Peter D. Smith
Director, Emeritus
Hopkins Center for the Arts

An Interview Conducted by

Mary S. Donin

Hanover, New Hampshire
Buffalo, New York

February 26-27, 2003
May 13-14, 2003

DOH-53

Special Collections

Dartmouth College

Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: Peter Smith

INTERVIEW BY: Mary Donin

PLACE: Rauner Library, Hanover, New Hampshire

DATES: February 26, 2003 and February 27, 2003

DONIN: Today is Wednesday, February 26. 2003. I am Mary Donin and I am sitting here with Peter Smith in Rauner Library in Hanover, New Hampshire. Mr. Smith was the former director of the Hopkins Center here at Dartmouth College.

So Peter, I think we would like to start out this morning hearing you talk briefly about your childhood leading up to your adult life. Your formative years.

SMITH: I was born in 1933 in Lowestoft, England, which is the most easterly town in the British Isles. It is primarily, or was until commercial fishing disappeared, it was an important fishing town. It was also something of a seaside resort. My father was born there and spent his life there as a house painter. I was one of seven children. My mother, for the brief time that she worked before getting married, was a nurse. I am the next to the youngest of the seven. All seven of us are still alive.

Around 1941 I guess, the school that I was going to – the primary school – the elementary schools of Lowestoft were all evacuated. Lowestoft had become something of a target for the Nazi bombers and so the schools were all moved to safer places. That was the first time any of us had been separated from our parents.

I was asthmatic as a child and my mother was very concerned that we should be, that I should be somewhere where my brother and sister – the youngest of the four sisters and my older brother – could look after me. That did not happen because, of course, we were evacuated as schools, not as individuals, and my school went to a different place from the two schools that they were attending.

It ended up eventually though, fairly quickly – within a matter of six or nine months – we rejoined our parents because my father had moved to another seaside town. Coincidentally, one of the more important fishing towns on the west coast of England called Fleetwood and we were all gathered together there at that point.

Of the seven of us, only my older brother and I ended up going to grammar school. This was in the days of the infamous "eleven plus examination" where, at the age of eleven, one took an examination set by the county in which one lived and on that was based the next stage of your education, the secondary stage. If you passed the "eleven plus," as it was called, exam, you could go to a grammar school. If you didn't, you went to what was at that time called "secondary modern schools." It was an extraordinary thing that, for all intents and purposes, the futures of a very significant fraction of the people who took the "eleven plus" were, in fact, decided at that moment because it was rare, exceedingly rare, for anyone who went to secondary modern school to go on to university or, indeed, to go into any of the professions. It was very unusual indeed.

My brother and I, my older brother, went to different secondary schools, different grammar schools in Lancashire, which is where Fleetwood is located. It is a county. My brother decided that, at least a couple of years before he would take the examinations that determine whether or not you go to university, he decided that he wanted to be out of school, earning some money. He got himself a job and very soon after that, left and set up on his own somewhere else.

My grammar school days were exceedingly important for me and I am not going to say much more about that except that the teacher with whom I stayed in touch until two or three years ago when he died – very close to ninety years old – was important to me in I guess two respects. One was his involvement in and interest in the arts. He had been in the choir of his church as was I in mine. He got involved in amateur theatricals, as did I. He was a very skilled artist, which I am not, and he was an exceptional person in a way that was very, very important for me, which I had not articulated until I guess two years ago when I visited England and spent some time and indeed stayed with his widow.

At one point she said, "Why was Ellis so important to you that you stayed in touch for fifty years? It obviously means a great deal to you." I said, actually on the spur of the moment, but it was exactly the right way to tell her. "Ellis made me aware that it was all right to be distinctive." She said, "That's great. Ellis would be very happy to know that." I will leave that there. It helped me get a sense of its being okay to be oneself. I am sure I wasn't aware of that at that time. I am not sure I would even have understood then the concept of what I am now talking about; but it certainly was a factor.

I was the first person in my family, the extended family…My mother and father…My father's father was a shoemaker. My mother's father was a farm laborer and sometime sort of a leaseholder in some way that made him modestly independent in a very small village in Norfolk. Each of them – my mother and father – both came from large families. I think my mother was one of eight or nine children and my father, one of seven or eight. So I had lots of aunts and uncles and, therefore, lots and lots of cousins. Out of that group of cousins, my contemporaries, I was the only one who went to university. I was then the first.

I think it was…I was very, very fortunate in that my parents cared for me, loved me, were happy about my success; but, the world that I moved into when I went to university was an unknown quantity. Except for a general sense of support – which certainly meant financial support in the sense that I was not bringing anything into the household – my time at university was paid for completely as was the case with every university student in England until the very recent past. It was provided by, in my case, the county of Lancashire. A modest grant to pay for one's lodging and a tiny sum that was charged for tuition.

So I went up to university knowing almost nothing about what university life was about. I was very fortunate in that five people from my school – five of my contemporaries from my school, four plus me – decided to go to the same university. This was…Each decision was made independent of the others and I don't think we realized that we were, in fact, all headed to the same place until the summer before we were due to go up. A sixth student brought us together. He knew one of the other four and he, too, was going to Birmingham and wondered whether we couldn't perhaps find digs together, which is exactly what we did. The six of us shared the accommodation in a rather large Victorian house, long since pulled down.

At the end of first year, we went our separate ways; but it was an extremely important assisting factor in terms of settling into a life that was new for I guess all but one of us. I think we were all a part of a generation whose parents…Since none of us came from a wealthy family, none of us were children of people who had had university experience themselves. So it was a great help that we were all there together.

The importance of this for my relationship to Dartmouth is that the three years as an undergraduate – I had two post-graduate years at

Birmingham – were the years in which I came to know and to love and to *need* this set of peculiar things that we call “the arts”.

I don’t think anybody from my grammar school had ever gone to Oxford or Cambridge. That has certainly changed since then. I am not sure if anyone had ever gone to the University of London. It wasn’t…the Oxford/Cambridge thing was not an option. I mean, it was technically…One could have applied, but there were routines, the process by which one gets in Oxford or Cambridge is rather different from all the others.

At any rate, some years later, it struck me that the chances were very good that, had I gone to Oxford or Cambridge or the University of London, I would have found the experience somewhat overwhelming. There would have been so much that I had to deal with. In that sense, Birmingham was – it turned out to be – ideal. The reason I chose Birmingham – I applied only to two places, the other one being Leeds – was its proximity to Stratford-upon-Avon. I guess this is also a relevant fact within my early years. One of my father’s sisters (in both those families, there were single ladies)...They were women who did not marry and who, I think in a general sense, were expected to look after their parents when they became old. It seemed to be one of my aunts…One of my mother’s sisters went into service and became a housemaid, but there was always a sense that someone would marry them. One of those in my father’s family had actually married and, a matter of weeks after marrying, her husband had been killed in the First World War. My father was in the First World War and was wounded, but survived. So, along with I guess millions of other women, my Aunt Florrie was a widow in her twenties and never re-married. She looked after her uncle, my great uncle. He worked as a kind of manager-type person for the Singer Sewing Machine Company and moved from town to town, depending on where he was assigned. His last assignment was in Stratford-upon-Avon.

In my family, if you would have a holiday – a vacation as we would say now – it meant going to stay with another member of the family. You took your towels and you took your sheets. In those days, you took your food, too, because this was during the war and all was rationed. So, at the age of eleven, I spent my summer holiday in Stratford-upon-Avon. Between then and going up to university, I think I spent four or five summers and, of course, went to the theater and was hooked. I mean that overstates it in a sense, but it was a very, very pleasurable experience and an important one.

So when I decided where to go, I thought, which was entirely stupid of me because twenty-two miles is nothing if you have a car; but if you are relying on public transport, especially since there is no direct rail…I had thought that I might live with my Aunt Florrie and save some money and make it easy to go. That didn't happen. It couldn't have happened, but it was a part of the decision-making.

The other one was that the person who was the head of the English department…I went up to read English for no better reason than it was the subject that I did best at school and I certainly went up there expecting, as did my parents and my friends, that I would become a grammar school teacher in English. This was the obvious thing to do if you were so fortunate as to go to university. The person who ran the English department at that time I thought was, in fact, one of the experts in Britain on theater. He had been dean of the school of drama at Yale, though he was Scottish. He had come back to found a research institute in Stratford-upon-Avon and to be the head of the English department at Birmingham.

In fact, he was an absentee leader. He spent as little time in Birmingham as possible and as much time as possible in Stratford. His interests were pretty exclusively the graduate students. There was nothing to complain about except I think the only person who had any reason to complain was the second in command who didn't get a professor's salary, but who actually had to run the undergraduate work and so on.

Professor Nichol showed up to give lectures, as did all the other people. There were no such things (and I think this is still largely the case in Britain), there is no such thing as courses as the work involved listening to a single person talking across a lecture hall on a subject of interest to him or her and having an hour-long tutorial once a week at which, on a tri-weekly basis, you presented an essay and it was critiqued by your tutor and the other two students who were a part of your life.

I did not work very hard at my studies. That was partly because I never had had to work very hard, until going to university. I had done very well without working hard. So I wasn't sort of geared to be a truly serious student. I might have, I think, made the switch. One always wants to succeed and do as well as one can, but for me, the five years in Birmingham were five years of going to theaters, going to concerts, going to the art gallery which is not as good as it should be for the second city of England, but nevertheless introduced me to works of art.

Birmingham was, I think, unique then among the British universities other than Oxford, Cambridge and London in having it's own art museum. It had been built and endowed by some wealthy person in Birmingham who wanted his money to go in that direction. So the Barber Institute, as it was called was a major resource also.

Birmingham was also the first place where I had lived where there was a constant supply of foreign films. There was a film society run by the undergraduates. There was a lot going on and it became…I still have somewhere my pocket diaries for those five years and I would be willing to bet that the average week involved four evenings going to something or other. I had a very good time. It was a new world and it was a very enjoyable world.

At school I had also developed an interest in and discovered a talent for what I guess one very broadly calls administration, management. Then at the school level – all that – the way that manifested itself was that I became the secretary of the "School Society." I don't know quite how common that was and I don't really know that it had any kind of official status, though it did have that title. All it consisted of was what nowadays are called "field trips," but they were not organized by the teachers. They were proposed by us students. They had to be approved by the teachers, by the headmaster, but they depended upon the initiative of the senior students. So I had that job and I guess I organized two such trips in the course of my year. You know, you had to make the arrangements with the places you were going to go.

I remember we went to Liverpool and were shown around a Cunard liner and visited the Tate & Lyle sugar refinery. It wasn't until many, many years later that I discovered that the Tate of Tate & Lyle was also the Tate of the Tate Gallery in London…another of these wealthy Victorians who decided that the arts were where they wanted to find immortality. Good for him. You had to book the bus. You had to organize the parents' permission. All of those things. Those were done by students and that sort of got me going.

When I got to Birmingham, I became immediately an active member of three units of this kind: the English Club of course which was where the undergraduates and graduate students for that matter in English sort of arranged a degree of social life and a degree of extracurricular activities of one sort or another related to what one was studying; and the Methodist Society. At that point, I was a keen churchgoer and the Student Christian Movement, which sort of took me into, made me

friends with students from other denominations, other Protestant denominations. The Newman Society took care of Catholics.

Eventually in my third year, my last year as an undergraduate, I was the chairman of the English Club, the chairman of the Methodist Society and the vice president of the SCM. So, in addition to spending time going to the theater, films, galleries, concerts, lectures about the arts, I was involved in running those three groups. In my third year, the outcome I guess of all of that activity of organizing these various entities, I ran for the Student Executive of the whole institution which, at that time, was called the Guild of Undergraduates. It is now called the Guild of Students because for half a century the number of people who had held office who had already graduated and were already in post-graduate work became very substantial. So it was an odd thing to be president of the Guild of Undergraduates when you, yourself, were not an undergraduate. A small detail which nobody need learn.

At any rate, at that point the University of Birmingham was divided into two: the original building – the grand and wonderful piece of Victorian Gothic architecture right in the center of the city – was where the law faculty and the arts departments were housed. The arts and sciences lumped together is not the rule in Britain as it is in the United States so that the arts, which means 'humanities' of course, had their housing in the center of the city next to the central reference library of the city, which was a much better library than the university's library. So it had a sort of satellite of the student union. There was a magnificent union building in the other part of the university; but for the people who were at Ed Street as it was called – Edmond Street – there was a little set of rooms that the university had somehow found and made available to students: the Guild Club.

So I became the Guild Club secretary and, in my fourth year, which was the year in which I obtained my education credential, making it possible for me to become this school teacher that I assumed I was going to become, I was also the Guild Club secretary and much involved in student politics. I guess there were several hinge points in my life, but perhaps the most important in that so many things depended upon it was, in my fourth year when I was in what I expected to be my final year, I have no recollection of how it occurred, but I found myself running for the presidency of the Guild of Undergraduates and I won.

One of the 'what ifs' or 'what might have beens' in my life and of considerable significance, is that another student…There were five of us or six or some such number running for the presidency and one of us, when we started out, was a very, very charismatic person. The only one of us who had already done his national service in the army, had come out; even as a national serviceman, had had a commission and blah, blah, blah. A major figure. He was a shoe-in. There would have been no question but that J. R. S. Morris would have won. Then (very, very rare in those days), it turned out that he was as I think they are generally called "a sponsored student." The firm that he was going to be working for which I think was in the textile business but at any rate, they were paying for him to be a chemical engineer student at university. They got wind of the fact that he was running for this office and they told him he couldn't, that he was there to get a first-class honors degree at their expense, so that was that. So J.R.S. "Dickie" Morris dropped out. Had he not, my life would have been completely different. I won: at which point I had to find a way of staying there for a fifth year, which turned out to be not so difficult so long as I was ready to pay my own way. There were no grants to help me; but, since I had won, the university was ready to lend me the money to take on a fifth year. In that fifth year…

End Tape 1, Side A
Begin Tape 1, Side B

SMITH: …I discovered a profession which, in a sense, I had taken completely for granted and hadn't thought of as a profession, which is that of academic administration. The union, the Guild of Undergraduates at Birmingham, was exemplary I think in terms of its having a great deal of autonomy over the activities of student social life including where they ate because the union was the principle, had the principle dining halls for the university. There were very, very few halls of residence at that time and a lot of students who did not live in residences – which was the vast majority – lived in digs where the arrangement was that there might be bed and breakfast; there might be bed and breakfast and an evening meal, but they would certainly have to find something in the middle of the day. So the union was a major concern and it's budget was very large and it was, as I say, significantly autonomous and the university administration kept tabs, but in a very, very modest and minor way on what was going on.

But one of the elements of life for the president of the Guild of Undergraduates was to have a meeting every week with the vice chancellor, that is to say, the president of the university. I was very

fortunate in that the vice chancellor in my time and for many years after I left was an extraordinary human being. A New Zealander who had been a Rhodes scholar at Oxford and then had gone on to medical training and had very quickly become a professor in one of the Scottish universities and then had gone back to New Zealand to be a vice chancellor and then come back to Britain as vice chancellor of the University of Birmingham. A man called Robert Aitken, very wise, very kind, very decent, very understanding. We stayed in touch until his death at the age of 93 or 94 a few years ago. He was a very good example of a very responsible administrator. I think one of the abiding beliefs for me, which is as strong as it ever was, is that there are very, very, very few institutions… human institutions more important than universities; that the work that is done in higher education is among the most important, the most precious.

I had gotten a third-class honors degree, which was certainly…I deserved no better. It absolutely ruled out going on to do an MA. So the question of what I did in my fifth year got itself sorted out in a very ad hoc kind of arrangement. Technically, I was a student in the faculty of social sciences. I was supposed to be preparing for a one-year diploma course. That was something that we all knew was simply a technicality to keep me *in statu pupilari*. At any rate, I went to a few classes. I learned a tiny bit about economics and sociology and social administration; but mainly, I was running with my colleagues on the executive…the Guild of Undergraduates. It was clear to me that university life was something that I enjoyed and benefited from and contributed to and that that was…If I could do that for the rest of my life, that would be terrific. It was obvious that I wasn't going to become an academic in the teaching sense because, as I thought – it turned out to be somewhat different -- but, as I thought, I had reached the end of the road with my rather lowly bachelor of arts degree. Whereas there were people who… Obviously, I was never going to be a vice chancellor, but I could aspire to being a registrar or something of that sort.

So that was what I thought my future should hold, which was, I guess, slightly puzzling to my parents because this was, as I said, a world about which they knew nothing. But they trusted me in terms of doing the sensible thing.

Then, as I was approaching the end of that fifth year, the end of my time as president, another moment of fate arrived because conscription had been a part of the British scene from the end of the war. This was…We are now talking about 1956. I graduated in '54. I got my

certificate for education in ’55 and was a student and president through ‘55-’56. Conscription was still in place. It was…Every able-bodied male had to serve two years in Her Majesty’s forces and that was what I was expecting to do. I had been on the point of being called up at the end of the education year and a few strings had to be pulled to enable me to get another year of deferment in order to be president of the Guild, but that would be the last one. Literally – absolutely literally – weeks before I was due to be enrolled or whatever the word would be, the government – Anthony Eden’s prime ministership – decided, for I don’t know what reasons, to relax conscription somewhat, I guess because there was very little for these soldiers who were called up to do. The world was at peace and there were friends of mine who did not get extra deferment and ended up as policemen in Cyprus, I remember. But at any rate, the government decided they didn’t need as many men as it had needed and concluded that, although conscription was needed, it would only in the future apply to people who had been, who had a medical grade of 1-A or A-1. Since I had this history of asthma, which had long since gone away, I nevertheless didn’t get graded at the A-1 or 1-A. So came this beautiful little letter from the ministry of defense to say that I would not be called up. That seemed to me like a gift from the gods. That was two years that I had expected to spend doing nothing of any significance.

So that, combined with the thought that I at least wanted to see what I could do in the field of academic administration, led to my being able to apply for jobs at the entry level. I had decided, since I had had very little experience of travel, only at the end of my fourth year…It was my first time ever abroad largely as a result of there not being much money around. Some of my contemporaries with their parents had started going around Europe. I had not. So I decided that I would use the two years that had been given to me unexpectedly to see the world.

So I applied for every entry-level job that I could find. At that point – this is now 1956 – it was pretty well standard practice for the universities of the British commonwealth to advertise all of their jobs, teaching as well as administrative, in the London papers and I guess it was a sort of a little bit of a hangover from the colonial days where the people who ran all of the institutions around the world had come from the home country. At any rate, this practice was still in place. So I applied for all of the jobs that I thought I might have some chance of getting and this was one of the other great ‘what ifs” because I obviously would take the first job that came my way. I needed money to pay back the university for my fifth year and so on. So I might have

ended up in Hong Kong. I know that I had an application in to do with the student union at the University of Adelaide. I know there was one application in at one of the African universities and there was an application in to I think a Canadian university. The job that came was as assistant to the registrar at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario. That was that.

I had another piece of good fortune because I got the job without being interviewed for it. The registrar had come over and there were a couple of members of the faculty who were spending the summer in England and so they made up the three-man interviewing committee for the people who applied…The registrar himself had been given the fellowship the year before to look at the university administration setup in Britain and he had come back thinking that it would be a good idea to have a Brit as one of his two new assistants that he was allowed so as to reinforce his memories and that kind of thing. So somebody was going to be appointed.

I was on my second ever trip to the continent and, since I was youth hostelling and hitchhiking, there was no way for my parents to get in touch with me when their summons to an interview came along. I am quite, quite certain that I got the job without the interview on the basis of Robert Aitken's recommendation. He was a very highly regarded member of the vice chancellor ranks in those times. There were, at that point, only about twenty universities in England, so it was very, very important. So the thing that made it fortunate is that, in my last year – the fifth year, the year I was president – I had grown a beard and what I didn't know until I…I had shaved it off just because I was fed up with it. Had I had gone for the interview with a beard, I probably would not have gotten the job. [Laughter] I discovered very soon after I got to Canada and started to grow a beard again that this was absolutely verboten. So that's a nice little piece of luck.

On November the fifth, 1956, I sailed out of Liverpool on a Cunard liner, making its final trip across the Atlantic before being assigned to the Caribbean as a cruise ship. It was a very poor old ship called the Franconia, which was supposed to take five days to cross the Atlantic. The Queen Mary did it in three. It ended up taking eight days. So I arrived in New York City in the harbor on November the 13th, 1956. I was born on the 13th of August and 13 became my lucky number then, to stay that way, as it was for John Kemeny. I am sure people have already told you. At any rate, that was the beginning of the big adventure. I caught the New York Central train to Buffalo, changed in Buffalo. We traveled there overnight. Changed in Buffalo and caught

the Toronto Hamilton and Buffalo Railway Company's little side shoot over to Hamilton and was met by the registrar and the director of extension – that was adult education – because one of my responsibilities was going to be the paperwork, all of the admissions stuff and maintenance of records for the part-time students who were studying as adults.

[Tape recorder turned off]

McMaster, at that point, was a Baptist institution owned and run by the Baptist Church – very small, very provincial indeed – and was about to change as did, I think, all of the religiously-supported colleges and universities in Canada because the development of higher education was such that the churches couldn't keep up with it. So all of those kinds of church-based colleges and universities in Ontario sort of gave themselves, as it were, to the provincial government and, in effect, became part of the province's university.

The McMaster time is relevant in one very important respect which is that my time as assistant to the registrar was very short. It turned out to be a very tedious job. I mean not that any job need be tedious. I made some progress in improving things in one way or another, but it was rather dead-end and the other person who had been appointed assistant to the registrar at the same time as me was promoted to assistant registrar almost immediately and I wasn't.

I was still sort of missing Britain and probably would have done as I had told my parents I would do, which was go for two years, but for the fact that the person who ran the extension department. At the point when he discovered that I was very unhappy working in the registrar's office, he asked me if I would like to work with him. That became important because he was an ideal supervisor. So long as I did the things that I was required to do and did them as well as I could, I was free to come up with other ideas and to expand the work of his division, within his budget.

There were two very important things that came out of that that became important the rest of my life. One was that I started a film society almost immediately. I missed the cinema and it was possible to do this because in Ontario at that time cinemas were not allowed to open on Sundays, but they could open for members of clubs. So we had a thousand-member film society and I remember somewhere in my papers there is to be found somewhere, probably in Vermont…We started this society, two or three young people, including the woman I

subsequently married. For ideas, we wrote to a few people around the world. Somewhere I still have a letter from Francois Truffaut who, at that point, had not made a film, saying what he would have in his first season of the film society. So we got that going and it was very, very successful.

The other important development within the extension division…I am realizing this as I say that there are three exceedingly important things…The third one very, very important indeed in terms of what happened in my life.

The second thing was that, with a member of the English department and with the backing of my boss at the extension department, we started a series of seminars in the summer at Stratford, Ontario. The Stratford Festival had begun in 1953 and obviously was there to stay. The permanent building had been built and they asked…They tried to get some university in Ontario interested in sort of deepening their experience for some people who went there. The university that took up this challenge was McMaster because my boss was a gambler, an entrepreneur in the nicest way. So, for several seasons, Professor Jackson and I worked very closely together in making these seminars a huge success, which indeed they were, and we had a lot of backing from the Canada Council with money. They were a very, very distinguished series with world-class scholars and theater people, with the full cooperation of the theater, itself.

The third thing that is crucial about my time at McMaster…Two things. One was that I clearly had done what I was asked to do and done it well. At some point…I don't know who had the idea. I think it might well have been my boss who said, "You know, you are not going to get as far as you should unless you have a graduate degree." So I was given a sabbatical by McMaster. I think the first administrator ever to be given one. I went back to England and took a degree called master of letters at the University of Durham. I chose that partly because one of the people who had taught me at Birmingham had moved there and was now senior lecturer at that place. Also because of this particular degree, the characteristics of which were… It involved only a one-year residency but the dissertation had to be Ph.D. length and substance. It was obviously going to be better for me to do that than to do an MA. That turned out to be significant also.

So in '63-'4, I spent that year in England, using it as I had previously with the various vacations I had taken…They had all been spent back in England. My parents were still alive and many of my friends were

still in the thick of things and got married and settled down. So it was a great place to go and spend time.

