I had to think about gee, was I going to resurrect this and all the feelings that went with it? But as I thought about it, the feelings were no longer there so it was just the right time.

He's a good man, good family. He served the college well for the time that he was there and then I think he...

You asked one of your questions -- how do I feel about the circumstances surrounding his resigning? I think he and the board acknowledged that he had lost the confidence of the faculty. And once you've done that it's hard to recover it. You can, but it takes a lot of good will on everybody's part. And I don't think Dave would have been able to win that back because of his personality. Did he make his mark on the school? He sure did. And I hope he will be remembered more for the good things that he did than for the painful mistakes that he made. He's a good man. God, he was a pain in the neck. [Laughter]

DAILY: Well, that certainly sheds some light on a couple of key issues.

SHANAHAN: Does it? Good.

DAILY: It really does.

SHANAHAN: Good.

DAILY: I want to kind of lean toward wrapping up here with James Breeden. How the two of you worked together? Recollections of your time together?

SHANAHAN: It's not Jim. It's James, isn't it? [Laughter] I don't know what he wanted to be called. Anyway, I'll call him Jim. Jim I thought was a good appointment. He came well credentialed to the foundation. And I think Dave was very excited about that appointment. I think he just didn't have it and part of it was style. I mean, Jim Breeden was a good colleague of mine. Somebody I could always talk to, open, collaborative, but he probably could have used a dose of Dave McLaughlin. I think what the foundation needed early on was, "This is where we are going," and James Breeden I don't think was visionary enough, charismatic enough, pied piper enough to get a following. So I think the foundation grew under him in terms of taking care of the various denominations on campus and I think they did wonderful programs but it was in the corner of the campus and it was going to stay in the corner of the students' lives. It just never matured. And then there were some awkward moments in Jim's history having to do with his personal life that just made it worse before he finally left the place. And there is the real question as to whether in that setting a Tucker Foundation could have thrived. I don't know.

I mean, I see Dwight Lahr at Yale. What a wonderful, powerful force at Yale. A similar kind of entity of more historical stature. I think he played a major role in the community, the New Haven community. Whether the Tucker Foundation could ever realize that remains to be seen. He may have had just an unachievable objective to make it, to

weave it into the moral fabric of the community. But I've always liked Jim. I don't know where he is now. I hope he is doing well. I was sad that he had some personal things that were going on in his life. I don't have the specific recall about it having to do with relationships [inaudible]. I think [inaudible].

DAILY: Is there anything else you'd like to comment on that you've thought about?

SHANAHAN: I'm going to think about more after you leave. You've triggered so many synapses in my mind about the school. My goodness. I did go over your questions last night. Even some of them, my god, my god, my god. I haven't thought about these things in years. Let me see if I've made any notes here that I haven't shared with you. No. I think you've got, you've prepared well, and asked well and encouraged effectively. So I think you've pretty much drained me. [Laughter]

DAILY: Okay. Well, thank you very much. Good interview.

SHANAHAN: Get you on the road at a decent hour too. Or maybe not. [Laughter][

[END OF INTERVIEW]