So the business of enjoying the arts continued to be a very important factor in my life. What made my working in the extension department of the greatest importance is that it led to one of the big surprises of my life. I am in the office doing whatever I was supposed to do that day and there is a letter addressed to me – personal and confidential – from the University of California at Santa Cruz.

The University of California began three new campuses, all of which had taken in their first students in 1965. One of them was the University of California at Santa Cruz. The others were at Irvine and San Diego. The unique thing about UCSC was that it was to be built along collegiate lines. Part of the folklore, as it were, of USCS is that it's origin came when Dean McHenry, who was the first chancellor there, and Clark Kerr who, at that time, was the president of the University of California as a whole, had shared lodgings when they were both graduate students at Stanford. Dean McHenry had graduated from UCLA and Clark Kerr had graduated from I think Swarthmore…either Swarthmore or Haverford…so they talked about the respective benefits of the large institution and the small institution and they decided that, if ever they were in a position to contribute a new idea to American higher education, they would try to found a university which was large, but also divided into colleges and therefore small.

That was where UCSC came from. It was built on what has to be the most beautiful campus in the world I think. It is very hard to…I have never seen one that matches it. Santa Cruz, at that point, was a very run-down little town. It was the only town in California that was losing population. It was really a sleepy place and the university purchased or was given – I don't know which – a two-thousand acre ranch called the Cowell Ranch which begins on a hill above Santa Cruz (which is a seaside town), and goes further back and is covered for a great deal of the area by second growth redwoods.

And here came this letter. It turned out that the new chancellor who had spent his entire working life at the University of California had long since decided that the extension business – continuing education or whatever it was called at that point – was not very well done anywhere and so, having written a book about it…He was a government professor. He had written dealing largely with the British Commonwealth. He had written books about the British Parliamentary

system and the Australian system and had a book about Canada. So he had decided to put his ear to the ground and find out who were the rising young people, which meant men at that point, in continuing education in Canada, thinking that that would be a good place to at least look.

So this letter asked me if I would be interested in being considered to be the first director of extension at UCSC and, if so, would I send my CV and blah, blah blah. So, of course, I wanted to find out more. I got a letter back almost immediately – Dean McHenry was an exceedingly efficient person – saying that he was sorry that he had opened up a possibility which in fact didn't exist because one of the odder regulations within the University of California was that nobody could be appointed as the director of extension at any of its campuses who didn't hold a Ph.D., so I was ruled out. So I had my little moment of pleasure and anticipation and then settled back to what I was doing.

It must have been weeks later, came another letter from Dean McHenry saying, "I held on to your vita. In reorganizing my own staff, the person who was my assistant I have made the director of educational policy" – or some such thing – "and I am looking for someone to be my assistant. Your vita and your life history so far is interesting to me. Would you like to come and be interviewed?" So I flew out at their expense. First time I had been west of the Mississippi and I remember very well that, at the San Francisco Airport, a car had been reserved for me and turned out to be a Ford Mustang. I took the long route through the Santa Cruz Mountains, thinking I was, feeling that I was James Bond. [Laughter] It was really quite an extraordinary time. And I got the job. I, of course, was bowled over by everything about that campus. It was a dream come true in that I was going to be at the very heart of a university with tremendous resources behind it, with a great vision behind it and I was going to be at the center because I was going to do whatever Dean McHenry asked me to do as his assistant. And it was thrilling.

Although the decision to go was mine, not "ours." At that point, I am sorry to say that this was still a very, very sort of male-dominated world. Although my wife was earning more money than I was when we were in Hamilton, it was still…I don't think I ever asked which is a rather dreadful thing to do. Maybe I could say in my own defense that I didn't need to ask. I mean, somehow the whole sort of excitement of this was…I was at the University of California for three and a half years. I had assumed that I would be there for a very long time. Indeed, I think Gwenda had, too. Gwenda started teaching there and

that's where our child was born. There was every reason to think that this was where we were going to spend, as indeed some of our very best friends have spent their entire careers. I mean, people who were members of the founding administration and the founding faculty are now at retirement age and some of them have not worked anywhere else. That is very understandable, although the dream faded in various ways. That's an important subject, but not for this archive. Again, the circumstances of the institution took me even more deeply into the arts. Three things in particular I guess became elements that contributed to my coming to Dartmouth.

End Tape 1, Side B
Begin Tape 2, Side A

DONIN: Okay. We were talking about the arts at Santa Cruz.

SMITH: Yes. The arts at Santa Cruz. The least of the elements was that, very soon after I got there along with a man teaching in the French department, I founded another film society. The film society had flourished at McMaster. I had become involved in the national movement and for a year or two – I guess maybe two – I was the president of the Canadian Federation of Film Societies. It was a matter of great importance that what film societies do in the way of augmenting what commercial cinema does was of great importance at that time. I guess somewhat less so now.

So Neal Oxenhandler and I got started on this film society. Of course it flourished, though the number of students was very small. Their original intake was the size of the first college which I guess was somewhere around four hundred. The college buildings weren't ready when the students arrived so Santa Cruz got another little bit of publicity, including I think even in those days, in Time magazine.

I remember when I was working on the history of Mr. Dickey's [John Sloan Dickey '29] presidency, one of the things that struck me was that, at the point where he was appointed president in 1945, that was national news. That had a column to itself in Time magazine.

Santa Cruz got into Time magazine because its students had to be housed in trailers in their first year. It made for tremendous community spirit. The kids who were part of that family group will never forget it. I am sure there are friendships there that…You know, they set out a whole lot of brand-new trailers that had been specially developed to turn into, in effect, mini-dormitories in sort of star clusters. It made a

very photogenic scene from the air. There were two buildings that were absolutely finished. One was the administration building and the other was what became the first part of the athletic facilities. So that became the dining room and the general meeting room for college assemblies. The faculty I guess…Where were they? It doesn't matter. I have forgotten. But, at any rate, this was a big adventure and the film society was a part of making some kind of a community on campus, which was a long way from the town – the center of the town – where there was nothing anyway.

The second thing that contributed to my professional life was that every campus of the University of California has an entity called the committee on arts and lectures. I think it is true that in many places the committee is there on paper, but each of the committees on arts and lectures has it's own professional staff.

USCS had been given the money to establish this agency, this office, and the money to pay for someone to run it. The person chosen…Every so often, when I think about the past, I realize that there are sort of gaps that make no sense. I have no idea where she was before she came to Santa Cruz. She was a very efficient person in terms of the handling of the things and had the title of manager, but she did not have very much in the way of ideas of what should happen.

So Dean McHenry appointed me the chairman of the committee on arts and lectures without a committee which therefore meant that I had my first experience as an impresario. There was money to spend. There were expectations that concerts and things would happen. So this was fine. It wasn't anything that I had ever done before, but I had seen the effects of it at McMaster where there was a very small program of a similar kind essentially coming out of the music department.

So I had the great fun of deciding who to bring there, who to import. There wasn't a lot of money and there wasn't a lot of point in having a lot of events because there was a relatively modest audience. But there, as in other campuses at the University of California, the activities of the committee on arts and lectures are seen as a contributing factor for town/gown relationships. All of those programs are open to the public and, at the big universities, at UCLA and UC Berkeley, the presenters there…The committees on arts and lectures, by virtue of the size of the audience, the size of the subsidy, the size of the facilities constitute, as far as I know, the main source of cultural

offerings other than the standing entities like the San Francisco Symphony and the ACT (American Conservatory Theater) and so on.

In terms of the kind of program that is made up essentially of people who travel in order to present their music or their theater or their dance activities…Those programs at the University of California campuses were very, very important and still are.

So I had this little very pleasurable duty sort of put in my lap and it began what became the modus operandi when I came to Dartmouth, which is, was, essentially, I programmed for myself. Not exclusively, but there was a degree of adventure in terms of bringing first of all to the UCSC campus where there was no concert hall so essentially there was no activity in the first year. There was virtually nowhere where anything could happen.

In the second year, two colleges that had been going up simultaneously both opened at the same time and both of them had large dining rooms and those became the concert halls. So, having admired the Amadeus String Quartet for a long time, I engaged them. That was a cherry on the sundae, as it were. [Laughter] It is not something unexpected. There was no better quartet in the world. Their fee was astonishingly modest.

It is one of the strange secrets of concert management … quartets generally sell for – even the most famous – something far lower than solo artists of the same degree of fame. Then it gets split four ways and then it has to cover expenses for four people with the cello having a seat of it's own. Anyway, that is a small sideline.

But this was a treat and, of course, they played wonderfully and everybody was very happy that they were there and I can't remember much else we did. We brought over the UC Berkeley orchestra. I remember that the first time I heard the Mahler Fourth symphony was in the Stevenson College dining hall. So that was something which I was expecting to continue to enjoy.

The third thing, which was the most substantial, was that there was a major gap in terms of theater. The chancellor was not satisfied with the junior faculty appointment that had been made by the first provost. At that point and for the first few years at UCSC, a part of the working out of this vision of a collegiate institution was that the colleges would each have a provost, as distinguished an academic as Dean McHenry could recruit, who would have a say along with the senior people in

each of the fields as to who was appointed to the faculty. Technically, the faculties' salaries were divided between "college" and "board of studies." There were to be no departments as such. They were to be boards of study – I think they were called – so that there would be links in any given discipline among the people teaching that discipline in all of the colleges. I have no idea actually how that arrangement developed. Now it seems so strange but it was so long ago. Most of the vision has either been abandoned or compromised, though in the most fundamental sense, the arrangement of the undergraduate body is still in the colleges, but the colleges are not much more – at least compared with the early days – they are not much more than sets of dormitories. There are still provosts and there are still funds that are available to the provosts to create their own programs. There are some differences among the colleges in terms of their academic emphasis and so on. I guess technically there are still joint appointments. The faculty are still fellows of a given college and members of the board of studies, but I think that it may be that they are now departments, as such, and that it is much, much, much more like the average institution than it ever was intended to be.

Nevertheless, the fact is that in the very busy time of getting this started, the first person to be appointed to do anything about theater was, I think, chosen by the first provost of the first college. He was not a particularly enterprising young man and I guess this is another of those places where I should know more than I am sure I do about why it was that Chancellor McHenry didn't want to entrust the future of theater to Robert Mooney. But I don't know that.

What I do know is that, at a point where a big chunk of money, by which I guess that means – I am talking 1966, 1967 dollars – probably a hundred thousand dollars was given to each of the new campuses to make a major difference in campus life to be devoted to a single or I think at most two projects. I guess Dean McHenry sort of decided this on his own, but probably having put his ear to the ground (he was a very, very astute administrator). He decided what should happen with our piece of special money was that one of the barns on the Cowell Ranch that had survived…The Cowell Ranch had been very, very successful in three ways. One, that it had logged the first growth – the virgin growth -- of the redwoods. They had made, obviously, huge sums of money on that. It had been a cattle ranch and it had also been – because there were limestone – it was built…I mean it was on the limestone shelf. There had been quarrying and kilns built to create limestone for which was then their principle outlet was up in San Francisco on boats.

So there was a fair number of the original ranch buildings and one of those was right at the entrance to the campus. It had not been assigned to any use. Most of the others had already been. In fact, the first conversion (the place where I was interviewed the first time) was what had been the old cookhouse, which was the place where the central administration had their first set of offices while the specially built places were coming up. There was a carriage house and this temporary library I think, something of that sort.

At any rate, there was this barn that had not been assigned to any use and Dean thought it should be turned into a theater and I was given the assignment of arranging for that. I don't remember exactly the extent to which I was free to do everything, but I can't remember much in the way of restraints. There was an architect in San Francisco who had not, up to that point, done any work at UCSC. UCSC became a kind of an experiment for architects in and out of California, but mainly California architects. Each college had it's own architect.

So there was a lot going on and, probably from the person in charge of that side of things on campus, the architect, I was put in touch with a young fellow in San Francisco. He was given this and then we brought in various consultants. I remember the first time I met Jules Fisher, who had probably won more Tony Awards for theater lighting design than anybody else. He was that consultant. So it was a wonderful adventure.

Dean also, in effect, gave me the assignment of choosing who should be the next person in theater. That sounds rather sort of odd to put it that way but this was in the years before affirmative action and appointments were made without elaborate selection processes. In this case, though, the only person who was there was somebody that dean did not think was good enough to be put in charge of this. There was money assigned for the second college to have somebody in theater. So I recruited one of the people who had been a member of the company at Stratford, Ontario, for many years and through its heyday years, under Tyrone Guthrie and Michael Langham. So he was assigned as the second person to teach theater and to be the director of the first production. No. The first thing he directed was in fact put on in one of the college dining halls; but it was also understood…He must have been involved in this conversion – now that I think about it – because Eric was certainly around. But he was certainly to direct the first production in the Barn Theater, as it is called. I think it is still there and is still used, though it is now much more a

student theater than it was because there is now a full-fledged theater building.

So the two productions that Eric did – both of which included in their casts the first young fellow who had been appointed – really had sort of shocked people with how good they were. Eric was able to borrow costumes from Stratford, Ontario, presumably at little or no charge. I don't remember. He did Twelfth Night first and I remember that the young woman who played Viola was wearing the costume that Siobhan McKenna had worn at Stratford had never heard of Siobhan McKenna. This was one of an early item in the way in which culture for student-age people changes so very quickly and what's important and who is well known. They come and go very quickly. That's a tiny footnote.

For the first time since my grammar school years, I did some acting, too, in the first production in the Barn. I realized the other day…For some reason, I found the program from that. Oh, no. I know why it was. It was not the other day. It was in the summer of 2001. I found a program and what I had completely forgotten was that, as that was going through the production and the proof stages and all of that, the part that I played was cast as being played by the director. I can't remember why we kept that a secret; whether that was…It was only…My name got in only at the final printing of the program. Whether it was because I'd never asked Chancellor McHenry's permission or not, I don't know. It is odd. At any rate, that happened. It was a huge success.

The University of California then decided that the next building to go up should be an arts center. By the time this happened, there were eight or nine – three colleges and five or six central buildings including the new library that were underway. The reason that I am sure of the process was that twenty years later…The last time I was in Santa Cruz, I was on the receiving end of a great many complaints from the people who are currently using the theater – the arts center – because it was known that I had been the campus liaison with the architect. That, indeed, I had had a major say in the choice of the architect, which was certainly true, and that the project had got going and then I had left and, in effect, there was no one there to supervise what happened along the way, which is more or less true. Eric, I think, was there…the guy I'd brought in from Stratford.

The reason was, and this I offered as a mitigating factor, was that the university said, "You either spend this money on this objective now or you loose it." So there either was going to be a theater, even though

there was essentially nobody there really qualified to work with the architect or. It was either then or never, or at least it was going to become very much so. So that was my last major assignment, working with that architect. He had been the architect for the Guthrie Theater in Minneapolis, which I had seen and thought was a great theater and that was the reason I was inclined towards him. I mean, I didn't just say, “It is going to be Ralph Rapson,” but I put forward his name to the campus architect and so on and so on.

I spent two years as Dean McHenry’s assistant and one of the recruiting areas which took a lot of time to get right was that working with the chancellor, there were to be three vice chancellors: one in the natural sciences, in engineering, one in social sciences, I guess, and one in the humanities. The first two of those were recruited and they were to be joined by a third. To them the chancellor delegated principle roles of working, building up the boards of studies and working with the provost in terms of recruiting faculty.

Dean McHenry certainly didn’t stay out of the picture. I think it was one of the great strengths there that even an instructor, even somebody taking on the first job of her career, was interviewed by the chancellor as well as everybody else. But the vice chancellor for the humanities took a lot of finding. I was assigned…even at that time I still only had a BA actually, though it was during my last year at Santa Cruz that my dissertation was finished and the M.Litt. degree was awarded. But it was a rather odd thing that, in the catalog it must have said “Vice Chancellor of Humanities TBA” and then “Assistant Vice Chancellor of Humanities, Peter Smith”.

There were things that needed to be done administratively and organizationally and the paper work and all of that which would have been assigned to the vice chancellor had there been one and it was understood that, if I was interested, I could continue that role working with whoever was appointed as vice chancellor of humanities. So I was sort of shifted in that direction, but that, of course, also included the future of the arts. So I suppose this was a tad more legitimate that I should have been the principal liaison with the designer of the performing arts building, etc.

In the course of my first year as assistant vice chancellor, the search was carried on very diligently and a person was chosen who I thought was fabulous, a classicist who, at that point, was at the University of Texas called William Arrowsmith. A major, major figure in many, many respects. So he was courted and he agreed to come. I was looking

forward to this as much as I had ever looked forward to anything, working with Bill.

Again, this was another one of those places where I never asked direct questions and so, if I ever knew, I have certainly forgotten quite what happened, but it constituted a sort of a mini-scandal within the University of California. Because if you were appointing a very senior person, and especially if you were going to be paying that person something out of scale, as it were, which is certainly the case with Bill Arrowsmith – he was a star – then there are a heck of a lot of people including the regents who have to sign off on it. This was all done. I mean everything that had to be done by the University of California was done for Bill Arrowsmith and then he changed his mind.

That had an immediate effect on me because the chancellor decided that he wasn't going to have another year of me as kind of acting vice chancellor, because I wasn't up to that. That certainly was true. It would not have made sense. But, without consulting me, which sounds like a very stupid way to put it because why should he consult me, nevertheless, he decided who he was going to choose from the existing faculty to be the acting vice chancellor until another one was finally appointed. The person he chose was the person within the faculty in the humanities who I found most difficult to deal with. Not so much on personality grounds – though he wasn't a particularly easy person – but mainly in terms of his lack of vision. Dean McHenry made the sensible decision that at least some of the first people appointed to this campus would come from other campuses so that they knew the UC system and so on. This guy was a professor of German, had been at UC Davis which, at that time, was thought of as the least of the campuses. He was very, very stodgy. He had no imagination. He was a stickler for all of the rules and for not breaking the rules. So in the summer of 1968, I was expecting that next year I was going to be working with this guy and I was not very happy.

End Tape 2, Side A
Begin Tape 2, Side B

SMITH: …the prospect for me is not at all attractive. Something else had been going on.

One of the assignments I was given by the chancellor was in effect sort of being more involved than anyone else on campus in the future of the arts there. So one of my assignments was to get to know the people at the major foundations who were in charge of their various arts

programs. That essentially at that point meant the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation, both of whom were devoting considerable amounts of money to the arts and both of whom clearly had no objection to linking the arts to higher education. So I got to know the heads of both those programs.

Out of that set of contacts (I guess I can't have met him more than three times at the most), in the late spring of 1968, I got a call from the man in charge at the Ford Foundation, which was by far the biggest program, by far the biggest program in the country. I mean the Ford Foundation at that time gave more money to the arts than the National Endowment itself. The man who ran it was called, his formal name was W. McNeil Lowry, known everywhere as “Mac”…Mac Lowry. He was a very, very important person in the development of the arts in America in the twentieth century and a very, very brilliant person. He offered me a job. I mean we had started…I guess before he offered me the job, we must have had a meeting, probably in New York – I don’t remember his coming out to Santa Cruz – where this was the subject. Then at the point where he had made up his mind that he wanted to offer me a job, I went back to New York -- it was the only time when I had been given a first-class airline ticket -- to meet McGeorge Bundy, who was the president of the Ford Foundation at that time. So then the offer was formalized. I don’t remember the exact dates of all of this.

Then came in the third strand because, again I don’t remember the month, but it was presumably, it must have been March or April of 1968. I am in my office in what was then called the Central Services building…the administration headquarters at UCSC. The phone rings and it is Neal Oxenhandler and his first words were, “How would you like to be director of the Hopkins Center at Dartmouth?” I said, “Oh, yes. You are handing out jobs in the Ivy League now? What’s this all about?” So he said, “I would prefer if you didn’t mention this to anyone because it isn’t final; but it is very close to being final. I am inclined to go to Dartmouth at the beginning of the next academic year to join the French department, so I was on an interview session last week, which included my being shown around the Hopkins Center by Leonard Rieser,” who at that point was both the dean of the faculty and the provost, "and he said, ‘You don’t know anyone who could run this place, do you?’” Neal said, “Well, yes, I think I do actually.” “So that’s why he said I could call you and ask you.”

Now we go back a few years. The first time I saw the Hopkins Center was in the summer of 1965. I had signed up for the job in Santa Cruz

and at one, at several, in fact, I think at all of the Shakespeare seminars that had taken place up to that time, among the people attending had been a very wealthy couple from Miami who had a summer home in Newfane, Vermont. Gwenda and I had become very friendly with them. We were quite close and the Bernsteins had insisted – Albert and Muriel Bernstein – had said that they would love us to come and stay with them in Newfane. So we were thinking…I guess one of our holidays together, either when we were going together or when we were married, had been in New England. So we had found that as beautiful and attractive as almost everybody does and so we thought that this was the time to take the Bernsteins up on their invitation. We were going to be three thousand miles away, blah, blah, blah. So with a stop in Newfane as our main point, we planned this "final" vacation in the East as it were.

I had heard of and read about the Hopkins Center while I was at McMaster. I guess…This is a little hard. It must have been publicized in the Globe & Mail, the main Toronto newspaper. It is possible that there was an Associated Press story at the point when it was opened because it was a major, major phenomenon that a facility of this size and up-to-dateness and impact was being built and was being opened. So somewhere I had read about this. I was quite sure that…I'm sure though I can't identify it as a memory that I know I had, but I was bound to have thought at the time, "This is what McMaster needs," and, at that point, there were no facilities or were still very, very modest. Maybe in the back of my mind, too, was the thought that, since we were going to be spending the next twenty-five years at Santa Cruz that this development would occur there as well. So I was quite sure that I wanted to see the Hopkins Center.

So we came to Hanover and maybe from Newfane or maybe on our way to Newfane. I don't know. It doesn't matter. I do remember that we did a little sort of window-shopping first and found the Dartmouth Bookstore and went into the Dartmouth Bookstore. I said to Gwenda, "This is probably the right place to leave you while I just go and pop into the Hopkins Center and see what it is like."

It must have been an hour later when I finally got back to Gwenda and she was not happy. [Laughter] But the reason for that was that I had wandered into the front hall and presumably I had gone over to the box office which was sort of the information desk as well, which at that time was in the foyer of Moore Theater now. I must have said what needed to be said to this old chap who was standing there for him to say, "Would you like to see the place?" That was my first meeting with

Warner Bentley [Warner Bentley '14A]. I had no idea he was the director, of course. He didn't wear a badge. I guess if I had been quick on the uptake, I would have realized that he was wearing the look of a person very proud and very happy.

So I saw everything. I mean, Warner's tours of the Hopkins Center, which eventually became my tours, were for people who were interested and knew why they were there and were pretty extensive. One of the things I remember saying very, very frequently on the tours for the Dartmouth Horizons programs was that one of the interesting things about the Hop is that it is like a three-dimensional jigsaw, that I got a pleasure from figuring out when I was in any given place what was above me and what was beneath because it is such an intricate building. So I got that tour and that was why Gwenda was left in the Dartmouth Bookstore wondering what on earth had happened.

So when Neal said, "Would you like to be the director of the Hopkins Center?", I knew what he was talking about. Eventually I said, "Of course I would," and the ball started rolling at that point.

What eventually happened was that I was in an extraordinary position in the summer of 1968 because I had the offer of the job from Mac Lowry; by that time, I had the offer of the job here; and Dean McHenry, bless him, had sort of picked up on this and realized that the last thing that I wanted was to work with this German professor. So he sort of made it clear that he would like to be given time to figure out what to offer me to stay at Santa Cruz.

What makes that particularly remarkable is that, during the years in Britain…I mean while I was still in England, America became very attractive. The first woman that I ever both found attractive and was able to summon up the courage to talk to was someone who was on her junior year abroad from Smith and the first time I ever heard of Dartmouth, which must have been in 1955, was when she told me that she was about to be engaged to a student at Dartmouth. So that hit that on the head. She and her partner – she married this guy from Dartmouth – they had three children. They lived a very standard and fulfilling life. He was in the foreign service. Then, when the children were grown up, she decided that this was the time for her to do what she had always wanted to do, which was to have a woman as a partner, so David and Marcia divorced and Marcia and Jill came to visit me in Buffalo last summer. We stayed in touch through all of this. I never was very close to David, but if I ran into him – he lives across the

river in, I forget which town, not handy to the river, but in Vermont – we would greet each other.

So America had been attractive for a long time to this particular member of the Smith family. An observation that I had made a long time ago and repeat from time to time when it is relevant is that America is the great country that it is, not only because it is a country of immigrants and continues to be a country of immigrants, but because – with the horrendous exception of the slave trade – most people who have chosen to come to the United States are in a sense already half American because they have had the gumption to make that trip, even when it is forced upon them as it has been for refugees through the centuries.

Nevertheless, you have already got a spark and the way I think of this is that… Anybody who knew or has known through the length of our lives me and my two brothers and were told that one of those was going to emigrate, nobody would have a second thought as to which one it would be. This is who I am, curious and risk-taking and whatever, and my brothers are not. So America was there in a sense from a long time back. Then I had nine years at McMaster, very close to the American border, watching American television, etc., etc.

I had come to the conclusion that there were three places in the United States where I would love to live and work. This was still while I was at McMaster. One is northern California, which I never visited but which we had seen so much of. San Francisco, of course, was a great magnet. One was Manhattan and the third was New England.

In the summer of 1968, I had the offers of jobs in all three and I chose to go to the Ford Foundation. This time, Gwenda was very much in the picture, very much consulted and, to a certain extent, there was some relief that this was not going to be a new upheaval for us. We had just bought our first house. Morgan was a year and a bit old. But Gwenda made it clear that she had always felt like a tourist in California, that she hadn't felt settled, that she missed the seasons so, if we were to move, that was fine by her and she didn't really have a preference between Manhattan and Hanover, New Hampshire. She knew enough about both to know that life would be interesting in both.

So I decided that I was going to go to the Ford Foundation because Mac was particularly, in an extraordinarily quiet way, charismatic and visionary and no-nonsense and the Ford Foundation program was just unlike any other in the world. So I decided, we decided, that I would

take that job and I phoned to let him know that I wanted to get the paperwork done and that I would say "Yes" as soon as I got the formal offer. For the first time in years, Mac Lowry was on vacation. He was a workaholic and he hardly ever went away and, even when he did go away, he expected to stay in touch. But on this occasion he was totally incommunicado. And his assistant is a very remarkable woman whose name will come back to me at some point when I don't need it. She was herself quite taken aback by this particular vacation because she had no idea where he was and she had absolutely no way of getting in touch with him. This was before mobile phones, of course, and everything depended upon when he called her. That might be tomorrow. It might be down the road a few days. He would be back on such and such a day, two weeks or more hence. So that was left at that.

I guess I didn't say anything to Dean McHenry or to Leonard at that point; but I did share my news with some colleagues on the faculty at Santa Cruz. And for what happened as a result of my coming here (Both for me and for the college and subsequently for Columbia.) I certainly have to be very thankful to an Englishman who is on the faculty there who I should try and track down. He is retired and has moved back to England. I ought to remind him of the crucial role he had in my life because when I went to tell him, in fact, that I was going to the Ford Foundation, he said, "Are you absolutely sure this is what you want to do?" I assured him I was absolutely sure that I had in fact told them that I wanted the job and so he wanted to know why I was absolutely sure and so we talked about that. Then he said, "Well, you know, let me just say that I think you would be making a huge mistake. We have been colleagues for three years here and I would say you have to be where there are students. You have to be in a place that is alive and that is an educational institution. That's who you are."

He was the person who gave me a definition of the university, of university life, which he didn't make up but which he got from the person who was the vice chancellor of the first new university in Britain in umpteen years. It was founded just after the Second World War. It's not a very important place, but it was very important then because it was a pioneer in terms of establishing a new way. The person who headed that up was a very, very distinguished Englishman who I think had been the head of the BBC at one point in his career and a major civil-servant type person. He apparently had coined the expression that "university education is the pursuit of truth in the company of friends" and Jasper passed that along from time to time because it certainly was very, very true of the atmosphere at Santa Cruz at that

time. So he reminded me of this and of what he took to be the need that I would find I had for that, rather than being in an office in a big building in Manhattan. Though I might get to travel. I might get to travel the world, in fact, and see a lot of interesting arts activities and meet a lot of interesting artists and so on, *this* would be missing. So I pondered that and talked it over with Gwenda and decided that he was right.

So the only bad encounter that I ever had with Mac Lowry was when he phoned. I hadn't told – I guess Jennie was her name – what my decision was. Otherwise he might have been even more fed up; but he was on this vacation. He had called in. She had told him that I needed to talk to him and, when we eventually spoke, it was to tell him that I was going to go to Dartmouth. If he had been at the end of the phone when I had made the first decision, blah, blah, blah.

Do you know the lovely Dartmouth story about Ted Geisel [Theodor S. "Ted" Geisel '25]? I didn't hear him tell this story, but I have been told it by people who heard it from his own lips. Not long after he graduated from Dartmouth, he produced what was to be his first book. How was it? ….on Mulberry Street…Something happened on Mulberry Street? [And To Think That I Saw it on Mulberry Street] Anyway, he produced this and the story is that he had taken it to every publisher in New York and nobody wanted it from this school teacher or something of that kind at that point. So although he thought this was what he wanted to do with his life, nobody else was interested. He was walking – so the story goes – up or down Madison Avenue and ran into a classmate and shared the news. I mean he told him what was happening and that he had come to a dead end. The classmate said, "Well, have you tried Random House?" He said, "No. They don't publish children's books." The classmate had said, "Well, they haven't, but you never know. I mean, they might take an interest." So he went to Random House and they took an interest and the rest in history. Apparently when Ted Geisel told this story, he would finish by saying, "Supposing I had been walking on the other side of Madison Avenue on that day?" [Laughter] So there is Jasper Rose.

To get to the end of this little piece, all that is needed, I guess, is to say that I met Leonard Rieser for the first time in our house in Santa Cruz. I was down with some kind of viral pneumonia and certainly was very unwell and Leonard was in California and decided that he would come to 331 Ocean View Avenue and see what Peter Smith looked like. I forget what the phrase was, but I guess more than once in public when he had to introduce me, he had spoken about the first time we had

met. "I can assure you, he was not a pretty sight", he said. [Laughter] So we talked.

DONIN: That was your interview?

SMITH: That was the first time we met. What was said between us was enough for him to decide that he wanted to pursue this and that meant coming here, of course. And it helped, of course, that I knew what the Hopkins Center was. I knew how remarkable it was and one very important thing…It has always been very important in terms of my own assessment of how this all happened was that when I came in the summer of '65 and was shown around by Warner Bentley without any idea that this would be a place where I would come to work, I realized that, for the builders of the Hopkins Center, the watchword had been what I had determined was my watchword in life to the extent that I could control matters, which is "nothing but the best". What had brought that home to me was not just all of the many manifestations of thought and care and all of that that went into the building of the Hopkins Center, but especially the fact that all the nameplates that were everywhere had been carved by Will Carter. I was sufficiently interested in graphic design and calligraphy from my student days to know who Will Carter was and the fact that the architects and the builders, and I don't know to what extent Warner was involved or anybody, had chosen him was of great significance.

Actually, as I say that, I now realize that I do know who was involved. The recommendation to Wallace Harrison that signage be assigned to Will Carter would have come from Ray Nash [Ray Nash '41A], who was a professor of art and a very, very important figure in Dartmouth's cultural history. His name may come up again at other times. But these plaques of all these sizes and different reasons for plaques had been carved by the best in the world. He lived in England. He's dead and his son now runs the press that he had and does similar work. That just said "absolutely nothing but the best".

I guess it is quite conceivable that actually I made some reference to that because I certainly found out at some point (and it may have been on that first encounter with Warner) that one of the other details that had happened was that Will Carter had designed a typeface especially for the use at the Hopkins Center. This is a type called "Dartmouth" which I guess doesn't, didn't survive to the extent that it traveled anywhere else and I would be almost certain that nobody at the Hop – maybe nobody at the College – knows of its existence as such; but it

was an element in terms of making this a very, very, very special place indeed.

So I came for I guess maybe only one, maybe two…I think maybe I came and saw just Leonard. I think that's possible, but then I subsequently met some members of the faculty, particularly, and spent time with Warner on the second go-around. I met the three people who were then called "directors" of music, theater and studio art, which was the setup at that point. It would be an important thing to go into when we get there. And I must do it to satisfy them.

The one thing I very strongly remember, which came out of my upbringing and my sense by then of the hegemony of Oxford and Cambridge, which is still hugely intact. There has never been a prime minister of the United Kingdom who went to university who didn't go to either Oxford or Cambridge.

End Tape 2, Side B
Begin Tape 3, Side A

SMITH: I have in my mind's eye a memory of a walk that I took with Leonard from his house on Elm Street in Norwich, up the hill where…There was no development then. I don't know what it is like now. I was very, very struck by how easy it was to get from this little bustling town to the surrounding countryside and Leonard's house is a real gem, kind of a small, I would guess, eighteenth century farm house. But the conversation had to do with this thought that was going through my mind of thinking of Dartmouth – about which I knew very little – as a place for rich white kids to sort of go to finishing school. That didn't sound particularly attractive. It was different from my own life. It was different from McMaster.

It was different from Santa Cruz, though interestingly enough, as recently as 1965 when the first students arrived at Santa Cruz, in that group of four hundred or whatever number it was, there was only one African-American and she came from a very wealthy family. That was very obvious. She was among those people dressed most up-to-dately and so on. So it is not as though I had seen that as a cross-section of the world; but, on the other hand, it did definitely… It was a representative sampling – it had to be – of people of that age in the university in the state of California. The only requirement to get in at Santa Cruz was high grades. Much sought after at that point, I think initially. It ranked second to Berkeley so that people who got in there got in through their brain power essentially.

I had this notion that Dartmouth was essentially a finishing school. I knew very little, I will have to say, about the Ivy League institution. I guess I must have known because it must have been one of the things that was talked about in that tour of the Hopkins Center and perhaps Leonard had sent me some written material about it, I certainly knew that Nelson Rockefeller [Nelson A. Rockefeller '30] was a graduate, so I sort of extrapolated from that to this sense that this wasn't a serious institution.

Leonard put me right about that in very…I mean, he knew the relevant facts and figures to make clear to me that, whatever it may have been and probably it never was that kind of an institution. Because I gather its history… Until comparatively the recent past, it had been a major private institution serving relatively northern New England and therefore there had been a lot of kids who had come through with no money and had gone on to, had been improved by the experience.

It wasn't until, I was told, until Mr. Hopkins' [Ernest Martin Hopkins '01] time that the idea of its becoming a national institution had emerged. As for my guess or prejudice about its being not much more than a finishing school, Leonard was clearly the first person who made me aware of John Dickey's mission for the college in terms of – for want of a better phrase – making it a serious institution of higher education. Also, there had apparently recently been a series of actions presumably promulgated by the faculty and the administration and then endorsed by the trustees to make a major effort towards the bringing in of a diverse – a much more diverse – student body. The first efforts to recruit African-Americans, in particular, and that that had been, to a certain degree, successful and it certainly helps change the institution.

One anecdote I remember from that conversation…I don't know that it impressed me at that time, but it has since, as an indication of a person in a senior place in an institution of some significance having his mind changed about something that was fairly basic. He told me that one of the things that nobody who had any part in trying to institute the recruiting of people from racial minorities especially, to make it a more diverse place…Nobody had ever thought through the situation, that apparently they were surprised therefore to encounter which was that, among the Black students who first arrived, they had discovered a great preference and maybe one should use a stronger expression than preference for, and maybe insistence upon, having Black roommates.

Leonard remarked how that had taken everybody aback initially and they had thought, well, it would be out of the question if some white student came along and said, "I won't stay here unless I can have a white roommate." And then of course the very obvious point emerged that, when you are part of – to begin with – a racial minority group and you become part of a group which is very, very significantly more of a minority, the sheer necessity of being able to maintain, to make some very close ties with others who shared the same situation. That, as I say, impressed me.

This is a point at which to say that Leonard Rieser and even more John Dickey became, and both of them in our day and in a sense still remain, heroes of mine. I think they were significantly good at what they did and I think they are two of – I don't know what the number would be, it might be five – people whose influence on Dartmouth is ineradicable and by now completely taken for granted. John Kemeny is in there as well. So I guess in a very different way and for a very different reason is Mr. Hopkins, too. I will talk about Mr. Hopkins in a minute or two.

So I must have had this conversation with Leonard clearly before the point of accepting the job at the Ford Foundation and so he…Those conversations and even seeing and being reminded of what the Hopkins Center was, they didn't convince me to take the job. Otherwise I would not have made my call to Mac Lowry. Jasper Rose's point about the desirability of being in a place, in an institution of higher education was what did make the difference and that has to mean that I didn't really have any serious misgivings about Dartmouth. It was just that there was something more glamorous about working for the Ford Foundation and a chance to live in Manhattan, I guess. In any case, that is past history.

So let me think what the timing must have been. My appointment here began I think on the first of December of 1998… Sorry…

DONIIN: '69.

SMITH: '68. I was here…we came from California in December. So when the final negotiations were made has now slipped by me. We arrived in the middle of December. We stayed in the Hanover Inn briefly until our furniture had arrived from California at which point we moved into Balch.

I remember that the day after we arrived, there was the annual Christmas party that President and Mrs. Dickey hosted in Alumni Hall. It was a fairly staid affair. Maybe I went on the payroll on the first of January. I don't remember.

What I do remember, because it was important to me, was a phone conversation that I had with Leonard when Gwenda and Morgan and I were in England in the summer of 1968 when Morgan was just a baby. I was very, very set upon my father's meeting his grandson, his first grandson…Not his first grandson, but his first grandson whose surname was Smith. Four of my sisters had had boys. That's true. There were other grandsons, but this was, I thought, special. All three sons' wives had children in 1967, but the other two were girls. At any rate, it was very important to me because – it is somewhat foolish – my father by then was, to a certain degree, already in another world, presumably something like Alzheimer's. But he knew who I was and he knew what this little creature he was holding was.

I can recall this because the conversation I had with Leonard took place from my parents' house in Norfolk and it had to do with making final all the details. I can't remember any details other than what my title was going to be. That had come up I guess in the very last interview that I had had before the formal offer of the job. This must have happened in the spring months of 1968. It included…Perhaps I only had two trips. Perhaps the first trip was when I met the various people at the Hop and the second trip was perhaps meeting them again along with conversations with Leonard and my session with Mr. Dickey, which was very important.

It was at that point that I came to understand in a conversation with Leonard the situation which had led to their needing to recruit someone to take this job and they were finding it difficult. What I had taken in from Oxenhandler right from the very beginning was that they had gone down a number of blind alleys and they were not quite sure how to complete their search successfully because, as I said, this was before affirmative action, before the headhunters effectively, before even advertisements I would think in many, many, many cases. So I don't know, but I assume partially from what I remember of the time, but much more importantly from going through the Dickey papers that a great many appointments were made via the grapevine and the old boy's network and this kind of thing. So they had gone down a number of blind alleys.

They had not expected to have to do this because, at the time the center was opened and Warner had at last gone into the promised land and was the director of this wonderful enterprise, a man called John Stewart [John Lincoln Stewart] in the English department had been made associate director. He was a senior member. I guess he was a full professor in the English department and had been much involved in the planning of the place and he was associate director and, in effect, director presumptive…Warner was very close to retirement age when the center was opened, so John was there as the person who was going to step into his shoes.

By one of those odd tricks of synchronicity, John disappeared from the scene in order to become a provost at one of the colleges at the University of California San Diego. They had a collegiate system, but on a much different scale. I mean it was kind of a halfway house. Irvine was built in the traditional method of departments and all of that. Santa Cruz was to have eventually as many as twenty or thirty colleges, each with a few hundred people. San Diego was to have and, as far as I know, does have a much smaller number of colleges, each of which had many more students in them.

John, whom I had met a few times, indeed, I met for the first time at a conference that I attended to represent Santa Cruz and he was there representing San Diego and I didn't know that part of the story. I may not even have taken in that he had come to San Diego from Dartmouth, but I met him. He was an amateur musician. He was a great lover of the arts and he was very articulate, but he got this much more attractive offer and that had left them sort of high and dry. But there was also at the time an assistant director and I suppose at some point I wondered where he stood in terms of succession, but I will come to him again in a minute.

So one of the things that came up that left me feeling rather anxious, I suppose, and may also have contributed to the initial decision to go to the Ford Foundation was that, in the last visit to Hanover, there was a conversation with Leonard – and I remember where we were sitting in the Hop – where he said something…I am sure it was some kind of preparatory phrase like, "Don't take this the wrong way," or "Don't think that we are having second thoughts, but the fact is that the plan had always been that, after Warner, the director should be somebody out of the faculty, somebody who could be a member of the faculty and still continue to teach, and so on. And that doesn't apply to you and I wonder how you would feel if initially your appointment was as associate director and then we nominated, we designated some

current member of the faculty to have the title of director?" I said that that would not sit well, that they either had to believe they had found the right person or it didn't make sense for me to come in under those conditions.

So that was…I mean I am sure that I made that very clear. What I guess I left open though was the question of nomenclature because the conversation that I had with Leonard from England which presumably made the final arrangements as far as the date I would begin and salary and that kind of thing also came back to the matter of title. I took in that, whatever else happened, I would be in charge. There would not be anybody other than Leonard to whom I reported; but that I wasn't going to be called "director."

So I mean there was still a little letdown in that. They were still hedging their bets to a certain extent, but in the most significant way, I had got what I asked for. I remember that we chatted about this a little bit and I – perhaps because it was in my head and it was always there or perhaps because it would just be brought back to my consciousness by virtue of being in England – I remarked that the person in charge of the Royal Opera House at Covent Garden who was a major figure and indeed a knight of the realm, was called the general administrator at the Royal Opera House and that was that, so it sounds okay. It sounds a little odd, but okay. So I started here as general administrator for the Hopkins Center. That was in the catalog. It was on my notepaper.

The subject didn't come up again until some small distance into John Kemeny's presidency. John was inaugurated, as I recall, in March of 1970, so I had a whole calendar year and a month or so as part of the Dickey administration. The way it came to a head and I don't think it had ever come up during the year under Mr. Dickey, was that either John Kemeny decided this for himself or… Because he had a very extraordinary mind for detail as well as other things, he noticed, apparently, that in the by-laws or whatever the statutes regulating the faculty of arts and sciences, there was a list of those members of the administration who were considered members of the faculty of arts and sciences and could attend the meetings and could speak and could vote. In that list was included, along with the university librarian, the director of admissions and I guess two or three others, the director of the Hopkins Center.

So I remember…I guess John asked me himself – John Kemeny – how come I wasn't called "director" and I explained this stuff and he said, "That's a lot of nonsense. As far as I'm concerned, you are called

"director" from now on and you fill this role with regard to membership as faculty." It was during my time, during those Kemeny years and I am also certain this is true. It could easily be tracked down if it is of any significance to anyone. But I am pretty sure that Seaver Peters [Seaver "Pete" Peters '54], the director of athletics at that point, made the pitch for being in that number because if the librarian was there and I was there and neither of us had teaching responsibilities, then he should be there. So he became part of that.

My interview with Mr. Dickey...I can't remember whether Leonard was there through it. It was a very important occasion. I don't know that it lasted very long, but it contained a beautiful "Dickeyism," a real what I suppose now the buzz phrase would be "thinking outside the box". He had an ability to rethink and also a very far from conventional, far from platitudinous choice of words. He also…At that time I remember and I guess throughout the rest of his life, but I can't be sure about it. He was giving up smoking. One of the odd things about being with Mr. Dickey was his way of giving it up was to roll his own, so there would be as much paraphernalia and time taken as there is with pipe smoking. He would sort of spill this tobacco out and he would roll it up and then he would moisten it so that it sort of stuck together. Then it sort of still didn't satisfy him, so he would sort of mold it a little further and moisten it a little further until he had this sort of very limp, odd thing that he would then try to light and then somewhere he would give up. [Laughter] Basically, he would have two or three puffs at most out of this non-cigarette. It was interesting to see that. It was also interesting that he had his dog in his office. It may have been, depending on…I mean, this was in the spring. I am pretty sure. I certainly…If it wasn't then, it was at another occasion, being impressed that he had an open fire in his office, too, in the fireplace. He told me that there was a small endowment given by somebody from a very remote class to supply firewood for the president's office in perpetuity.

DONIN: Right at the end of his career, the campus was in an uproar.

SMITH: Not quite. Not then. There was a degree of ferment, both in terms of the war in Vietnam and with regard to the introduction of a significant…I don't know what the number was. I am sure it was under a hundred, but the African-American recruits also added to its not being the place it had been. The big troubles with the Vietnam War certainly came after I was here because I was witness to them. I mean there was nothing at Santa Cruz at that point either. It must have started at Berkeley though because, while I was at Santa Cruz, in my last year at Santa Cruz, Ronald Reagan was elected governor and it

always struck me as a tremendous example of raw power was that, at the first meeting of the board of regents, that Governor Reagan attended, Clark Kerr was fired. What was striking about that was that one of the interesting things about the setup of the University of California is that the regents are appointed for I think twelve years, if not sixteen. It is intended clearly that it shouldn't become a political football, so that the terms are very long and I can't remember the sequence.

What I do remember very well, because it struck me in its…And there have been other instances of this. It seemed detrimental to good governance. Pat O'Brien…not O'Brien….Pat…the governor of California…Who was the young governor of California who was a presidential candidate? Mr. Moonwalk, boyfriend of Linda Ronstadt…

DONIN: Jerry Brown.

SMITH: Yes. It was Jerry Brown. His father was governor three times. Pat Brown…was that his name? Anyway, he didn't use his real name, I remember that. At any rate, he had the politicians' hubris. The thing that goes with the territory I suppose which is that you feel that you are doing such a good job that the state or the country or whatever can't be without you. So there is no reason to think that the governor's mansion would have switched from the Democrats to the Republicans that year except that Pat Brown was asking one time too many and Reagan was exceedingly attractive in many ways as a candidate and was well and truly handled. I remember seeing a Canadian CBC documentary in which whoever it was might be… The principal handler said quite explicitly, "We have our candidate speak as little as possible outside of the set speech."

But what was interesting was that probably the majority of that board of regents had been appointed by a Democrat, but there were enough people whose nose had been put out of joint by Clark Kerr and the beginnings of the huge upheaval that eventually almost brought Berkeley to a stop. He was summarily dismissed and the golden faucet also was turned off. I mean it was within a year of Reagan's …

End Tape 3, Side A
Begin Tape 3, Side B

SMITH: … the occupation of Parkhurst. Yes, I was. So that definitely was '69. I really…Memory is such a strange thing. I mean, the conversation or the time with Mr. Dickey must have been at least a half an hour I would

guess. That was an appropriate amount of time for his job and for someone he was meeting for the first time. There is not a great deal that I can for sure tell you I remember from it. But I think I am not forgetting something when I say that the national situation and the concern about the war was not part of our conversation and it was not there. I may have gone over with him…I may well have…The conversation with Leonard about the rich boys' finishing school, that would have been very probable. Actually, if I had known then what I subsequently found out about Mr. Dickey's own origins, I would have realized that I had no business talking about it in those terms because John was exactly the kind of person for whom a place like Dartmouth exists and it meant a great, great deal to him.

But I do remember this beautiful back handed compliment, which was John's way of expressing the situation I faced. Something along the lines, he said, "You probably gathered that we have been trying quite a while now to fill this place and to have someone to step into Warner's shoes and we haven't done as well as we had expected, I guess, frankly. What we decided was what the ideal person would be for this job and, by now, it is clear that we are not going to find him. So the question is, if we can't find one, we will have to grow one and the question is, 'Are you ready to be planted?'"…which was a very lovely figure of speech. I said, "Yes. I believe I am."

It meant a great deal to me to meet someone who was the very opposite of a human cliché and I guess we talked a little bit at that point about how the Hopkins Center came into existence, but not a great deal. I am sure that it wasn't at that point that I came to realize, as I must have done probably from reading old alumni magazines as part of my getting into the swing of things, that it was as big a struggle as it was for Mr. Dickey.

Since this doesn't have to be entirely chronological, it leads me to a point that a few years later, in 1972, we celebrated the tenth anniversary of the opening of the Hopkins Center. We celebrated it on the day, which is, I think it was October something in 1962 and I had the big commemorative book from that. I still have a copy, though they are getting very scarce.

But, in 1972, I remember phoning Mr. Dickey at the house that they had built up on the Lyme Road. Mrs. Dickey answered and I explained to her that I was hoping to talk to Mr. Dickey because I was planning the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the Hopkins Center opening and we hoped that he would play a role there. We had all taken in that

he wanted to disappear from the scene. He was very, very explicit about wanting not to get in John Kemeny's way in any way, shape or form and so on. I said that I knew this was in general the thing but, on the other hand, the Hopkins Center was surely unique in terms of his presidency, etc. So she said, "What date is it?" and I gave the date and she said, "Oh, that's out of the question. That's in duck season. He won't. He just won't." [Laugher] So the question that came to mind then was how would he manage to sacrifice that for the actual opening. Presumably it made it even more memorable for him.

But, a day or two…I don't know, as I say, I have forgotten the date and I certainly don't know what the dates of the duck season are. But a little while after the conversation with Mrs. Dickey, I found myself at the gas station over by the Coop, the old Coop and Mr. Dickey was there in his outfit for going up to the Grant and then getting into his hide with Bill Andres [F. William "Bill" Andres '29] and doing his duck shooting, because he was all equipped. So we had this moment and my explaining that I hoped that Mrs. Dickey had told him that we had hoped that he would come to this and he wasn't going to, but we were going to have a celebration and we obviously would have a good time and we would clearly remember the role that he had played. So he wished us well and then he said, "Peter, no one will ever know how lonely I felt in the years that led to bringing the Hopkins Center into existence. I was on my own and one of the things that I held on to – and I used to have it on my desk in the president's office until I stepped down – was an anonymous postcard which had come in a little while after the Hopkins Center had been opened and it simply said, "Dear Mr. President, Re: Hopkins Center, You were right. We were wrong."

Then, as I say, there is a good deal of documentation about the opposition that came from many quarters. But one part, which I am sure isn't on the record but, if one were to make a study of the Hop within it's second, it would be possible I assume to verify what I am about to say and expand upon it. One of the people I inherited from Warner was a young man who was his business manager, who was a graduate of the college here, the class of around 1960 I think, 61. The first business manager had also been an alumnus. He was a little older and had become the first business manager of the Kiewit Center when it was established.

So John Goyette [John Goyette '60] had come in. The first business manager's name was Tom Byrne [Thomas E. "Tom" Byrne III '55 TU '56] and the second was called John Goyette. John was an interesting case because he had been a "typical" – it is a loaded phrase – but a

"typical" Dartmouth student in terms of the typical Dartmouth student from the frat house, from "Animal House". John had been a jock and was still a jock for that matter. He had been a member of the football team – the varsity team – and had been a very active fraternity-type in the SAE house. At one time, we were having a conversation and he said, "Did I ever tell you what the brothers at SAE used to call the Hop when it was still a hole in the ground? We called it 'pansy palace'." And what was very interesting about John -- very, very, very commendable – was that his first job after leaving had been some very junior job obviously for, I think, Mobil Oil or Esso as it then was. At any rate, one of the major gasoline distributors, refineries, distributors, etc. Fairly soon…He was very bright and very conscientious so he had gotten some kind of a promotion which took him and – if I remember correctly – his wife… He… I think he married, as many people did at that time, more or less as soon as they graduated – to Paris. It is fair to say it changed his life. It put him in touch with a lot of other "pansy palaces" that he frequented and he learned to love. [Laughter] He is, I believe…The last I heard, he is running the opera house in Claremont, New Hampshire. I think he is basically the artistic general manager of it.

So there was opposition of many kinds and there was certainly a lot of expressions I read about of people saying that it was absolutely not necessary. "Dartmouth doesn't want this. It doesn't need this. It certainly shouldn't take the last space on the green." Then, of course, there was all that controversy over how modern it looked. When one thinks about how modern it might have looked, how very modern it might have looked. I mean poor old Wallace Harrison sort of gets it from both directions because, for the non-traditionalist, it is nowhere near adventurous enough. So, but for the traditionalist, it is far too way out and for the modernist, it is far too old hat. So there were very few people who would go to bat for it as a major work of architecture.

Partly I suppose to deal with that subject, on Horizons tours and to preempt anyone who was going to ask about what it's reputation was as a piece of architecture, I would say up front that although you could have many points of view about whether it was indeed an exceptionally good piece of architecture aesthetically, there was no argument that could be, no argument that functionally it was a magnificent piece of architecture. Everything Mr. Harrison was asked to do, he did, and it involves a tremendous amount of genius in use of space and planning of space. Spaulding is as good a concert hall as any in the country in terms of acoustics, which may be luck, but also had to have been intended. It has a lot going for it. I don't know that Mr. Dickey and I

talked very much about that. He, only once in my time as director, came to an even there.

I should say, just for the record which will be reflected in some papers in some archive box…the arrangement that Leonard and I agreed on was that I would arrive on the first of January. I would go on the payroll on the first of January and with the title of general administrator. Warner would stay on the payroll until the 30th of June with the title of director. That for the first three months, Warner's day would be what it had always been and I would watch. For the second three months, I would start to be the decision-maker and, you know, chair the staff meetings and that kind of thing and Warner would look on, with the expectation that he would guide me as the need arose. That worked very well.

Then, on the first of July, Warner retired and I was it. Then it must have been that fall, we gave a big party for Warner. I remember two things from what I said. I am sure John Dickey must have been the principal sponsor. He must have presided over that celebration. A lot of people were invited back and came back who had been students in the Dartmouth Players through Warner's thirty-odd years or whatever it was by then. I guess more than that almost. So it was a very, very grand occasion and it was made to coincide with a production of the Dartmouth Players, which was one of the best of the by now many, many dozens of student productions that I have seen here and elsewhere, with Errol Hill directing.

This was a production of Peter Shaffer's The Royal Hunt of the Sun, which is about the conquest of the Incas. [Rodney W.] Rod Alexander, who was the director of theater and had been a professional actor, played Pizzaro and white students played the Spaniards. All the Incas were played by African-American students. In one of those pieces of incredible luck, the student who played Atahuallpa, the prince of the Incas and leader of the Incas, was a natural actor. He became a journalist and I don't know very much about him, but that role, especially in that arrangement, could not have been better played. I mean the play is all about, not all about, but many things involved in that conquest and in that rape, as it were. But it also has to do with the human nature and I don't know enough history to know whether it is true or not, but Peter Shaffer makes the Incas, especially Atahuallpa, heroic and incredibly noble. Herschell Johnson [Herschell L. Johnson '70] was the student. He was just staggeringly good and Erroll was very reluctant ever to cast anyone who wasn't a student. But he was new. That was only his second year, I guess.

In any case, I have no reason to think that it wasn't his idea to cast Rod, but it made the balance absolutely right because Herschell was a bigger figure than any other student on the stage. I mean he just was outstandingly dramatic and Rod was a very experienced actor and looked the part. It was a superb event. It was the one which, for a great many people who came to Warner's party, was the first production they had seen in this wonderful new space. There were others who had been there at the opening, but that obviously had to involve a lot of people with nothing particularly to do with the theater, whereas this was Warner's occasion.

I remember saying two things and I thought of one this morning over breakfast when you were talking about your husband's taking on Cary's role and what big shoes they are because I said, "You know I came here expecting to have to fill big shoes. That was very apparent. What I hadn't counted on was what a funny shape they are." [Laughter] Warner was really one of a kind. And the other little thing which was just a nice little something to have thought of was that "We come to praise Caesar, not to bury him." So this was all about Warner.

DONIN: Is that when they named….

SMITH: The Bentley Theater. Yes. That was Mr. Dickey's doing, his initiative. Warner was glad and grateful and a little unhappy. He knew that those unnamed spaces ought to be worth a lot of money to get a name on and he was very conscious about that, but he wasn't going to argue.

There was a degree of rivalry that had existed over thirty or forty years I guess between him and Henry Williams, Henry B. Williams, in whose name the theater collection here is in his honor, his name. They had shared the whole enterprise for many, many years along with someone who had been their backup in terms of the staging, who was a designer and a general handyman, though Henry also designed. That was one of his notable abilities, was to design costumes as well to direct. At any rate, he comes into my mind because I suppose it was possible that Henry…Now I can't find the right words. Certainly one way of finishing this was somewhat unhappy. Warner had this named after him and I think that is not worthy of Henry. That's not the right way to say it. It would have been noted by Henry more than by anyone else, I think, that it was understandable that one of this pair should be singled out in this way. After all that it was…Whatever Warner's title had been before the Hopkins Center came into, which is…I can't remember. Nevertheless, it made it clear that he was Number One. On the other

hand, Warner never had, or if he did have, he didn't really sort of fulfill the faculty appointment whereas Henry was a member of the English department for many, many years until the drama department split off just before, well, at the time of the planning of the Hopkins Center. So that is that.

DONIN: I am curious. Before coeducation, what did you do about women?

SMITH: Well, before…This is the wrong way to say it. It is going…I was going to say "before I arrived", but that implies that I had something to do with it. Up until 1969-70, which I think was the second or third year…I may be off a year. At any rate, before coeducation for two or three years, the college arranged for…once the drama department had come into existence and I think that happened after the Hopkins Center opened, not immediately after. I am just trying to think if, whether in my first, in that first term there were no women in Royal Hunt of the Sun. At any rate, this is a detail that anybody who is interested can track down easily enough. The department of drama, presumably working through the dean's office – dean of the faculty and dean of students – organized an exchange program with some of the…Not just the seven sisters because I think Skidmore was involved. But at any rate, there was this arrangement.

DONIN: The Twelve College Exchange?

SMITH: Maybe something to do with that. It may have had an element…it may have been an offshoot of that general thing, but it was specifically geared towards students in the women's colleges who wanted to study drama and wanted to do more than they could do in their home institutions. It was obviously done with a view to having women take those roles in the production. Before that, I am quite sure that the roles were taken by faculty wives and by – depending on the age of the character – women in Hanover High, maybe from Colby [Sawyer College], too. I don't know that for sure. At any rate, it was fudged in that way.

Jean Kemeny…One of the things that I wish I had been around to see was Jean playing Daisy Mae in Li'l Abner because she was apparently a great success on stage and very shapely and very full of life. She wasn't on stage in my time. Her daughter was – Jenny [Jennifer "Jenny" Kemeny '76] – after Jennie came back from Yale. Jenny went to Yale initially and was so put out by its lack of welcome for it's women students that she transferred back here.

At any rate, one of the…A story to dine out on for me comes from that period because, in either my first or second academic year, one of the exchange students was a young woman from Vassar with the name of Meryl Streep. She chose this program, partly because of curiosity, but also because there were no playwriting classes at Vassar. The person who got to know her best was Erroll and she must have acted, but I don't know how much. I don't have any memory and I hold on to all my programs. Bonnie [Cornelia "Bonnie" Wallin] could figure out how much she got into acting at the Hop. But she was here for a year.

What I do know and what is a very striking story was, after she graduated from Vassar, for a year she lived with her boyfriend of the time over in, I think, Thetford, one of the towns in the Upper Valley and definitely in Vermont. In whatever it was, my third year here, Rod Alexander, who was something of a specialist in putting on musicals – a tradition which seems to have lapsed, I regret to say – put on a production of Guys & Dolls and I went to see him to ask whether he ever cast non-students and he said, yes, he was going to. His wife was going to play the general of the missionary league and so on. I had made it clear that I was asking if it was possible that I might play Arvide and he said, "It all depends on if you can carry a tune. Let's go and see." So I had known this song for so long and it was so beautiful and I have always wanted to sing it, so I played Arvide Abernathy and the Salvation Army, it's not Salvation Army. I often wondered why Damon Runyon…Maybe there was a mission that had nothing to do with the Salvation Army except they all had costumes and uniforms and had a band. Let me think.

This is anomalous actually. This must have been after coeducation came because there were a number of women in it. They couldn't all have been exchange students. This is a detail of very little significance. But at any rate…So the lists were put up for tryouts and so both students and non-students came. In fact, the woman who played Miss Adelaide was a student at Colby [Sawyer] College. I am almost certain of that. But there was a question of who was going to play Sarah. The man who played Sky Masterson became I guess the most successful product of the Dartmouth Players of his generation, a man called David Carroll [David J. Carroll '72], who had I think three Tony nominations. He was outstanding in everything he did on Broadway and died of AIDS at the age of thirty-something. Terrible. But anyway, he was as good a Sky Masterson as any there has ever been in a student production. It was a role he should have played on Broadway. Coming down from the hills was Miss Streep, just checking out what was going on around here and signed up to audition for Sarah

and she was not cast. To make things worse, the woman who was cast was Rod's daughter, who was then in Hanover High and who was not bad. She became a student here and did a great deal of acting. But at any rate, my story is that I almost sang that song to Meryl Streep fifteen times or however many times we had that.

DONIN: [Laughter] That's great.

SMITH: It is lovely and she was given an honorary degree fairly soon after her career had taken off and we had a little chat about many things, but I didn't bring…

End Tape 3, Side B
Begin Tape 4, Side A

SMITH: Somewhere I have a letter from Meryl Streep saying, "Yes, I did try out and, yes, I was not cast." [Laughter] That must have lasted a very few years I think. But I can remember quite well some of…I have no recollection of ever having met Meryl Streep, though when she came for the honorary degree, she said various things about remembering me, but I don't know quite how that would have occurred except that, of course, the director's office in those days was on Shakespeare Alley so that we were in the heart of theaterland, as it were. So there was a lot of coming and going and, for all I know, she may have come to see the production and to see the director...yes, yes, yes. It is easy to forget that there is always in many, many different places that relationship where you are one of one and the other person is one of many.

Let me think more about…I'm trying to put into the record the relatively few other contacts that I had with John Dickey. The most important by far of the items of work for which I was responsible in calendar year 1969, which meant that I was working for Mr. Dickey…The most important by far was that, very soon after I arrived, Leonard told me in some degree of confidentiality that at some point I was going to be asked to make a report to him and John Dickey about the Congregation of the Arts. So he wanted me to be aware that its future would be subject to study in the coming academic year, 69-'70. But I know that I was not free to divulge that, but I was expected to bear it in mind throughout my experience, my first and only – as it turned out – experience of being there through the Congregation of the Arts. So I had my ears and eyes open more even than they otherwise would have been. I was paying careful attention to what went into this effort, both in terms of the expenditure of time on the part of employees of the college and the money that was involved. I guess when… This will

perhaps spill over into some consideration of the role of the center and the expectations that were made or that were in place at the opening of the center.

I think that the Congregation of the Arts, which must have been proposed as the place was being developed, the people who were appointed to be director of music, director of theater, director of visual arts, were all here and in place at the time that the center opened and they presumably were here for at least a year or more leading up to that. Each of them…

No, I beg your pardon. I was going to say each of them has a statement in the commemorative booklet for the opening, each of the three directors. In fact, there isn't one there from anyone with the visual arts. Matthew Wysocki [Matthew Wysocki] must have come after the opening. I mean, there must have been a statement by Paul Sample [Paul Starrett Sample '20]. I know there is a statement from a chap called Hugh Morrison [Hugh S. Morrison '26] who was a professor in the art history department. Among the honorary degrees that were given out, there was one to Hans Hoffmann [Hans Hoffmann] as representing the visual arts. But in the performing arts, in theater and music, it was clearly intended that there would be activity, which was not formulated by or the responsibility of the music department. In theater, there was no drama department at the very beginning. So Jim Clancy [James A. Clancy], who came here from Stanford as director of theater, first director of theater, presumably had a professorial title even before there was a department. But in the…We opened in '62. The first Congregation was in '63, so there must have been five of them. Three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. There must have been seven of them. My goodness. Jim Clancy must have been around and stayed through the opening of the center and through the formation of the drama department. He must have had a significant hand in that. By the time I got here, he was in charge of theater at Cornell and Rod Alexander had the title of director of theater. He must have been in his third summer I would guess.

The driving force, without any question, behind the Congregation of the Arts… The driving force in terms of the people involved was Mario di Bonaventura [Mario di Bonaventura], who was the first and indeed the only director of music at the Hopkins Center. I don't know the extent to which Jim Clancy's activities in those first congregations was on a par with what was happening in music.

By the time I arrived, the budget was very skewed towards the music program – a lot of money – and I have never been good at remembering figures so I won't even guess except that we are talking about six figures. We are certainly talking about more than a hundred thousand dollars of subsidy. This is over and above ticket income and any other kind of income.

The driving force in terms of personality by the time I got here was Mario. The driving force in terms of the mission of the center was to have an impact on the life of music and theater in the nation. This was the place where it had been decided that money should be spent in order to create something which used the facility, which was commensurate with Dartmouth's sense of itself in terms of it's importance in higher education in this country and which would bring the college and the center and it's activities into the pages of the national press, which it did to a certain extent and I think initially a considerable extent.

The music program was much more distinctive than the theater program. I feel odd now that I never went back to look with any care at what the theater had been doing in the early years. What it was doing in the one summer that I saw it was creating an equity company. There was an arrangement made with Actors' Equity to have a company which would be partly equity actors, but with students as apprentices and participants and so on. I can't remember how many equity people were signed up. There would also, of course, have been an equity stage manager as part of…That always happens where there are equity actors. The designers were not necessarily the people who were here to design for the Dartmouth Players and I don't know the history of the use of either costume or set designers other than the people who were on board. The tech director had to have been a separate appointment because the man who was tech director through the year – he was on a nine-month appointment – happened to spend every summer as a senior tech person at the Santa Fe opera. So a part of the expense of the theater program would be the ancillary staff as well as the actors, as well as some kind of modest stipend for the students. There was no credit, I think, given to students at that point, though that came in subsequently.

So there was a link – somewhat modest, but nevertheless actual – between the students interested in theater, some students interested in theater, and this summer program. But it was essentially an equity company putting on the classics as a new contender in the whole business of professional theater in the summer in New England. The

idea was that it would become something like the Williamstown Festival. I think that may have been a reasonably exact model for them to aim for. I am not sure. I can't say that it didn't happen but I think that the theater program never made much of a splash. I don't think…It certainly never got to the point…I don't know why, but it certainly never came close to being commensurate with Williamstown, though it had a much better theater than the one at Williams College. Well, except, of course, Williamstown Festival is separate from Williams; but this was fully funded by the college, by the institution.

At the other end, things were very, very different. Fundamentally, what happened was that students, from conservatories essentially, were recruited with very modest stipends and living allowances in effect to form an orchestra. The inducements for most of them was that, in addition to getting this modest stipend and a summer up here and an opportunity to play this repertoire, they would have instruction from major professional musicians. I don't know how this was stated and I don't know the data, the figures, but they would be taught by another cadre of professionals of significant standing who would be the principals in this orchestra. They were chosen from the nation's orchestras, for the most part, those orchestras which didn't have summer seasons so that the… I remember that at least a couple of the people, the principals, were members of the Metropolitan Opera orchestra. They were all of substantial status. I think, for those who were particularly well-established, it wasn't particularly happy-making to go into this orchestra and be playing alongside their students; but, nevertheless, there was money involved. It was a nice place to be. There was interesting repertoire.

So this orchestra was formed, which had some impressive professionals in it and otherwise was made up of students. In addition, there was the program associated with living composers. This was indeed a major, major program in that people were invited to come to Hanover for I guess two weeks. In most of those seasons, there were three composers in residence and I think each of them…I think that maybe two of them had a two-week spell. I guess the Congregation lasted eight weeks and one of them had a shorter spell. There was always a senior American and someone from overseas and I guess a less well known American composer. When one looks back on that list and one sees that there were relatively few major composers who did not come to the Congregation of the Arts. I had a very sort of crash course on who was prominent in the world of music beyond the handful of the people who were active and whose names I knew like Britten, Tibbett and Stravinsky. They didn't come. I mean they were not a part

of this, but there were people who were extremely important whose names I didn't know because this was not my field, but who, once I put my ear to the ground, I realized were people who would in fact go down in the history books. Among the Americans, there were people whose names I certainly knew, Copland being by far the most prominent. But Walter Piston and Roger Sessions. This is where I might have done a little preparation, but I didn't.

DONIN: Not to worry. It is all in the documents.

SMITH: It is indeed all in the documents. What I found out more and more as I became more and more involved and, in an important respect, responsible for, this program was that the people from overseas were *very* important. I came to realize that, for some of them, maybe for all of them, but certainly for some of them, the chance to come to America was by no means a given. There were not many people inviting people to come. This was especially true of those who came from behind the Iron Curtain. I don't know. I mean, I obviously do know because I had to authorize the checks. I was going to say that I don't know how much they were paid, but it was along with generous time at the [Hanover] Inn and so on and during the time that they would be here, the bulk of the programs, they would perform two concerts a week. The bulk of the programs would be their music and they would be invited to sit in at rehearsals and talk to Mario about this, about what was going on and it was of interest to the best students. I mean, the better the student, the more interesting this experience was. Even if you never got to meet the composers, you were in their presence and I kept in touch very sort of tenuously with one or two people who went through that as students and it was a major experience for them.

I mean, as I say, it was a learning curve for me. Of the people who were here from overseas, I am not sure if I had heard of any of them to be quite honest, which…That fact may have been clear to Mario di Bonaventura. I may have made that clear inadvertently, I guess, and that may have factored into the unhappiness that was to come because, in a sense, I was out of my area of any sense of competency.

But I quickly…One of the important things that I brought to the job at the Hop and to the one at Columbia, for that matter, and I don't know quite where it comes from. I don't think it can be learned and I don't quite know how it is acquired but something that John Dickey had and something that Leonard Rieser had was a kind of instinct for…I mean, I speak for myself here. They might put it differently though I associate

what I am about to describe with them. The kind of instinct for who you go to for good advice…a way of sorting out probably.

Now that I am sort of made to articulate this, made by myself to articulate this, I would think it has a great deal to do with what one calls "character". One, without ever articulating it for oneself, about oneself, knows that one is a person of integrity and seriousness and that one's responsibility in any job is to give value for money. So the question of tracking down the people who can tell you, who will be honest in talking about a subject about which you don't know much, but about which you need to know more. That applies to the dean of the faculty, especially the faculty of arts and sciences, where there are eighteen – or whatever it is departments – which any dean can only be really, really knowledgeable about three or four at the most. So it is part of that.

I believe I did the right thing by the subject in hand. So I became aware that Mario's choices were outstandingly good and that a program like this, it did indeed redound to Dartmouth's credit. It was a wonderful thing for Dartmouth to have initiated it and for it to be doing.

This is where, for the first time, I am talking out loud to someone other than…I am talking to the machine for the first time about what happened with the Congregation of the Arts. There is always, in a situation like this, there will be a tendency to oversimplify. So to make the big oversimplification at the very beginning, what I came to know but could not judge for myself beyond the most elementary and unacceptable level of participation as a member of the audience was that my sense of what was going on did not really count, but it was there.

By then I had become devoted to music more than to anything else, actually, and had been to a great many concerts in Britain and in Canada and in the United States. So there was something there, but it wasn't sufficient to make a judgment on. But there were other people who were in a position to help me in the job that I had been assigned.

One thing that happened which had absolutely nothing…I think Mario may well have come to the conclusion that this had been a little bit of a conspiracy, but it was not at all. One of the things that has always interested me and still does…In fact I couldn't get to sleep last night just thinking of it in the context of Columbia right now. One of the things that I think is appropriate for an art center in an institution of higher education to be involved in is some degree of formal attention to the criticism of the arts. I had and, in a sense still have, the idea that

there should be a course available for which, in a sense, you would have to be chosen to audition, as it were, which would be called, "Thinking, Reading and Writing about the Arts". And that was in my head from as soon as I got here. I had discretionary money, not on a large scale, but I had…I was expected to take some initiative.

So, with this in mind, with the thought that I would try to cultivate or get to know more about this idea of mine and discuss it with people, I brought over from England that summer – or I think he was here at our expense for two or three weeks – the person who probably most people would have put at the top of their list of music journalists in Britain. He was the music critic for the Sunday paper, The Observer. All papers in England have gone down over the last fifteen years very badly, but at that time, The Observe*r* was on a par with The New York Times in terms of both the amount of space it devoted to the arts and the quality of the writing and Peter Heyworth was someone I had read every Sunday all my life, all my post-secondary school life.

I had never met him, but I knew how intelligent and articulate he was and I deduced – this is another quasi-intuitive thing – that here is a man who had integrity, who was balanced, who did not take pleasure in stabbing people in the back, who, in fact as all good critics should be in my opinion, starts out intending to celebrate the art and the artist. So I had then and had never had any…I had no regrets at that point nor misgivings that this was not the place to start.

So Peter came over and he sat in. He eventually became an important element in my coming to understand – and this is where the oversimplification comes in – that the big problem about this program was that it was wonderful in conception. It was very good for the student who we paid to come here, not our students. It was wonderful for most of the composers, not necessarily ours. But, in terms of what actually happened, it was second-rate at best. In other words, Mario was a wonderful conceptualizer of a program, but a very far from good conductor. So both in terms of what the audience was getting and what the students were getting who made up the orchestra, there was a lot to be desired.

So Peter was important in this because he had no role other than to evaluate and I am not sure I even initially told him that I was, that one of my responsibilities was to review this program, but I certainly asked him what he thought. He had very, very serious misgivings. He was not impressed. When he wrote about it, which was very good for the college to have a good many column inches in The Observer once he

got back, he wrote principally about the concept and about Roger Sessions' music and so on. There was nothing there to indicate that he had been blown away by the performances. He was judicious and fair.

But there were critics who had come on a regular basis from the Boston paper, most importantly, Michael Steinberg, who was, I think, again one of the people that anybody in the picture would say was a very, very good critic. He came regularly on behalf of The [Boston] Globe. He wrote very positively for the most part about the programs over the years. There were others who came and there were a few people I guess who had come up and written about the project or the concerts from The New York Times. At any rate, I made contact with several. Michael was by far the most important and I think was sort of put on the spot, as indeed I guess I was myself, in the abstract at least, in looking at this just as something out there, that the idea was splendid and that there was…It had importance especially in terms of bringing major composers. I should say that the only one of the composers from overseas whose name I knew was Zoltan Kodaly, who was by far the most important of the imports. The others were very major…

End Tape 4, Side A
Begin Tape 4, Side B

SMITH: …mentioned, the most important beyond Kodaly, again, there are people who are expert in these things who might make this order slightly different. I am quite sure nobody would say that any of the others was more significant than Kodaly, but there is a Polish composer [Witold] Lutoslawski…I will write these down at some other point. There is a German, Hans Werner Henze. There is an Argentinean, the first name just goes out of my head. There was [Ernst] Krenek. Others may come back to mind, too. But those are very important names if you look in the Grove Dictionary, they will have very lengthy entries. In some cases – I am almost certain that this is true with Lutoslawski and it may have been true with Henze as well – it was the first time that there had been a major sort of exposure of this sort in the United States.

So the most important conversation I had in connection with this was with William Schuman. Bill Schuman had given the principle address at the opening of the Hopkins Center. I don't know quite where this fitted into his life. He was the president of the Juilliard School and then became the first president of Lincoln Center and I guess he held that

title at that point. The opening of the Hop and the opening of Lincoln Center were pretty well coincident and the fact that Wallace Harrison designed the Hop and the Metropolitan Opera House was noted in the five arches and all of that. I guess it must have been the case of whether he had taken up the role or not that Bill Schuman was going to be the president, if he wasn't already the president of Lincoln Center.

I will come back to Bill Schuman from a different angle; but in terms of my responsibility of sorting this out, it was very important for me to speak to him because he had a connection with the place. He had been involved in the discussions about setting it up. He had been closely connected to one of the advisory committees that had been set up, which turned out not to be equally active or useful, but he knew the picture. Although he was president of the Juilliard School and was indeed, would have been on anybody's list of the five most important composers of his generation up there with Copland and Sessions. I am not going to take the time to concentrate to get to the others, but a major, major figure. He had not been to the congregation, but he was known and I think by almost everyone highly respected as a rare instance of a major artist who was also a superb administrator and advocate and all of those things. He was indeed a tremendously important person.

So I asked if I could see him. I went to his apartment in Manhattan and laid out what my role in this was. I guess…Not a great many specific things remain with me. One is a beautiful thing, which I've said from time to time. He asked me if I had any idea how di Bonaventura had related to these visiting composers. What was it like? I said, you know, that I had only seen him with two because the third of the people who was to be there in my one summer didn't come because he was too ill.

That was a factor for me in terms of trusting Mario because one of the things I found out was that – Roberto Gerhard, he was called – had been ill, seriously ill for so long that there couldn't have been any possibility that he would be coming anyway. So we were publicizing something that Mario must have known was false essentially. It was a come-on to students that he recruited to a much lesser extent than the faculty, most of whom were on a pretty regular assignment here and doubtless would come to depend upon this to a certain extent. Not for a great deal of money, but for an interesting experience in the summer in a nice place at no expense.

But I had very little…I couldn't take in very much about how Mario related to Roger Sessions. I am trying to think who the third one was that summer. At any rate, I hadn't much to say. I had heard…I had picked up the fact that he had gotten along extremely well with Aaron Copland. Bill said, "My definition of a neurotic is someone who can't get along well with Aaron Copland." [Laughter] He was very, very sweet. He heard out what I had said.

The people I had spoken to included some of the musicians who were some of the professionals who were there. Mario had gone beyond the field of American orchestras and had brought to be principles in his summer orchestra world-class soloists who had been in orchestras, but no longer were, the most prominent of whom was a chap called Barry Tuckwell, who was at that point by everybody's vote I would think the most important horn player in the world. And there was a German cellist called Siegfried Palm. Both of them very reluctantly were willing to be put on the spot in a sense. They didn't want to have to talk about their sense of what was going on, but nevertheless were not willing to say nothing or to say what they didn't think.

This is where the decision-making process sort of becomes less clear than one would want it to be. Ideally to make a decision of something of significance, which this undoubtedly was…It certainly was to Mario di Bonaventura, much, much more than for anyone else. The ideal thing would be to have a lot of affidavits, a lot of precise statements in writing in which people have pointed out the deficiencies, but there are no such things.

Bill Schuman was the last person I talked to. I left without any doubt at all that what I had come to understand was in fact the truth of the matter, that it was a lovely idea. But, as Schuman said…I said, "You have never been…" and he said, "Yes. I have absolutely no interest in hearing my music played by a student orchestra. I hear my music when I hear it. It is programmed." Essentially he was saying, which was certainly true, "I am not interested in being flattered by being asked to be the center of attention even in a place like Dartmouth."

So the issue was… It had very little to do with theater. The money that was spent on the music side of the Congregation of the Arts was significantly greater than that on theater. It was a significant fraction of the total subsidy for the Hopkins Center throughout the year. I mean it was a large, large item. Attendance was not very great. I mean Mario was pretty astute at building programs, but most people don't want to hear new music and most people are not going to travel very far to

hear new music. So, in box office terms, there was not a great deal to offset other considerations. Although it was written up in the papers from time to time and in musical journals somewhat, that had begun to diminish, too.

One of the sources of anxiety for me was the extent to which Mario was ready to insist that attendance would be far, far greater if only we had a really competent publicity staff. My take on that, by the time the final decision came to be made, which was a good deal later which I can explain, was that this had been terribly unfair.

But one thing that I learned very quickly here and have had in mind throughout my career since is that nobody who puts himself or herself on the line as an artist, especially a performing artist, especially someone in front of the public for such a person, there is no such thing as too much publicity and there is never enough. My decision fairly early on was that this was asking far too much of a one-person or one and a half person staff, although I think Marion Bratesman, who was in charge of publicity throughout the whole of my time as director and had been there from the beginning with Warner, I think did a much more than competent job. I think she did an extremely enthusiastic representation of the Hop in just about every circumstance and she certainly deserved more credit than she was given. There were compensations for the flack, the unrelenting sort of pressure on her coming from Mario. There was compensation in there. Yes, she got to meet important people. She hosted critics from city papers who otherwise wouldn't be here and she worked very hard to build on that foundation in terms of keeping the Hopkins Center in the public eye beyond the Upper Valley. But she was also of course on the spot and in a certain sense always responsible for getting an audience for the glee club and for whatever the Dartmouth Player's production was.

I think an important moment came for me with regard to Mr. di Bonaventura. On…Isn't that odd? I thought we would all know this date. On the concert day…Was it a Sunday or was it a Thursday? At any rate, on the concert day in the summer of 1969, it was made known that, in the course of some point between noon and midnight, the Eagle would land on the moon and there would be the transmission of images from the moon to the earth in real time. So that happened on a concert day. And I am very clear about there being no absolute certainty about the precise time when this event would take place. It was a concert day.

It must have been a Sunday, I think, because in addition it was one of the concerts that came between the visits of the visiting composers, the composers in residence, and Mario wanted to do – every year – a major, very large scale event. So he programmed the Mahler second symphony which is a gigantic orchestra and a gigantic choir and two soloists. This in itself was a major effort because the university, the college, was not in session, but all or a large part of the glee club was sort of summoned back. Paul Zeller [Paul R. Zeller], who was the director of the glee club, had to prepare them for this. The Harvard and Radcliffe glee clubs were also imported. So it was a very big undertaking and it is a very major work. But the performance of it coincided with the most significant event in the history of the world that could be witnessed. Spaulding was about three-quarters full. The concert happened. There were some critics here. There was somebody here from Montreal, I remember, and afterwards there was a party for the soloists and Paul Zeller and any critics who were around at the di Bonaventura house on North Balch. It was in the course of departing that we all gathered around the television and saw Neil Armstrong put his foot on the moon.

The next day, I was walking in town on Lebanon Street and a car pulled up beside me. Mario got out. He never…I don't know if he could drive. He never… He was the only college professor that had a one-person, one-to-one secretary. His secretary drove him around. This car came up beside me and Mario got out and dressed me down and through me, Marian Bratesman. But this was aimed at me because I was ultimately responsible for the fact that Spaulding had not been full the previous night. That this was insupportable that an event of this importance…Even for that, we were not able to bring in the 850 people who would fill Spaulding. I thought this is more than unreasonable. This is Cloud Cuckoo-land in a way. This is a fantasy world. So that was not unimportant.

Eventually, with Bill Schuman's input mattering most, but with input from I would guess five or six people who were very, very knowledgeable and, in the case of Palm and Tuckwell, reluctant but nevertheless willing to be as objective as they could because they were both paid very large stipends. It seemed very clear that this was not a perfect program and initially my thought was…This shows you that I was very naïve because I don't think this was a good idea. But in any case, it would never have been acceptable to Mario.

What I thought was that because this was a program, potentially at least, of national importance and certainly good in that Mario had

chosen very, very well the composers that he had brought here – though there was bound to be an end to that at some point – that the thing to do would be to somehow persuade him to continue to do this program and hire another conductor. I should have known that that would be out of the question. In the end, it was not ever mooted. I did do a lot of ear-to-the-ground stuff and came up with a person who I would have been ready to recommend if this had been followed.

But, by this time, the cost of the Congregation – the lion's share of which went to the music program – was, to use one of Leonard Rieser's very favorite expressions, "a non-trivial amount". It was something about which it was appropriate for the president and the provost to be devoting time to. The session I had with John Dickey and Leonard – we were both there – who I think was very anxious because, among the other things that he had already taken in and my efforts certainly confirmed, was that this was a hot potato. This would be controversial. People would be very unhappy. Mario most of all, but Mario would make his feelings known around the musical world and we had to be sure that we did the right thing. John Dickey was very anxious that the decision should be made before John Kemeny came into the presidency. I can't remember right now whether the meeting took place before John was named or after, but the search was in it's very last stages if it was before any formal announcement. John certainly wanted it to be a decision that he took. John Dickey.

DONIN: Can you explain to me for a minute, what was the origin, what was the thinking behind starting the congregation?

SMITH: I think it was to make a really significant splash in the performing arts on the national scene. That it was intended that this magnificent facility should be used to the full to make Dartmouth's commitment to the arts manifest way beyond the Upper Valley. I suppose in the best of all outcomes, what would have happened is that the theater program would have become as important as Williamstown. It would have had people making the decisions about who was cast that would bring the renown that came to Nikos [Psacharopoulos] whatever his long Greek name was. A decision was made to invest in one person at Williamstown in which the college participated and the choice was made right and that man who was on the faculty at Yale spent his summers there in this magnificent program. It is still magnificent. So we would do that x miles north and we would bring in the crowds as were brought in at Williamstown because this is vacation.

DONIN: Was this John Dickey's idea?

SMITH: I don't know whose it was. It may well have been. I know that the choice of the phrase "the Congregation of the Arts"…They wanted to give it a name which would be distinctive. I am virtually certain that that was a coinage from John Finch [John Wallace Finch] who was the first chairman of the drama department and who died just a few months ago. But I think the devotion of money on a significant scale that could only tangentially be referred to as money spent on education as it were, that that was a decision really having to do with the reputation of the college and the exploitation of the decision it had made to enter the world of the arts in higher education in a big way.

So, if the theater program had become another Williamstown Festival, and if the music program had become the American equivalent of the two or three very, very successful new music festivals that take place in Europe…Again, whose names have slipped my memory, but they exist. They still exist. They are places to which people interested in what is happening in the world of music find their way. They were places…One principally in Germany with a long name is a place that Peter Heyworth would be at every year and probably someone from The New York Times would be at every year in the hey day of arts coverage. So that it was not an unreasonable aspiration to say that, in addition to everything else that the center is there to do, it is there to put Dartmouth on the map in terms of the performing arts with professionals involved in that and not in anything else.

Ultimately, the decision that was made, sort of came in two stages, though I don't think anybody expected the outcome to be any different from what it was. But the decision that was announced was that the Congregation would be suspended for a year and that the summer of 1970 would be devoted to a long process of doing something that essentially it was time to do after the center had been opened this long, which was to make a formal decision about what the role of the Hopkins Center would now be. There was a substantial budget, which included bringing some of the principal people who had participated in the music program over the years back to Hanover to meet and to talk with us. I don't know if Leonard met anybody.

At any rate, I was engaged in various conversations with people who were very unhappy being asked to, even in a very modest way, sit in judgment on something which they were involved in only because they had been asked to be involved in it in the first place. So there were some awkward times. But there was work going on in the three

departments to develop a formal statement with regard to the future of the arts at Dartmouth.

There was something that came to be known as "The Nantucket Conference". John Finch had a home on Nantucket and, in fact, died there. At that point, it was just his summer place. So he was the senior among all the people involved. He had been at the college longest and it was agreed that there would be two people from each of the arts. There would be the chairs. John was chair of drama. Jon Appleton was chair of music. John Wilmerding [John C. Wilmerding, Jr.] was chair of the art department, which at that point was both art history and studio art, and the three directors. So Rod Alexander [Rodney W. Alexander] was there and Mario di Bonaventura was there and Matthew Wysocki was there from studio art. The dean of the faculty was there in the person of Larry Harvey [Lawrence E. "Larry" Harvey]. This was at the point where Leonard shed one of his two titles. Larry died a long time ago, but that's a big gap in terms of the academic history of academic studies at Dartmouth. Essentially, I think Mario was right to come out of it feeling that this, not that this was a foregone conclusion, but that this wasn't a terribly important document that we produced…

End Tape 4, Side B
Begin Tape 5, Side A

SMITH: The very, very important thing that did come out of the "Nantucket Conference," which was seriously discussed and which was seriously decided, was that, in spite of having the facilities and the personnel who could support such a development, that we would not, Dartmouth would not engage in graduate work in the arts; that it would not start MFA programs; that the extent to which, except in the experimental sciences and psychology, the decision had been made not to be a graduate institution, not have Ph.D. programs really should be reaffirmed in the case of the arts.

DONIN: That is significant.

SMITH: Yes. It is and it was a thought-through decision and it was, at least on paper, a unanimous decision. I say that only because the one deviation from that policy is the program that Jon Appleton brought in a few years ago. There is now an MA in electronic-generated sound I guess or something of that kind. But the arguments that could be made, and presumably were made to institute that program, could be made in other areas as well. That when you have a facility and a

faculty as good as they are, it has to be a conscious decision and should be a conscious decision not to engage in graduate work. I mean I expect that a case could be made for most, if not all, of the humanities and social science departments that they are better than a great many other places that do give Ph.D.s. But that's not what Dartmouth is about and this was felt very, very strongly by everybody there. Whether Jon Appleton, at the time, had sort of reservations about that, I don't know.

This program was certainly begun and it was certainly important and has expanded since. It is more sophisticated than it was. But at any rate, that was the outcome, the most important outcome. I don't think that…I can't remember, but there are papers available that give a formal statement about the outcome of the Nantucket Conference. We were there four or five days I guess, trying to hash things through in as many respects as we could.

I don't think that the future of the congregation, as such, was an item on the agenda; but I am sure that the implication was very strongly in place that the role of the Hopkins Center and the three arts departments was to be essentially devoted to those students who took part in the activities of those departments.

One of the ironies and I would imagine that Mario would have seen it as more than an irony – as a tragedy as it were – is that a very, very important factor, which as far as Leonard and John Dickey were concerned, was that there were virtually no Dartmouth students involved in that music program and that a great deal of money was being spent. Not only were they not there in the audience, they were not there in the orchestra. They never had anybody good enough to be in the orchestra in those days, or hardly any. They were not engaged and Mario's arrangement was such that he did very little teaching. I am not quite sure what he was capable of teaching actually.

This is one of the places which we can go into tomorrow about the role of the director of this, that or the other thing. I am not certain about this, but I think that it was understood that one of the two terms of… (There were only two terms at that point.) The fall term was always his leave term, as it were, his off term. The summer counted as a term totally for him and the spring term was, or the term from January until graduation, was largely given over to the details of the preparation for the congregation.

One of the things that…I don't know if it is fair to say were factored in, but they nevertheless were out there on the table, was that it was pretty clear, and this doesn't necessarily involve anything other than something to celebrate. But it was pretty clear that Mario's career as a conductor away from Dartmouth was almost non-existent and that, when he did conduct as a guest conductor, it tended to be in the countries from which the visiting composers had come. So it was not unreasonable to infer that there was kind of a quid pro quo and, had everything been wonderful, had he been as good a conductor as he was a promoter, especially of himself, then maybe we would have been delighted. You know, then something would have, it would have become a much, much harder decision to make.

But the fact that a very large amount of money, in terms of Dartmouth's whole budget, was going into an enterprise with virtually no direct effect, either on the rest of the faculty or on any of the students, that was finally the point at which it was decided that this was not the appropriate use of the college's resources.

But there was also… (And it was with this in mind and there are two or three other places also that I ask who gets to listen to these tapes?) I guess the very key moment in the history of the Congregation of the Arts came when I made my report to John Dickey and Leonard Rieser from the conversations I had had which culminated with the one with Bill Schuman. John sort of sat there with one of his droopy cigarettes and said, "Well, I think I have learned something important in this hour. Mario di Bonaventura needs Dartmouth more than Dartmouth needs Mario di Bonaventura." That was a perfectly reasonable conclusion to come to and, of course, impossible to put into a press release or to talk about. And Mario was left rather high and dry and terribly resentful and unwilling to accept that, at the very heart of this consideration was that there would be a redrawing of priorities within the arts and the use of money. I didn't finish my sentence, I realize, a few minutes ago about the irony and what Mario might think of as the tragedy of this. That was, within two years, there was a summer term and indeed every student, every student, has to be here at least once in the summer and that will tie into a part of what happened subsequently and what has developed in the time since I left, which basically has to do with the summer, the summer rep. So that was a moment of truth, Mr. Dickey's seeing this particular penny drop. And Mario sulked and I don't know if he did very much more than conduct the Dartmouth Symphony Orchestra. That was also what he was supposed to do, but there had to be an assistant conductor to take care of half of the academic year while he was away and in Europe and effectively on leave.

He had, which I think Leonard came to regret though it turned out not to be as bad as it might have been, but Mario had become a tenured professor, too. This had sort of been seen and argued for as appropriate to someone with this large a role to play in the life of the institution. I am sure that Jim Clancy [James H. Clancy]…I am almost sure that he had tenure at Stanford and so was given tenure here, so that there was, to the extent there was a comparison to be made between the theater and music, it was reasonable for Warner to press for Mario's having the same status.

Warner was devoted to Mario. Warner found Mario – I don't know where and how – and really thought that Mario could do no wrong. I don't think Warner and I were ever particularly close, nor were we ever subsequently at logger heads, but he was deeply unhappy about the decision to suspend the Congregation even when year-round operation had come in and there was so much more going on. The students were much more involved and the residency of the Concord String Quartet was a direct outcome of the suspension of the congregation. This was…A rather large chunk of money had to be used to pay for them to be four assistant professors here and, in effect added to…

But then so did the instrumental instruction program come. At the time that the Congregation was going on and very, very large sums of money were being spent on this particular program, there was no instruction for students in the playing of instruments. I mean it wasn't seen as appropriate or it wasn't…and another thing which I suppose the word is "sensitive" to say was that it was an atrocious music department at that time. I mean it was really, really seriously weak. Jon Appleton had arrived I guess around 1967, somewhere in there. He was a newcomer and he was seen as the beginnings of a new department. But Jon aside, there was no one there who I think one could say would have had an academic appointment in any other Ivy League institution. There wasn't much of a department before…

[Break in Interview]

DONIN: Good morning, Peter. This is Mary Donin. We are back on Thursday, February 27, 2003, for session two with Peter Smith, the former director of the Hopkins Center. So we can just pick up where we left off yesterday.

SMITH: I think something occurred to me that it is worth including on this tape…I think. I am sure. The one significant encounter that I had with

President Dickey in retirement. I mentioned yesterday running into each other around the time of the tenth anniversary.

But several years into John Kemeny's presidency, I think…I can't remember whether it came before or after the very remarkable faculty meeting at which the faculty voted a resolution asking for the administration to end the fraternity system on campus. I am not sure if it was before or after. It doesn't matter, perhaps. It probably was after because that debate sort of highlighted for us all I think the down side of the fraternity system.

One evening as I was leaving, my car was parked by Thompson Arena and it was well after the end of the workday. It was dark and, as I got to my car, I realized that there was something happening in another car in the parking lot…perhaps the only other car. What I took in – now I can't remember very much in the way of details – was that this was part of a fraternity pledge hazing situation. Then again, without being able to remember, maybe I sort of turned away. What I was absolutely certain about was that this was a ritual of humiliation, which I had heard about as part of many initiations in the fraternity house.

But this was out of doors and I had a sort of a visceral response to everything I had learned about fraternity hazing. It was a part of life that I found abhorrent. In this particular case, I sort of…The whole pathology of humiliating another human being and of allowing oneself to be humiliated in order to reach a certain goal hardly worth reaching really got under my skin.

I decided to go and talk to John Dickey about the fraternity situation and I have to say that I wish I had thought it through because it was very, very unfair to go to Mr. Dickey and, in effect, to say…this was before I got involved with the Dickey project, but who I knew I admired tremendously and in effect say, "Why do you let this carry on?" But that is basically what I did. "How could this be, John? This is what I saw. This is in a sense just a minor incident in a long history of this kind of activity." Almost as soon as I had put the question, I realized that I really didn't have a right to do this and it obviously brought back many upsetting thoughts to John and he…I don't remember precisely what he said but it was along the lines of …One thing I do remember precisely, but generally it was along the lines of, "This is a very complicated thing. You must know how virtually impossible it is to get alumni opinion behind you and, yes, I wish there had been something done, but I certainly didn't find a way to do it."

The thing that I remember specifically was he said, “You know maybe the one opportunity I had that I didn’t take, which was in the year that Jack Sawyer, the president of Williams, just summarily ended the fraternity system, and perhaps I should have followed that example, but I didn’t and there is really nothing much more that I can say about it.”

Just to skip ahead, I remember being in what was then the faculty house, the faculty club. The big, not very big frame house on the corner, over there just past the Webster cottage. Choate House. I remember being there at a point where I was sort of stuck in a narrow corridor and John Kemeny had by then retired. He was leaving and so was the person he had lunch with or was about to have lunch with. The three of us were sort of stuck there. I sort of arrived at this moment as the other person, whose identity I have forgotten, said, “John. You just about did everything, didn’t you, that you wanted to do in your presidency.” John said, “Yes. With one huge exception. We still have fraternities.” So it’s been…How could it not be?

Just to finish off this little section…When I was preparing to write the book about John Dickey’s presidency, I did a certain amount of interviewing of people outside the college. One of the people I interviewed was Jack Sawyer, who by then was the president of the Andrew Mellon Foundation. I guess I brought up this conversation with John Dickey about the opportunity that would have come, at the point where “I should have followed the Williams example.” Mr. Sawyer said, “I know what he went through because, you know, we…those in the pentangle group, the five colleges that met together…whose presidents met together on a regular basis and we alternated around the five campuses. More than once I remember coming out, leaving the president’s house at Dartmouth and, of course, as you know,” said, Mr. Sawyer, “the president’s house is on frat row. There are hardly any other buildings around there except for fraternities and you could see the pain in John’s face and the embarrassment on the occasions when he was saying ‘farewell’ to the other presidents while some ruckus was going on. I think it was agony for him.”

DONIN: Are you still talking about John Dickey or John Kemeny?

SMITH: John Dickey. John Dickey. So I don’t think I have any other recollections. What is difficult actually is setting aside – which I think is appropriate to do right now – other recollections besides the one with President Sawyer from the time when I was the Dickey historian, as it

were. I will put that aside because that, in effect, comes at the very end of the seventeen years that I was at Dartmouth.

DONIN: One thing that I just wanted to wrap up. I feel like we got interrupted last night in ending your story about the end of the Congregation of the Arts.

SMITH: Okay.

DONIN: What was the fallout when you ended it?

SMITH: The fallout was fairly severe. As I mentioned, effectively, Mr. Dickey wanted to be the president who took this tough decision, but since the initial decision was to suspend the 1970 Congregation and consider that summer as a planning period and so on, ultimately it had to be the Kemeny administration that announced that the Congregation of the Arts would not be revived in 1971 and subsequently.

There were, I guess, two elements in the protests that required a response. One was locally. I would be surprised if, in these oral history interviews, you don't come across the name "Emil Rueb". Emil Rueb owned the camera shop and was a very important and a quite remarkable influence within Hanover. A refugee and a highly cultivated man. He probably was one of the relatively few people in the vicinity who knew, in terms of the stature of, particularly of the foreign composers who had been brought in, he knew that this was a very high quality event. Very early on, he had gotten behind it and either through his own pocket or in some way that he organized among the other merchants in town, they put together something which made it possible for each visiting composer – certainly the foreigners but I am not sure that it applied to the Americans – to receive some memento of their time in Hanover. I don't know what it was, but I do know that Emil presented it. Emil was tremendously upset and did whatever he could think of to get, by then, John Kemeny to reverse the decision.

So that was painful and I recollect that Emil sort of brought into the argument the disappearance many years earlier of an eye institute that had been created here. Emil's point was, "In my years here, we have lost two world-class entities that ought never to have been allowed to vanish." Since Emil was very highly regarded by everyone and certainly by me and was devoted to the Hopkins Center as a whole…But that took some dealing with. In the end, there was nothing…Nobody was ready to reconsider this. As I tried to indicate yesterday, we did have the summer of 1970 for discussions, but the

time with Mr. Dickey and Leonard Rieser essentially closed it down. But John Kemeny had to deal with what happened when the final announcement was made.

The other part of the criticism was organized, without any question, by Mario and I have no comment. I mean, he had every right to do everything he could to get this changed. So there were letters from lots of people on John Kemeny's desk. People in the music world…One I remember very well indeed, was from a guy whose name I think is Bernard Jacobsen, who was the music critic of The Chicago Tribune and a much better known person in the music world than most newspaper writers. He was and still is – I occasionally find things that he has written – extremely articulate in his letters to John Kemeny. I think there was more than one, which I was delegated to respond to. I can't remember whether in my own name or drafting letters for John to send. He held on for a long time to the argument that this was indefensible and so on. But it happened.

As I say, Mario stayed on for a few more years, very disgruntled, indeed. As I was taking charge of the replacement for the congregation, he was highly critical and scornful and so on. It was a tricky time, difficult. He is not a nice man. This is where the difficulty comes.

There is something quite, quite searing about one particular incident in the aftermath of the decision on the congregation. I was the impresario. I was the person who decided what came in from outside in the music, theater and dance. I guess it is important…This is a relevant point to make that a couple of times in my years as director of the Hop, very early on and then some few years later…I don't remember how many, five, six years later when I was well established and had my title as director and so on, the question came up again which was, "Shouldn't there be an advisory committee? Shouldn't there be a program committee? Shouldn't there be consulting people who are interested in music?" That was something that I knew I absolutely did not want. I don't remember what arguments I gave to Leonard, but it was certainly through him that the issue was raised. But whatever it was, I prevailed. There was…I mean, I suppose my argument was a little bit like the one over my title. "You either trust me or you don't, and I am ready to be fired if I don't perform as you want me to perform in terms of my choice of programs; but I don't want to have to deal with a group of other people."

End Tape 5, Side A

Begin Tape 5, Side B

DONIN: Okay. You prevailed.

SMITH: Yes. I prevailed. I was never obliged to deal with a program committee. I think my recollections from listening to the oral history tapes, when I was preparing to write the Dickey book, leads me to use a minute or two here with a nice anecdote which, in a sense, is very importantly relevant.

The story is told that when, after Clark Kerr had been fired and whereas the chancellor at Berkeley had been fired at the same time in their troubles of the '60s, the person who came in to be the chancellor of the Berkeley campus was a man called Roger Hynes who had been the president of the University of Michigan and one of the conditions that the regents laid down was that it would help make things somewhat different if they insisted that the chancellor live in the chancellor's house on the campus, which apparently was a practice that had fallen out of fashion.

So the story is that Hynes acquiesced on this and eventually there was a party being held for the opening – the re-opening – of the chancellor's house which had been refurbished and redecorated and all of those things and somebody had said to Roger Hynes, "It is very odd. All of the curtains, all of the drapes are beige. That's not you." "Well," he said, "the decisions about decorating were made by a committee and the only color that the committee could unanimously agree upon was beige." [Laughter] That is an important story because beige is what program committees will produce and I wanted brighter colors.

At any rate, within a year or two of the end of the congregation, I was by then in my third or fourth year as impresario and one of the events that I scheduled was a recital given by the French composer Olivier Messiaen, who was indeed…I would think anybody would now say a more significant composer than any – even Kodaly – of the people that Mario brought.

So I perhaps was tweeking it. I didn't do that with that in mind. I just had come to know something about Messiaen's music and to think very, very highly of it and he is a very famous person and he was a very important person. So through his agent, I arranged this evening where he would appear. His wife was the principal exponent of his piano music and the evening consisted of the first half where she,

Yvonne Loriot, performed solo works and then the second half was a piano duo piece that was one of his masterpieces.

I remember we used to have weekly meetings of the Hopkins Center staff which meant that the people who were purely administrators, people who reported to me on finance and publicity and that kind of thing, plus the three directors – the director of music, theater and studio art …

So I was laying out what was lying ahead of us in terms of events and I remarked on the visit by Olivier Messiaen and Mario said very, very scornfully, "Well, do you think you will get an audience for that?" or something along these lines. "Do you think any student will come, because I gather – this kind of talk – I gather students are all-important here?" So I said, "How many do you think will come?" He said, "X, let's say fifty." I don't remember what it was at the most. I said, "Mario, I'll bet you…I will give you a dollar for every student present under fifty if you will give me a dollar for every student present over fifty." He said, "Of course. Done."

I don't again remember what the figures were, but there were many, many more students than this minimum number that he had thrown out, maximum number that he had thrown out. Many, many more. I think he ended up owing me in fact seventy-five dollars or something like that and the jerk did not come through. He gave me, as my…To settle the bet, he gave me a bottle of California brandy, which had been opened. I mean it was…I suppose his pride was very, very hurt and, of course, there was never, at any point…Not from me and I am sure not from Leonard to whom he undoubtedly went separately and probably to tell John Kemeny, too.

I don't think there was ever a word which sort of dealt with the second principle issue. I mean the first one was that a very, very, very large sum of money was being spent annually for a wonderful piece of p.r. – a wonderful piece of window-dressing as it were – that benefited Dartmouth students not at all. So that was at the heart of it, but I think they were also convinced, as I certainly was, that even with this program, the music being produced under Mario's direction was very far from a high standard. As far as I know, Mario hasn't done any conducting since he left Dartmouth. I have certainly never seen his name in any paper. Eventually, he got a job as director of publications for Schirmer, one of the music publication firms, and left and I haven't seen him since.

The question as to whether there should be a selection committee I guess is a place to try to say something about the role of the director of the Hopkins Center, which is an issue really at the heart of my time here and, in a sense, the time of my successors. It took me a little while to realize the truth of the situation in this respect: there is no equivalent of the Hopkins Center at any of the other Ivy League universities and there is, in fact, no real equivalent anywhere I think. I guess the closest that I know of is the Krannert Center at the University of Illinois in Champlain at their main campus, which has it's own director.

But it gradually occurred to me that this element of uniqueness had a downside in that, for the members of the faculty, especially in the performing arts departments – the theater and music, drama and music – they had to deal with an extra layer of administration – a fifth wheel – whereas in most institutions…every institution of any significance and I guess this is still true. It was very importantly true in the '60s, '70s and '80s, which was the point where universities and colleges emerged as one of the principle purveyors, suppliers of cultural activity. There always was a concert series here. There probably was in most institutions.

Warner Bentley ran the concert series here before the Hopkins Center opened and I think it consisted of five concerts a year. I am pretty sure that he didn't consult the music department. He had contempt for the music department, quite properly, as I understand it. There were one or two stars who came into the music department and went on to other music departments. The residue was always very sub-par. So through the '30s and '40s and '50s, there was a concert series held in Webster Hall and it was very high quality in that people liked Casals and Rachmaninoff and Leontyne Price. I mean major, major figures on their annual tours were booked by Warner and these were important events.

But somehow there was a revolution which deserves a book on it's own in American higher education and in American culture, which came sort of gradually into place after the Second World War and was beginning to be seriously effective, as it were, in the early '60s, which was that to a degree that has absolutely not been the case before the war or anytime previous to that, the universities took on the function of conservatories and ateliers and academies of dramatic art. There are some, of course, that still survive. Especially in music, there are half a dozen very, very, very important conservatories whose function has remained constant. Of course Juilliard is at the top of that list and then

there are all the others, the ten that anyone can name. But, in terms of theater, in terms of dance, in terms of studio art, there was a gradual diminution of the number of high quality academies producing people for the professional fields in the performing arts.

At the same time…and presumably the two things that linked in cause and effect, but not in a direct cause and effect, gradually it became the role of the universities to take that on. I am sure that any graph that could be produced in terms of the number of universities offering MFA degrees and the number of people receiving MFA degrees will have gone up like that from a relatively low starting point. I mean, I don't know if it was literally the case, but it was probably the case that the only place you would go for university training in the practice of any of the arts before the Second World War was the Yale Drama School, which was famous and deservedly so, but pretty well unique. Gradually the involvement of universities and colleges in the performance and practice of the arts grew to the point where it is today, where relatively few people who are now successful – the younger people who are successful as creative artists – have not been through a university training, MFAs. It is slightly less true in the acting profession, somewhat less true in movies; but, in general, it has been a major trend.

Here that didn't, as I mentioned yesterday, that did not become a part of Dartmouth's mission. Alongside this development with formal programs in the practice of the arts, there was the university as cultural presenter. The Hopkins Center was, and as far as I know still is especially in terms of the facility itself, exceedingly important as an instance of a private university's commitment to the culture of it's region.

But, at most universities and colleges who offer programs, there is somebody whose title will be one variant or other of concert manager, importer of cultural events, something like that. In some places, an increasing large number of places have a special facility in which to present this. But the idea of there being a senior administrator whose only job is both to be responsible for the operation of a major facility and to create the program that will go on in that major facility, that's very rare and certainly I feel slightly embarrassed that I can't say this categorically, but I am almost sure that, at the point where the Hop was built and the point where I came in 1969, the Hop was, if not literally unique, was still an anomaly.

The fact that there was a director…Now I am suddenly realizing that I should have long ago tried to trace back the origins of the decision to create a director because that developed, as is well known, that is part of the folklore here. Mr. Hopkins promised Warner Bentley a theater at the point where Warner was hired, which I think was in 1928. It became almost a joke that every time Dartmouth was about actually to build this theater for this stage director and little dynamo, some catastrophe intervened. So the Depression, the Second World War, the Korean War were all due to the fact that Dartmouth was girding it's loins to build a theater. As Warner, himself, said many, many, many, many times, "It was worth the wait. What I got was something far more extensive than what I had expected."

But that was a development. That was a metamorphosis because, without any question, when it was first thought about, it was intended to be "the theater." I don't know if I ever asked how Warner came to be the concert manager, but that was very subsidiary. He was still directing the Dartmouth Players with Henry Williams. That was his full-time life until the arrival of the Hopkins Center. I don't know and I would like to know and maybe at some point I will find out or someone else will find out at what point the conception of the need for, the desirability of, having someone running this center who would be, in terms of the life of the institution, a genuine counterpart to the chief librarian. This person would be a major figure in the administration and that was borne out by the fact that John Stewart was heir apparent. The extent to which this is the existence of the direction for the Hopkins Center and, initially and all the time that I was director, one was also technically in charge of the exhibition program, too, before the Hood arrived. So there was this person who, on the whole, didn't exist anywhere else and the faculty had to deal with this person.

One of the points that I would make which sort of goes beyond in chronological terms the scope of what we are dealing with here because it is still a factor and I will be prepared to bet that, at the point where…Maybe I won't bet because this is a very pessimistic thing to say, but it would strike me as very odd if it didn't happen. At the point where Lewis [Crickard] steps down and the new director has to be appointed, there could very well be, as there certainly has been in the past, a concern expressed to the administration as to what exactly the director of the Hop does. In effect an underlying question, "Why do we need one?" My observation is that, at each point where the directorship is changed, the size of the job – the expectations on the director – have been diminished. That it's…I may in fact be…That is my perception. What of course one cannot know is, because I am sure

there is nothing down on paper… And it inevitably will tie in with the personality of whoever is the director.

My perception is that, in ways difficult to describe, the change from one director to another after my departure has constricted the role of the director to a certain extent. The scope of the activity that is the director's own responsibility as I saw it, that has diminished I think. It probably doesn't make a lot of sense to say much more than that because, as I say, we are now going beyond the Kemeny and the McLaughlin eras which is the basic scope here.

But I think it is something worth having on the record as my perception that there was a built-in tension between the creation of the job of director and the functioning of the arts department. One has to bear in mind that, at the point where the Hop was conceived, the only department as such which existed was the music department and was in a rather weak state. It didn't have many FTE and among the FTE that it had was the director of the band and the director of the glee club, who were both very good at what they did, but were not people who would be hired to a music department if those two things didn't exist.

The other manifestation of the importance of the position of director came in the budget, which again I suspect was unique around the country. In a general way, the division of, the way in which the budget was made up was perhaps more symbolic than real in this sense. An attempt was made when the budget of the Hopkins Center was first created. Certainly I inherited it. An attempt was made to separate in financial terms, to divide up in financial terms the activities of those members of the performing arts departments who were also involved in production. That is to say the drama department budget did not include the considerable expenses that went into mounting the various plays that the Dartmouth Players put on nor the expenses associated with the activities of the glee club, the band and the Handel Society. The direct expenses of putting on those activities were on the Hop's budget and fractions of various people's salary were on the Hop's budget.

In an attempt to I guess rationalize the expenditures being made on the arts, made on behalf of the arts by the college… To rationalize the actual division between curricular and extra-curricular because, when the Hop began, even when the department of drama came into existence, the performance was not credit-bearing. It was extra-curricular and, as far as I know, still is, mainly. There was a change in

that when the Dartmouth summer rep came into existence and it has now gone out of existence. It was the one time in the year when you could get credit for acting. That was something that I enthusiastically backed.

What this did was – at least on paper – give the director of the Hopkins Center a role in the personnel of the department. One of the things which were very important for me personally and I honestly believe were very important for Leonard, whether he was dean or provost or both and also for a succession of associate deans for humanities – there was no division between arts and humanities, so the humanities dean was responsible for the academic departments of drama and music, and ultimately when it was separated off from art history, studio art. The question of the extent to which that actually, that gave actual power to the director of the Hop is something that waxed and waned. That was from time to time a subject of debate as much as anything I guess, depending on whether I walked with tremendous care or whether I walked somewhat carelessly into this area.

To an extent which I am sure nobody in those departments knew, I was de facto the associate dean for the arts, spending a lot of time with the various humanities associate deans…Bill Scott [William C. Scott], Henry Terrie [Henry L. Terrie, Jr.] and various others who had had that role and with Leonard Rieser and with his budget officer. I sat in on the discussions about the budgets of those three departments, about salary increases for the members of those three departments and my input was listened to with regard to my sense of the effectiveness of these people who, initially, the people whose salaries were to some extent carried on the Hop budget. Eventually, I think I was trusted as having input worth considering on the other members, the musicologists and the one or two people in theater who were neither designers nor directors.

There is no question but that that developing role for me made a very big difference in when the moment came for me to be an applicant for the deanship at Columbia. I mean I could honestly say that *sub rosa*, I had been involved in the building and the sustenance of these departments and I certainly saw myself as an advocate within the administration at the university for the arts as a whole.

DONIN: How did the chairs of these departments deal with that?

SMITH: Well, it depended who they were. Of course, in an important respect, none of them knew the extent to which I was consulted by…At least as

far as I know. That certainly never came to the surface. I mean literally there never was a moment at which the chair of music said, "Do I understand that you sit in on budget meetings and so on.…" So as far as I know, that was never there.

Where the tension arose, I guess, was where there was a legitimate and expected piece of input from the director of the Hop, from me in the decisions of the department with regard to their own affairs. The number of times the wind ensemble would perform, the timing of the Dartmouth Players' season, the negotiation with the drama department as to how close to the opening of a Dartmouth Players' production there could be an important event in the main theater. I like to think that there were few, if any, times when push came to shove and I think…One of the things that I take some pride in is that I recognized the limits of the director's power and made an effort not to overrate it, not to overstep the mark, not to be involved either behind the scenes or overtly in decision-making which the departments could reasonably consider their own.

DONIN: Because a continuing theme, of course, throughout this is the sort of tension between faculty and administration.

SMITH: Faculty and administration. Absolutely. I think it is fair to say that I never achieved what I would have regarded as the ideal state where every member of those three departments saw me as an advocate for their activities, which indeed I considered myself to be and which I think in a considerable extent, I was. I mean the fundraising side of being director of the Hop in many, many instances did not flow into that part of the Hop's program over which the director had complete control. That is the presentation of imported events. As much as anything, I was trying to help the fund-raisers to raise money for endowed chairs in the arts, for support of the Dartmouth Players' productions, for endowments that reduced the cost to the college of the activities of the Glee Club. Actually, that's an instance that I don't think actually happened, but that's the kind of effort which I saw myself as being expected to make. There wasn't a fundraiser in each department. I am going to take a little break.

End Tape 5, Side B
Begin Tape 6, Side A

SMITH: I guess I feel odd about never having followed up what should have been curiosity on the subject of how the role of the director was seen at

the point when the Hopkins Center was being planned and in the years that were leading up to Warner's…

DONIN: You know, we have Warner's oral history.

SMITH: Good. Good.

DONIN: It is publicly available, so you might want to read it.

SMITH: Okay. Okay. Yes. That's important. Actually, I think John Stewart may not any longer be alive. It would be interesting to have his take on this. The point was and essentially still is that the directorship of the Hopkins Center is an anomaly in term of higher education. He does not have, she does not have an equivalent anywhere else in the Ivy League. The desirability or indeed the need for that position to exist I think has been questioned from time to time.

I think that my efforts not to sort of wield the power that on paper I had, kept the boat steady almost all of the time. Other people might see that differently; but there is certainly no important eruption nor, as far as I know, was there one during the tenure of my successor, Shelton Stanfill. But the person who succeeded him and I am embarrassed to realize, because I tried to think of this just now, I can't remember her name.[·] It was the one woman who has been director of the Hopkins Center and whose tenure as director was very short. I think… And I was not at all involved. In fact, I think I may already have left for Columbia, but that is unimportant, that detail is. I was not much involved; but, to the extent that I did know what the problems were, it struck me that she had not taken in that this was power on paper rather than actual and had literally used the fact that on paper the various members of these two performing arts departments sort of reported to her and were funded by her…My impression is that she acted as though that was reality rather than symbolism and got into very serious difficulties, especially in terms of programming in the Center Theater, now the Moore Theater. That's a digression. That's many years down the road from here.

This is a rather personal thing to say, but entirely relevant. I don't remember precisely when, probably in my fourth or fifth year with the help and great invaluable counsel of the man who was at that time director of the university medical service. At that time, one was still welcome to go and see Sid Jackson [Raymond Sidney Jackson] at Dick's House. If anything was seriously wrong, obviously you went

[·] Lynn Britt

then to see someone in the Hitchcock Clinic, but I am sure I wasn't the only one who, in terms of not feeling so good, went to consult Sid Jackson.

However I defined my problem led to my going to see him two or three times in fairly quick succession. Eventually he said, "You know I think you have to face the fact that I am the wrong kind of doctor and I will be glad to act and to make inquiries and see who, given who you are and what your job is, who would be the appropriate member of the psychiatry department for you to consult." It was a very…I suppose it is possible for me to exaggerate the importance of this, but it was tremendously important because once that thought had been put into my head, I recognized – or thought I recognized – what I was going through as being the early stages of what we used to call all the time, very commonly, a nervous breakdown. My sister, who is much older than me, still refers to anything to do with mental health as "nerves." [Laughter]

Of course, as I imagine anybody who has become involved in psychotherapy at any important level comes to see very quickly that what one thinks is at the heart of one's problem isn't necessarily the thing that is there. My first session with the man with whom I then worked for many years until he left the medical school, a very remarkable refugee from Poland. My take…The way I started this was that really my anxiety, this very high level of anxiety comes from the fact that I think there is a real possibility that I am going to be fired. That thought was in my mind. That fact was in my mind because of the most recent instance of the question being raised again, "What is the role? Why do we need this person around?"

I would be virtually certain that there were two people who were principally on my mind as my – to overstate it – my persecutors, the people who were out to get me, the people who wanted me gone, the people who were undoubtedly talking to Leonard Rieser in such terms.

One of the…I am certain one would be amazed to hear what I am saying and to refer to him as Errol Hill. Errol is and always was a literalist and someone who did everything by the book, as it were. So he, probably more than anyone else could never quite see why there had to be a director of the Hopkins Center who did anything other than look after imported events, be the concert manager. So, from time to time, there were issues where we definitely didn't see eye to eye. I think it may have been at that time that there was I think the only formal effort made by Leonard under pressure to create a solid

statement, a written statement, about the role and responsibilities of the director of the Hopkins Center. I can't remember whether that ever came out eventually or whether everything blew over, whether my going into psychotherapy – which of course none of these people knew anything about – helped calm me down and so on. Leonard knew.

At any rate, I mention this because it was an important part of my life that undoubtedly, in terms of the trigger, came from the tension. The other person who – I was about to say might not be surprised to know – that seems a rather odd thing to say – was Jon Appleton, who you can't interview because he is still on the faculty. I think the moment that… Jon is a very, very complicated person.

I think the moment that really brought a great moment of alarm, "Where the hell am I? What am I here for? What is this?," came in the aftermath of the cancellation of the Congregation of the Arts. It was a meeting that I had with, I guess it was at the staff meeting. It may have been either at the staff meeting or more likely at a meeting with the members of the music department. Mario was still in place as director of music, but the Congregation had disappeared and Jon was probably the chairman of the department at that time. Before the meeting, Jon and I had had a long stroll around campus, going over the matters that were on my mind with regard to relations between the Hop and the department. I thought we ended up in agreement about what was reasonable, whatever the issue was, what the outcome ought to be.

So I went into this meeting. Among the things being dealt with I guess was what the music program for the coming summer was going to be, which was now my responsibility, not Mario's. I don't remember actually whether the idea was that Mario would have some input, but he certainly didn't and very probably didn't want to. At any rate, in the course of that session, a particular issue came up and Mario was, and I don't remember what the issue was, but Mario was particularly stinging in his comment. I returned in kind. Jon said, "How dare you speak to Professor di Bonaventura like that." All of a sudden, the floor under me disappeared. This anecdote is, in a sense, of no great significance except that, quite apart from whatever underlying issues were there for me in terms of my mental health, the spillover of the built-in tension between the academic departments and the director of the Hop came right to the surface and I have, in an almost literal way, had very, very little to do with the Hopkins Center since I stepped down from the directorship.

It was very important to me as it had been for John Dickey that, while I was still around Dartmouth and Shelton was in charge, we grew cordial; but I never intruded and I was never asked, except on very rare occasions for anything. I had a very minor role when Shelton went to work at Wolf Trap and there was a need for a new director. I guess I had arrived at Columbia by then because I was asked by the then provost, John Strohbehn, if I would see what I could find out from my friends in the theater business, particularly anything about the woman who was emerging as the leading candidate and I found out the stuff that was, on the whole, very positive about her. So that I reported back. She, as I say, did not last very long and ran into very, very serious problems, both with the departments and I think with the administration.

At that point…This is just for the record, but I think it is relevant in terms of my relationship to the institution. At that point, I played a very major part because the search committee that was appointed to find a successor to Lynn [Britt] – the name is gone – the woman whose appointment was being terminated to end this altercation. I think she threatened suits and that kind of thing. By then, although I was no longer in the Upper Valley, John Strohbehn and I had had enough conversations and doubtlessly he talked with Leonard. At any rate, he clearly came to the point where he thought he could trust me and that my input would be valuable.

Nobody, as far as I know other than John Strohbehn and I, know this. That search committee was headed towards the appointment of a person relatively senior in the whole concert management business with a track record. I think it had been…He obviously had not been offered the job, but I think he had been informed that he was the leading candidate and now it was a question of wrapping up things. At the point where John had sort of intuitive misgivings about this man's style and how it would play out in this small and rather close-knit community, he asked me if I would really, this time, put my ear to the ground – very discretely, but very seriously – to see whether there was anything to back up John's sense of this. I discovered that indeed this person was incredibly difficult to work for and so on and reported this back. And the search stopped. I don't think that John would ever explain to the search committee what had led to his…though he may have talked about it in a general kind of sense, that he had done his own soundings and had come up with this particular piece of information. I would assume that the search committee understood that and saw the point of this kind of personality in this particular setting. So the search was resumed and somewhere quite well along

in that second resumption, it occurred to everybody that the chair of the search committee, Lewis Crickard, would be the person who should be appointed, so it ended with a happy ending.

DONIN: How much did you participate in finding your own successor?

SMITH: That was on your list. Yes. That's easy. I met with the search committee at the point where they had narrowed the field to a few and I think it was arranged that of course I would meet the finalists, because they would want to meet me and have our conversations and that did take place. I can't for the life of me remember who they were besides Shelton. But I did meet with the search committee and I did…I was given their curriculum vitae and I did have the opportunity and took the opportunity to give my impressions of what was there on paper. I certainly thought that, of the people that they were considering…I assume actually that I was free to or may have even been encouraged to encourage people to apply. But I was given the opportunity and took the opportunity and, on the basis of what I took in from the printed matter, the resumes, certainly felt that Shelton was the strongest, that his experience up to that point…Because he was the concert manager and the impresario in one of the elements of the state- supported university system in Colorado, various places with slightly different names. That was where they went anyway. I would say, I mean, in a sense, since I had the input that was appropriate…I certainly was in no way, to no extent upset about the process or about the outcome. Further down the road, I did have serious misgivings, but that's relatively, that is not relevant to this.

There is one other particular moment that arose from the relationship between, specifically the music department and the director of the Hopkins Center which, had I been asked to speak at Leonard's memorial service, would have been included in my remarks, which is a lovely story. The phone rang and it was Leonard at the other end. He said, "I am calling to congratulate you. You have done something that I have been trying to do for years without any success. You have united the music department. They all want you fired!" [Laughter] He said, "I never thought I would live to see a piece of paper signed by both Jim Sykes [James A. Sykes '53A] and Mario di Bonaventura, but it is sitting here right in front of me." [Laughter] The trigger for that…The specific was actually a genuine misunderstanding so that it certainly never came to the point where Leonard was thinking of acting on their advice, quite apart from his view of most of the matters of that department at that time. This had happened in, I guess, the third summer after the demise of the Congregation. By then a new person had come in to run

the summer program, who should certainly be on your list of people to interview and you may already have interviewed him, is Gregory Prince [Gregory "Greg" Prince, Jr. '63A]. Greg had come here from Yale. Spike Chamberlin [Waldo "Spike" Chamberlin '27A] had, which is not Eddie Chamberlain [Edward T. "Eddie" Chamberlain Jr. '36], it is another Chamberlin. He must be dead now a long time. He had been running the summer school, such as it was.

Of course, it went out of existence at the point where year-around operation came; but there had always been a summer school and it suddenly occurs to me that possibly – very likely, I suppose – the conservatory students who came here to form that orchestra may have also gotten academic credit that they transferred back to their conservatories, in a few cases, I suppose, universities. They certainly put in a lot of work and there may have been something on the record – music, such and such a number – that they may have finished.

At any rate, Greg came in and this was probably his first summer in charge of the summer school program. The misunderstanding came from the discussions that he and I had about what the Hopkins Center's contribution to the summer school would be in this thing. Maybe that was the summer in which there was the first experiment about giving credit for people acting. Maybe that was…At the theater end, there was the beginning of what became the summer rep. At the other end, I proposed to Greg that there should be a course that up to that point didn't exist. Some number was given to it – music something or other – a course which was essentially tied in with the summer program that I was putting together which was, for all intents and purposes, pretty well exclusively devoted to the music of Schubert. I mean I had as many contacts by then in the world of the academic studies of these subjects, as anybody in the music department did. So I did my consultations and I put together a program that actually was world-class and created through four instructors a credit course of whatever…I can't remember how that is designated, but a full course that would last through the eight or ten weeks of the summer school and taught in succession by, with one exception, imported professors.

I certainly didn't talk to the music department. It was a mistake and this is certainly one place where I deserved to be reprimanded because sheer courtesy ought to have involved me with them, but maybe it was just one of the low points of the relationships between them. In any case, I was very enthusiastic about this and one of the things that had been characteristic of me throughout my life is, if there is something I really want to do and I think there is any danger that if I

ask if I can do it, I will get the answer “no”, then I don’t ask. So that was probably in play, too.

This was an astonishing event actually and, had it been spread around, there probably would have been graduate students in musicology coming just for this course. There were three professors who came here. One was Joseph Kerman, who was then the head of the department at UC Berkeley. One was Edward Cone, who was a senior professor of musicology at Princeton and the third was a professor at Harvard called Earl Kim. The fourth instructor in this course was a member of the music department who had just arrived (and I am sure that I was thought of as having taken advantage of the fact that Gabriel Chodos had only just arrived).

We divided up Shakespeare’s – that’s an easy slip for me – Schubert’s works in terms of the music that would be presented in the summer, so that the orchestral music did not come into consideration. There was no orchestra. I think I ‘ve got this right. Joseph Kerman taught the section that dealt with the string quartets. Gabriel certainly taught the section that was concerned with the piano sonatas and he played probably two, if not three, concerts that summer and there were Schubert’s sonatas in them. Ed Cone had taught the section on the chamber music other than the quartets and Earl Kim taught the section on lieder. There were two or three lieder concerts in the course of that. They had a very small turnout…very, very few people enrolled because there was no publicity given to it. The series either started or finished…I can’t remember now.

There was one other treat which was that one of the recitalists coming with the lieder programs was a Dutch soprano called Ellie Ameling who was, at that point, I would think universally seen as the leading lieder singer, female lieder, those things. She came to the Hop many times after that. She was a real favorite and she gave a kind of lecture demo of some sort. She was not a lecturer, but her English was very good and she talked about what it was to produce lieder.

The other thing was…I think it must have been an introductory lecture as to why Schubert has his place in the pantheon. That was given by the man who was at that time the music critic for New York magazine, a guy called Alan Rich, who subsequently I think got a job with, as a sort of critic in residence for the LA Philharmonic, I think. But at any rate, he left that role there. I had been reading him for a long time and regarded him very highly. He was splendid in terms of the public address on this topic.

So that season came and went. When it was all over, the music department expressed it's outrage to the provost. For good measure, they sent a copy of their petition to Joe Kerman and Earl Kim and Ed Cone and Alan Rich. The outcome of that was splendid because…I can't remember in any kind of detail. I assume I got phone calls from Joe and Earl and Ed, but Alan Rich made it the topic of his column in New York magazine in terms of the fustiness, the conservatives and the pedantry of departments of music in our universities who seem to care about everything except making music and enjoying music. That, of course, was a very high point in my sense of who I was and what I was doing at this place.

It is not inappropriate I think to tell a small piece about this character, Jim Sykes. It may well be… I would hope it is in Warner's contribution to this oral history. Warner, too…Telling this story indicates that the presence of someone outside of the departments, whose chief concern was the presentation of the arts, though Warner, of course, had a role that I had no equivalent to in terms of putting on theater specifically. But at any rate, clearly the membership of the music department was of interest, to say the least, to Warner in his years as the culture man on campus. He got wind of the fact that they were thinking of appointing this guy called Jim Sykes, who at that point was teaching, I think, at Colgate. So he did his own little phoning around. He had his counterparts around the place and the report he got back from Colgate was that this was a disastrous appointment that Dartmouth was about to make and he went to the then dean – I don't remember who that was – and shared this information and told me that he was almost literally kicked out, that he was told that this was none of his business, that their take of Professor Sykes…This, of course, was long before affirmative action. This was when you put your ear to the ground and you consulted the people you wanted to consult. Jim came and Jim was a sad, sad, sad figure. A sweet, well, not so sweet, but an engaging character who had almost nothing to offer and of course was given tenure. A moment I recall much later…

End Tape 6, Side A
Begin Tape 6, Side B

DONIN: So Jim Sykes was given tenure.

SMITH: He was given tenure. He came with tenure. A moment I recall was when a new member of the music department here, who very quickly got fed up with the situation here and went to Brandeis and is, I think,

among the world's leading scholars of Verdi. This was his first job. He came from UC Berkeley, a chap called David Rosen [David B. Rosen]. I remember once we were sipping cups of coffee together in the snack bar at the Hop.

The phenomenon of the Hop and it's drawing power besides the facilities – like the snack bar, like the post office – I don't think can be overstated. That's just a digression because, as I remember, we had…David and I had this conversation. David was a real firebrand. He was left wing in everything and of course the matter of academic freedom of speech was high on his agenda. This was not long after the Berkeley uprisings and all that kind of thing. I remember his saying, "I never thought, I never thought that I would, for a moment, doubt the importance of the concept of tenure; but, now that I have met Jim Sykes, I have to think again." Jim sort of had three functions. He taught courses in musicology and music history. He directed the Handel Society, which is I think technically the oldest choral society in the country or maybe attached to an academic institution, and he gave piano recitals and he was abysmal at playing the piano, but tremendously enthusiastic.

One of the issues that I came up against very early on, which is worth a little reflection on with regard to the role of the Hopkins Center and the community, was the matter of who could perform at the Hopkins Center. A very thorny topic. I eventually with Leonard and probably with consultation with the music department came to a very, very firm policy which it was as well to have and although I have always been someone who hates policies and rules and regulations that are never allowed to have an exception, for me, that was a tremendous protection.

At any rate…But, Jim was in a shadowy category because he was, after all, a member of the faculty and, at the point where the introduction of credit for students to study instruments came along, one of the first appointments was of Gabriel Chodos, who would be the piano instructor. He was also qualified to teach various elements within theory and history within the department. He was a well-rounded person, but he was also a pianist of some significance. Of course, it was understood that Gabriel would give recitals. That made it much harder to deal with Jim's desire to give recitals from time to time. So, from time to time, he did. They were hard on everybody, but he had his claque. They were strange, strange events.

I mean whatever else could be said about Mario di Bonaventura except with regard to his own abilities, he was a serious professional musician and he must have, almost as soon as he arrived here – at which point I imagine Jim Sykes was chairman of the department – he must have realized what a waste this was. That accounts for Leonard's remark about never expecting to see both signatures on the same piece of paper. And Jim went his merry way and had a wonderful, rather crazy, wife. The two of them were important fixtures around here; but it was a waste of a place and perhaps was reflective of the way in which the arts, which at that point consisted only of the department of music, with Paul Sample [Sample, Paul S. '20] as artist in residence and the activities of the Dartmouth Players. But in terms of what was in the curriculum, music was the only place and presumably it did not have a very high priority. It certainly was a very small department. But at any rate, Jim was, I guess to a certain extent, marginalized as the years went by and eventually retired.

One thing that occurs to me that probably was "public knowledge"…At the point where Leonard decided to give the building-up of a first-rate music department the highest priority in his then academic plan, came a number of years into my arrival as director. It was manifested at the point where, having done his soundings and inquiries – I don't think I participated in that process – he had come to hope that a man called Charles Hamm [Charles E. Hamm], who was – I am almost certain, yeah I am certain – at the University of Illinois at Champlain, that he would be the ideal person to appoint. The year while the search was going on included a meeting of the American Musicological Society in Washington, DC, as I recall at which Charles Hamm would be installed as that year's president. So this was an appointment of significance. Henry Terrie, who was at that point the associate dean for humanities, and I both went down to Washington. That must have been…That can't have been *sub rosa*. So whether or not that put anyone else's nose out of joint, it was a demonstration, it was a manifestation of Leonard's sense of my role. Of course, the important thing about it was that it established with Charles the role and, as far as I know, he accepted that in a way that others in the department had not or had difficulty with. Indeed, he was appointed and it was a superb appointment. To digress a moment and I need to zip downstairs, but I will remember where I was.

[Interruption in Interview]

DONIN: And you went to the convention.

SMITH: I went to the convention. Henry and I spent a lot of time with Charles. We were both tremendously impressed and came back very sure that he should be given the job and eventually he was. I don't know what…he obviously had to meet the members of the music department and that must have happened.

That appointment ended in a very disappointing way. Though I had involvement at the level that I have been suggesting and though I had a very good relationship with Charles, I was eventually, and possibly this happened after my time as director…But at some point, Charles believed, felt very, very strongly that he had been very, very badly let down by Leonard; that he had come expecting much more in terms of the building up of the music department than he was eventually – or I think relatively sooner – aware was not going to be. That whether it was promised or whatever it was, was not going to be delivered upon and did what he obviously thought was best, which was to step down from the chair at the end of the period that had been designated for his tenure as chair and to have relatively little to do with the workings of the music department from then on.

It is a detail in the history of the arts at Dartmouth, but an important one. The status of the departments…the history of their waxing and waning is a story in itself and the circumstances to do with Charles Hamm and the loss of momentum in trying to create in an undergraduate institution a world-class department are part of that history.

I have to say very frankly that I could not name at the moment any member of the current music department except for Melinda O'Neal [Melinda P. O'Neal] and, of course, Jon Appleton, who must be very close to retirement, but there is no retirement age so he may still be a member when he is ninety, and the director of the glee club, Louis Burkot [Louis G. Burkot]. That's worth mentioning actually, the bringing into play of the names of Melinda O'Neal and Gabriel, because Gabriel…not Gabriel. I beg your pardon. Louis Burkot.

Louis was appointed primarily to succeed Paul Zeller [Paul R. Zeller] as the director of the glee club. This was a place where I think everybody agreed that the director of the Hopkins Center had an important part, had a legitimate role. I think it is fair to say that I played the leading role in the search that led to Louis Burkot's appointment because, like Paul Zeller, his principal role here would be directing the glee club. He would teach somewhat, but not a great deal.

By then an important development had been that, in addition to instruction in instrumental music, there was also credit given for studying vocal music and Louis played a significant role in that development. With the retirement of Jim Sykes, there was the need to find a successor for the Handel Society, which I think has always been significantly a community choir, though there are university people in it, whereas the glee club is exclusively students. The Handel Society is almost exclusively community; but, since Jim's activities with the Handel Society had been limited I think to two concerts a year…I think on the general terms of The Messiah annually and one other program. There would be a significant amount of teaching expected from whoever took over the Handel Society.

My role, as I recall it in Melinda's appointment, was not as central as it had been in Louis Burkot's. It was very important that someone be appointed who would add strength to the teaching obligations of the department. Interestingly though, I think that the sort of dynamics that by then was in place led to an understanding on Melinda's part that I was very much in the picture in terms of the activities of the Handel Society, at least what it's functions would be. At a point soon after she got here…She was a very, very competent choral conductor indeed. She, I guess would have come to me – I think this is true – to say that she would like to form a group of the very best singers who would be known as the Dartmouth Chamber Singers. It wouldn't add anything in the way of expense, but it would add to the offerings that the Hop produced, as it were.

That was, on the whole, a very good relationship. It came under a degree of stress at a point just before I gave up the directorship emanating from a very, very bitter quarrel between her and the conductor of the Dartmouth Symphony Orchestra, a man called Efrain Guigui, who was eventually the successor to Mario di Bonaventura.

There was quite a little search when Mario left. The person who was his assistant director, assistant conductor I think had already left and gotten himself a regular full-time appointment somewhere else. But, with the orchestra conductorship, it was agreed, everybody agreed that, among other things, whoever we thought was in the running for the job had to spend a term or part of a term rehearsing with the orchestra and then conducting in public. So I guess there were three people probably when that happened.

Efrain Guigui was at that time the conductor of the Vermont Symphony Orchestra and living in Burlington and was seen I think universally as

the best of the people wanting the job and eventually was given it and was still there at the point where I left. But he was very disparaging about Melinda's abilities as a conductor and was foolish enough and vain enough – I suppose it had something to do with his own sense of himself – to make his views public to some degree. So at some point, there was a serious quarrel which, as far as I can remember, I really wasn't able to patch up and I think they sort of went their separate ways.

It's a small, small, small story, but it is a part of the dynamics of an institution where, among the people who have regular appointments, though neither of these people had tenure…Melinda I think has subsequently received tenure but they are not easily dismissable so that, if things don't go right, if the dynamic isn't right, you have this problem.

I think it is fair to say…I am sure it is a kind of cliché and I imagine there are some people of my colleagues in the administration of the arts who would find this slightly offensive in it's over-simplicity, but I think the fact of the matter is that anyone who sets out to make his or her living and their contribution to the betterment of the world as someone who gets up in front of other people to create something as a performing artist, that that temperament is such that it is reasonable to say that there is an artistic temperament which, in most cases, not all, but in most cases, has a ragged edge to it which has to be dealt with. It has been one of the challenges and one of the pleasures of my own career is to try to do my best to make the activity of these performing artists agreeable and viable and so on.

Leonard taught me or suggested or gave me, gave me a piece of advice which, on the face of it, is a very simple thing that you would think everyone would realize for himself, but it hadn't struck me in quite this way. That with any appointment to the faculty, but particularly in this somewhat mysterious world of the performing arts or indeed the studio arts as well, there will be, there is the likelihood of there being more – as they say in England – aggravation coming out of it. There will be some degree and some frequency of what it is slightly offensive to call "temperamental behavior." Leonard said, and this was actually in reference to Jon Appleton, who was a very prickly character indeed and, as far as I know, still is. "You know, the fact is you really have to work this through for yourself as I have done with Jon." I think this was probably before Jon was tenured. "You have got to balance the grief you have got to put up with against what is good about that person's presence and contribution to the life of the institution. If it comes down

that the grief is too high, then you do whatever has to be done to bring his presence to an end. I decided sometime ago that the grief I got from Jon and you are getting from Jon was offset by much more in the way of positive contributions to the life and vitality of the institution."

That became a very important element of the eight years I spent as dean at Columbia. It was a very good way of at least concentrating on, focusing on, a very important aspect of the role of a dean or whatever. My admiration for Leonard is intense and probably it doesn't make sense to go on about it here. I always felt and I think on appropriate occasion certainly at the time that I retired, the way in which I expressed it came out of an unlikely source because I knew nothing about American football until I got the appointment here. Of course I realized that there is politics to any kind of administrative job and it was important for me that I should be seen at the football games. I have to say that, on the basis of watching most of the football games in most of the seasons that I was here and what relatively little I have seen of professional football on television, college football, especially in the Ivy League, is much superior. There is some degree of skill and finesse and so on; whereas it strikes me that professional football as it is played, is essentially…There is an old quip coming out of the class system in England where the upper classes play rugby and the lower classes play soccer and the little aphorism is that it is a strange irony, it is an anomaly that rugby is a game for barbarians played by gentlemen and soccer is a gentlemen's game played by barbarians. [Laughter] So American football seems to me just barbaric and a contest of strength combined with weight and a game which doesn't really exist. I mean it is stopped so frequently. I think it is ludicrous.

However, I came to enjoy it, Dartmouth football. I was asked to contribute if I was willing to, would I like to, very soon after I got here; write an essay that would go in the football program. So I hadn't given any thought to what one might say on that occasion, but it did occur to me and I did write along these lines, that the game of football – by then I had seen two or three of them I guess – was very much a drama and that many of the things that went into success on the playing field were relevant in the arts.

So I made this case and I called it, knowing what I was doing, but it became something that made me a little bit of a personality on campus. I called the essay "Which End is the Fifty-Yard Line?" [Laughter]

On the whole, I mean, considering that Seaver Peters knew nothing about and cared nothing for the arts, I nevertheless had on the whole a good relationship with Seaver, with Pete, as director of athletics. One of the early casualties of the McLaughlin presidency.

This is a point well worth making. It was something that I am virtually certain that I articulated to Leonard and perhaps John Kemeny along the way which was that I…the account books, the finances of the university were public knowledge in very broad outline. For one reason or another, the general figures for where the income came and how it was expended, they put out one every so often. I don't quite remember in what context, but those were public knowledge. I made the point and did my utmost to stick to the point that the ratio between what was spent on athletics and what was spent on the extracurricular activities in the arts – that is to say the Hopkins Center's budget – should always have a relationship. I can't remember now what it was. I think probably something along the lines though that the Hop's budget was roughly half of the DCAC budget. I made that point as a specific point and maintained that relationship throughout my time as director. I have no idea what it is at this point. In a way, it is…Well, I was going to say in a way, it may, should be altered because fundraising has been sufficiently good for the arts at Dartmouth. Bringing the Hood into the equation as well and there is now to an extent that there was not when I arrived, there are now endowments to support those activities and therefore the drain on the free funds of the institution should be smaller.

On the other hand, there ought to be endowments supporting the DCAC, too, and maybe there are, for all I know, so maybe the relationship should remain where it was. This was one way of expressing something that I felt or came to feel. I certainly wasn't aware of it just by virtue of arriving at Dartmouth, but it came to be an important consideration for me and something that really was a statement of intent, which was that for "x hundreds"…No precise figure had to be associated with this, but it had to be, to use Leonard's phrase, "a non-trivial number." For hundreds of students, it should be as natural, as automatic that they go and spend a lot of time in Hopkins Center as for "x hundreds" more it was natural to go to the gym for whatever purpose. I hope that is still true.

I think…what this brings to mind was a very valuable encounter that I had in my first year here. I got to know, I don't know how, but I got into conversation with a student who I guess was a junior at the point when I arrived, who was very active and very well thought of, I think, as a

student in the visual arts. He latched onto one particular assistant professor as a role model and so on and tended to copy his style to a degree which I am sure goes through in every piece of art education. The important point is when you stop using the other person's pallet and set of things. At any rate, Stephan McKeown [Stephan G. McKeown '70] he was called, and in a slightly tenuous way I think throughout the by now thirty some odd years that he has been a working adult, his art, in one way or another, has put the bread on the table. Sometimes he has taught at other universities. At any rate, he said to me, and this of course made a very big impression very early in my time here, "If the Hop were not here, I would have gone insane." I don't want to convey that I took in that prejudice against the arts was pervasive. The "pansy palace," when I was told that, that came as a surprise. It was understandable that this place was known as a jock school and so on and, god knows…

End Tape 6, Side B
Begin Tape 7, Side A

SMITH: The way in which the arts are regarded in general in American society, it is still developing, but there is still some sense, fairly widespread, that they are not for everyone or that not so much. I think this has disappeared, but not totally. But I don't think it is pervasive anymore that somehow for a man to be involved in the arts is to reveal a degree of effeminacy.

Interestingly enough, just last week, I went to an event put on by the public television station in Buffalo where a little chamber music recital was presented to a group of us who put a chunk of money into one of the music elements in their programming. The chamber music recital was given by two women and a man. At the end of it, the station manager or somebody came up and presented flowers to the two women and a bottle of something to the man. I thought to myself, "God, I thought that had disappeared by now." I mean, it was offensive. It was absurd. I mean on the continent, no such distinction has been made for generations. I means flowers are a way of saying, "thank you" and you don't distinguish between the sexes.

At any rate, this matter of some degree of stigma attached to the arts or at least…That's too strong a word, but suspicion that they are not really manly, that they are not appropriate, that there is bound to be some degree of homosexual tendency that will go along with that. We all know that. That was…It strikes me as I think back on this, it was not as overt as I might have expected, though that isn't saying it quite

right either because in many, many respects and at very many points in my career, I have been made aware of how naïve I am and how I assume that everybody thinks the way I do and so on. But something like that was present and I think to a degree that is tremendously important subliminally.

The emergence of Pilobolus was a tremendously important event and I saw in the current issue of the alumni magazine this lovely photograph of four of the five principal founders back here for the 40th anniversary celebration. I wondered where Jonathan Wolken [A. Jonathan Wolken '71] was and I suppose sometime I will find out. But I wish I had been there to see the photograph of these four guys with their graying hair and by no means sagging bodies. [Laughter] They are still all of course in wonderful shape. That was tremendously important and there is a small miracle of synchronicity. I mean no one made this happen, but it is a very, very remarkable thing that they came out of the very first set of classes taught in dance at this institution.

One of the things that I would say quite often when it was appropriate to say it was that there was this interesting anomaly that Dartmouth was the last of the Ivies to go coed. I think that's true. Actually, that's not literally true because Columbia College went coed just before I went there. That was many years…But Columbia had always had Barnard as it's sister institution and that arrangement had included women undergraduates being in the Columbia classes and vice versa. Dartmouth was the last to go coed and the first to teach dance. It is a strange thing.

There is an anecdote which I have also told many times, which…As I was thinking about this interview, I knew it at some point had to be told. It, too, was, what's the word? It was in a modest way "shocking". It may have been even during the transition six months with Warner or it may have been in the fall, certainly in my first year. I had this phone call from Gilbert Tanis Gilbert "Gil" Tanis '38]. Gil Tanis was John Dickey's…I don't know quite how to…He was…Alex Fanelli was around at that point. Gil Tanis was to John Dickey what Alex Fanelli became for John Kemeny. He was the right-hand man, a very interesting guy, very sweet…very gentle. This will sound terribly derogatory, but it is what comes to mind. Very gentle for a Dartmouth graduate and a very honest person. Very, very much the kind of person that John Dickey would want close to him. So he was called "executive assistant," I guess.

The phone rang and Gil was calling me. He said, "This is one of the routines that you will get to know about. There is a lot, a great many people go out from the college to talk to alumni clubs around the country. It is a very important element in the life of Dartmouth. As the president's executive assistant, I have done this every year. I go out and give a sort of general overview of what is going on at the college to a number of alumni clubs around the country. That is coming up for me in a few weeks time and I've made a practice in recent years to get in touch with various people at the heads of various elements within the institution to find out what news to convey to the alumni. So my question is essentially, 'What's new at the Hopkins Center, apart from your arrival?'" So I said, "Well, you know, I am not sure I can give you an adequate answer. One thing I am very well aware of is that we have just started teaching dance in the drama department." There was this silence. [Laughter] Eventually Gil said, "Well, actually I think that is something I won't mention." [Laughter]

There is this lovely irony with that, that not only did a dance company come out of those first classes, but that it was a dance company which actually made history in the dance art, in the art of dance. This extraordinary combination of athletics, gymnastics and a free form abstract movement. The fact that that happened was the most remarkable piece of luck in a sense. Luck in the sense that various people are there together at the same time.

DONIN: Of course this was before coeducation.

SMITH: Yes, it was. Indeed, it was. Indeed, it was and that was very important, too. I suppose that by the time Pilobolus was established enough to be written about outside of the Upper Valley, coeducation must have been just around the corner because going coed was clearly a part of John Kemeny's sense of mission. Of course, the first regular women graduated in the class of '75, though they had come in as sophomores, as I remember. So that there was a sort of gray area in terms of whether it was all men or all women. But, certainly the formality of admitting women had not begun at the point where Pilobolus burst on the world.

I would like to claim some role in the formation of Pilobolus. I can't. In fact, I think to the extent that I can think of anything…Actually I do have something. I do feel that the Hop was important in their lives, very important actually, but not me except indirectly.

I think actually that, if I have any memory at all of dealing with these four guys while they were still students and while this was aborning, it is a negative one. I think I would not back them up in their appeal to the man in charge of security, the wonderful man who's name was…Now it zipped out of my head [John J. O'Connor]. There was something very, very remarkable about the guy who was the head of this very small police force here. At any rate, they had tried to talk him into allowing them to use Webster Hall outside of its hours. Webster Hall sat virtually empty virtually all the time. But they hadn't been given permission and I think I am remembering correctly that they came to see if I would go to bat for them and I think I declined. I think I wasn't convinced that this was serious. I don't remember. The contribution that the Hopkins Center made though is significant. It is not decisive. Their history would have been what it is without it; but, I think it was helpful because, almost as soon as I got here, the Hop started it's outreach program.

Just to zip back to Pilobolus which is the last thing to say…The second person who ran that program had among her objectives…The idea was that what was going on in the arts in the college would go out to the school set. That was true for a little while, but it was relatively tenuous. The outreach program ultimately became more or less 100% bringing kids into the Hop and of course, now the Hood. But, at any rate, at that time we definitely were…if there was anything that we could send out into the schools, it was sent. Pilobolus' first appearances before the public…I think even before they put on anything at the college for people to look at…was a part of this outreach program.

Kathy Hammer [Kathleen H. Hammer], the woman who was in charge at that point, I think became a member of the Pilobolus board at some point and maintained a very good relationship with them after they had reached the point where the original dancers were no longer dancing. They were only choreographing.

The outreach program is something which I think…And I don't know that I am any less to blame in this respect than anyone else, probably more to blame since this was my bailiwick. I would say though that it's an activity for which Dartmouth has never received enough credit in the world out there. Because I think it may still be true… It was certainly true for many, many years that it was the only instance where a private university was devoting it's own money to some extent to bringing the arts to the children of the region. It has been a very, very significant part. It has, as far as I know…As I say, I know very little indeed about the details of what goes on for the Hop and almost nothing about what

goes on for the Hood in recent years, but that amount of money from the free funds of the college was never very great. For all I know, it may have diminished over the years, but it has been replaced by money coming in, especially from the Friends of the Hopkins Center, but also I assume still, even though they are strapped for money, from the two state arts councils. For a long time, I think money was coming in from the NEA at a point where it had money to shell out. But the credit that belongs to Dartmouth for being willing to put money into this program, I think, has never been fully given. It may have been written up one place or another outside of the Upper Valley, but I don't know that it has.

I mean, one of the things that pleased me a great deal was when I retired, an anonymous donor, though I am almost certain that I know who it was, gave a chunk of money, I think a quarter of a million dollars, into essentially an endowment fund for the outreach program, which went along with the naming of a room in Wilson Hall for me because there were certainly people who knew what was going on. I can't be 100% certain who gave this money, but I am 100% certain that it was one or other of the members of the board of overseers who had come to know that this program existed and what it did.

DONIN: I think we could take a break now. I would like to ask you about the board of overseers when we come back.

SMITH: Yes. I can talk further about outreach and that.

[Interruption in Interview]

SMITH: Children had not, by any means, been ignored during the early years of the Hopkins Center. That is to say, there was a tradition which I inherited of there being some children's theater company arriving for a short stay towards Christmas time. After the term was over and the drama department no longer had any use for the theater, there was then and still are many, many touring companies that present children's theater and this was a part of what happened and continued to happen and I don't know if it still does. That's immaterial. So there was an awareness that, as part of what the College had always articulated as it's sense of mission for the region that there should be children involved, was a given. What that developed into though was something much more proactive and much more complex. As I said earlier, as far as I know, this was unique – certainly within the Ivy League. It came about…

Becoming proactive and our setting up a program and our having an employee to look over it came about in an odd way. One of the students whom I had come to know who was very much affected by the Vietnam war was a young fellow who went on to become a professional actor. He has dropped that now, but he went from here to the Royal Academy of Dramatic Art in London and could have had with lucky breaks, a decent career, but I think ended up having not as good a career as he had wanted. He decided eventually to become a lawyer and that is what he is doing now…a member of the class, I think, of '72. But at any rate, he registered as a conscientious objector, as a commitment, I mean, not as a pretext. He was a Quaker, is still a Quaker. So he registered as a conscientious objector and was working with the draft board on what his alternative service would be and came to me essentially to talk over whether there was something that he could do for the Hop that would satisfy the board. It may well have been his own idea that maybe it would be possible to organize a program for schools of stuff that was exportable and could he be put in charge of that if that seemed to make sense?

As it happens, in a different way and on a different scale, that had come about the previous year because, as an initiative I think from the New Hampshire Arts Council. I am not sure. They certainly put money into it. There was a production of the Dartmouth Players of Molière's L'Avare, which toured a few high schools in New Hampshire and that was quite an elaborate event. That may have been on this chap's mind. So we talked about it and I am sure very readily said, "Well, let's give it a try." So we, Peter, drew up the outlines of this program. I can't remember the chronology here. I can't remember why…I am pretty sure there was not a two-year commitment on his part, so whether the end of the war came and the draft disappeared, I don't remember. But at any rate, he certainly did a year and he may have done two of trying to figure out ways in which children could be made aware of and perhaps encouraged to come to the Hop for things that would be of interest to them besides the children's theater program at Christmas time and started thinking about whether there were exportable things that were less elaborate, less costly than touring with a full production. So that program began.

It will be interesting to know what is in the files in terms of what is written down on paper about that. Enough good came out of it, enough things happened to make me and again, I can't at all remember whether, in those circumstances, I needed to take it much further. But at a point very soon after that, the thought came and it may have been put into my head by someone else, that if we appointed someone to do

this, the chances were very good that VCA and the New Hampshire Arts Commission would help to support it. I must have gone to Leonard because it certainly involved putting someone else on the payroll even if on soft money. So that all happened.

Kathy Hammer was at that time married to an employee at the Woodstock Inn and I can't for the life of me remember how she came to get in touch and ask if there were any jobs that she might be allowed to have. Again, no search is going on in those times. At any rate, that was a piece of luck. She is a graduate of Smith. She was, I think, an art history major. She is a very bright and intelligent person. The idea that was afloat of creating a substantial outreach program appealed to her a great deal and she took it on with great enthusiasm and great effectiveness. For a period of several years, she was a very important member of the staff of the Hopkins Center because she had qualities of mind and spirit that were just appropriate to the program at the Hop and was very personable and so on.

So when I arrived, the staff of the center consisted of, at the very moment I arrived, it consisted of an assistant director. This is one of the details I wasn't sure about the point of including, but I will now come back to it. An assistant director, a business manager, a publicity manager and I can't remember what his title was. I remember what his name was. I guess a house manager maybe. But the person who, reporting to the business manager, dealt with the logistics of the event setups and making sure the piano was on the stage and all of that kind of event management and making sure there were ushers. There was also…Well, there was a secretary for the director, a very remarkable woman who I inherited from Warner and there was a box office manager. I think there was a part-time – one day a week – bookkeeper who obviously worked directly with the business manager.

That was augmented very gradually in the course of the time that I was there and I am almost certain that the first significant change was that there became a full-time outreach director that Kathy Hammer occupied. So we were a team. My secretary, Pat Varney [Eileen "Pat" Varney], wasn't included, nor was the house manager in the sort of professional cadre of the people who met once a week.

So there were initially only four of us or five of us, plus the directors of theater, of music, of studio art and the director of the film society, Blair Watson [John Blair Watson, Jr.], who was a long-time employee here and whose salary was paid not by the Hopkins Center, but by what was called the OISER, Office of Instructional Support and Educational

Research, or something like that. A strange, strange little entity run by a very interesting man called Bill Smith [William M. Smith], who was from the psychology department. At any rate, Blair was very much a part of the Hopkins Center entity, a wonderful man and a lovely colleague.

So the creation of a job for looking after outreach was the first development. Oh, also, I beg your pardon. There was another person who reported to the director of the Hopkins Center, but whose salary I think was at least somewhat paid by the college development office. His title was Secretary of the Dartmouth Arts Council and he had been there a year or two and had been brought on at the point where – I am sure at Mr. Dickey's instigation – it had been decided that there should be this entity called The Dartmouth Arts Council. It's basic function was to be supportive of the activities of the Hopkins Center.

It had been chaired from the very beginning by another wonderful Dartmouth alumnus, class of 1924, called Frank Harrington [Frank L. Harrington '24]. Frank was still a member of the board of trustees at the point that this was formed and, though he stepped down, his term of office…It was about at that time, and this is something I don't know, but is a detail in the history of Dartmouth…Somewhere around that time the board of trustees' mandate was changed to fixed terms and so Frank Harrington's stint came to an end. But he stayed interested and stayed interested until his death.

The gallery that is in the Hood Museum is called the Harrington Gallery, which is I think essentially devoted to teaching exhibitions. It comes from…I think in that case, not from his own largess but from a gift made in his honor by his children. Frank was importantly successful in his business, which was life insurance. He owned or ran a company, not one of the giants, but a major company whose headquarters are in Worcester, Massachusetts. His interest in the arts was genuine, but relatively narrowly focused and his life-long enthusiasm was for Colonial silver. So the beginning of a collection at Dartmouth of what I guess we call decorative arts came with Frank's interest and I guess a very large percentage, if not all, of his collection after he died – more probably after his widow died – became the property of Dartmouth. Maybe his children had the option of taking a piece or two. He was a wonderful person, truly honest, genial, generous and very, very tolerant of other people. I mean a good person in that sense.

There was a down side to this in that the secretary of the Dartmouth Arts Council was not a particularly competent person. This was a piece of 'old boys' network' which hadn't worked out. His name was Allen Dingwall [H. Allen Dingwall Jr. '42]. He was a member of the class of '42. His father, I think, was a member of the class of '20 or '21 or '18, one in there. Allen was a fine person, a good person. I think he was the first person as I was becoming a mature adult and professional…He was the first person who brought to mind the phrase, "completely without guile." He was naturally a very open person and with all the right instincts and his heart in the right place and all of those things. He was okay and he had a very considerable interest in music.

His appointment though came about as a result of his deciding that he had had enough of working on Madison Avenue. He had gone, as a very large majority of Dartmouth alumni did at that point, into the corporate world in one way or another and had also been in the Second World War for a spell. Then he had worked for one of the big advertising agencies and that had some off-shoots from time to time. Whatever the agency was, he had been the liaison between the agency and the sponsors of the Jack Benny Show. And one very major event, which thrilled everybody before my time was that he talked Jack Benny into coming up to the Hop for a benefit. I think maybe it was the first time that the Arts Council sort of had it's name on something. It was a huge success as it was bound to be and it raised a chunk of money.

End Tape 7, Side A
Begin Tape 7, Side B

DONIN: So…Allen Dingwall.

SMITH: Allen Dingwall had been involved in the arts while he was an undergraduate…such little activity as there was in that he was the accompanist for the Glee Club and also was a very competent…much more than competent…pianist. Indeed, he gave recitals with a classmate who went on to be one of Dartmouth's…A Dartmouth alumnus who had a distinguished career as an academic, a man called Wiley Hitchcock [H. Wiley Hitchcock '44], who became an important musicologist. This was important to Allen. This is worth mentioning because Allen cared enough about music certainly and maybe the arts as a whole to be very glad that somebody he had known well had gone on to this kind of a career. Allen was not dilettantish, though he never became a professional pianist. He was much more than competent.

At any rate, he decided that he had had enough of Madison Avenue and that he would, although he was among the relatively early ones in this trend, but obviously his heart had been left in Hanover and he would see if he could find a job back here. I don't know the sequence, whether he actually made the decision, made all of that without the job and then found it, or not. At any rate, he put out feelers for what might be available at the college and it is conceivable, although I don't know this for a fact, that Warner remembered him. Warner certainly had been here for a long time when his class came through.

His looking for a job must have coincided with a decision to create this support group called the Dartmouth Arts Council, so he became the secretary of the Dartmouth Arts Council. He was only sort of moderately successful. I don't remember now how many people were on the Arts Council. I am fairly sure that, on paper, they included people from the so-called advisory committees that were formed when the Hopkins Center was being planned. But several of them were very busy people in their various spheres of influence – major figures – and I don't think they paid a great deal of attention to the Dartmouth Arts Council. I don't remember how frequently or infrequently it met, but it had not to any significant degree come through as a source of major financial support, except through Frank Harrington who I think, pretty well from then on, apart from his contributions to the alumni fund in his class…I think everything he gave to the college in the Third Century Fund and subsequently, all was channeled into the arts in general. His money played an important part in the transition from Congregation of the Arts splendor into what followed. I think with these representatives from the more or less dormant advisory committees, the other people who were on the Dartmouth Arts Council were all Dartmouth alumni with some connection to the field.

At any rate, not to belabor the point, it existed, but it made very little impact and I suppose from the very beginning, it would not surprise me if the records showed that I did indeed send a memo to Leonard saying, "What is this thing and what is it supposed to do and who is Allen Dingwall, etc."

DONIN: What was the role of the advisory committees?

SMITH: The advisory committees…There was one in each area and I think it varied from subject to subject. I guess there were four. In the long run, the existence of those committees and the people who were put on them made a considerable impact in some instances. I guess there

is actually a quite natural progression from those advisory committees in the planning and building of the Hop through to the Dartmouth Arts Council and then through to the board of overseers in that sort of threads, not exactly indirectly but with that set of connections, some of the financial support for the Hopkins Center was on a very large scale for it's time. I am sure in the archive there will be the printed booklet that accompanied the opening and all the names are in there.

One name that became very important in my life and I think of importance in the history of the Hopkins Center was a man called Goddard Lieberson, who was for a very long time the man in charge of Columbia and subsequently CBS records. I mean he was in charge of the whole kit 'n caboodle I think at various times, but his own principal involvement was with the classical side of their product, which at that time was very, very substantial and very important. What I think happened was that there were alumni or very close friends of the college who could head up the theater committee, the film committee, the crafts committee, the studio arts and gallery committee, but there was no one in music. Although there was a member of the class of 1900 or 1901 by the name of Arthur Virgin [Arthur R. Virgin '00] who was by then getting along in years and apparently was not the person to ask, even on a more or less honorary basis, to chair this, though he became a member of it and he gave the first…He gave the money for the first endowed chair in any of the arts, the Arthur Virgin Chair in Music. So these were important contacts of John Dickey and Ort Hicks [Orton "Ort" Hicks '21], his inimitable and phenomenal man in charge of raising money.

From the beginning of 1969, initially with Warner and then after July on my own, I went to Mr. Dickey's monthly, weekly, I can't remember, staff meeting and I am smiling and laughing because there was one gorgeous moment. Ort Hicks was very, very reactionary and was quite far to the right on the political scale. Because he was the vice president for development and alumni relations, which he stepped down from just about the time that I arrived, but then of course stayed on as a fixture…But he could be counted on to make sure that the senior members of the college administration, Mr. Dickey in particular, had heard him say how much such and such an act or action or decision or whatever was going to alienate the vast majority of alumni, so this became a part…The first time I heard him go through this though, something about it must have, if not irritated Mr. Dickey, at least sort of piqued him a little bit because when Ort had finished speaking, he said, "Well, Ort, you know I have to say, the windup may differ, but the pitch is always the same." [Laughter]

So anyway, Ort Hicks was very considerably involved in the formulation of the various support groups. A very major friend of his from the times when he was in the movie industry was a man called Arthur Hornblow [Arthur Hornblow Jr. '18], who I think was class of '18, who was famous for being an ex-husband of I think it was Paulette Goddard. He had been an important, really a significantly successful film producer. So he was the chair of the film advisory committee and important and still on the scene when I arrived and, indeed, there is a little anecdote that I will come to in a minute. But he was very much a part of the cultural power scene in New York City and so somebody – it may have been Ort, himself, or it may have been John Dickey – asked him if he could think of anyone who might be the chair of the music advisory committee because there wasn't anyone obvious within the Dartmouth family. He knew Goddard Lieberson as a friend and put forth Goddard's name. Goddard had not been to university. He was a graduate of the Eastman School and I think partly out of curiosity, partly to accommodate Arthur Hornblow, he took on this role. So the advisory committee in music, with the exception of Arthur Virgin – I think you will find in the printed program – consists of all the major artists on Columbia Records at that time. So you have Eugene Ormandy and it has Leonard Bernstein and it probably has Isaac Stern and so on. I don't think it ever met.

To jump ahead by a fair number of years, one of the things that I was responsible for was in fact redressing what I assume was an oversight, but it may also have had something to do with the fact that Goddard was not an alumnus. All the chairs of all the advisory committees received honorary degrees in the course of the years after the opening of the Hopkins Center; but Goddard didn't. But that was dealt with later and very much helped in what became Goddard's contributions to our success and so on.

I can't remember who was the chair of the theater committee. The chair of the art committee was this father of an alumnus. Yes. Yes. The Jaffe-Friede Gallery in the Hopkins Center was named for the couple who gave it, though I didn't know at the time. I subsequently realized that, though they both gave it, the money was all Mrs. Jaffe's. Mrs. Jaffe was called "Mrs. Jaffe" when I first met her, but it is there as Jaffe-Friede because formerly she had been Mrs. Friede. As Mrs. Friede, she had been the mother of two other graduates at the college. So this was, although that wasn't laid out in the plaque, that was the appropriate way of doing this because the Friede family of alumni and the Jaffe family of alumni.

Bill Jaffe [William B. Jaffe] was a very flamboyant and domineering kind of person. Mrs. Jaffe who, after Bill Jaffe's death, became Mrs. Hall and, as far as I know, has been a constant member of the board of overseers and is still alive. Yes, I think almost certainly. She was one of the four or five daughters of Moses Annenberg and sister to Walter Annenberg. That's where the money came from. This was pretty astute. I don't know who first discovered Bill Jaffe, but he was a big enough self-promoter that he probably came on the scene all on his own. It is easy to make fun of Bill Jaffe, but he was very, very important in that, if, as I certainly believe is the case with everything I know which doesn't include everything current, but I am assuming that the board of overseers at the Hopkins Center has played and continues to play an important role in the life of the center. Through an action taken by the board of overseers, which I will come to, the importance of the Friends of Hopkins Center is also a byproduct of the coming into existence of the board of overseers. So Bill Jaffe, odd man as he was and very good at spending his wife's money and flamboyant sort as he was, was important. He was a very, very, very successful…I shouldn't say that he didn't have any standing in his own right in terms of money either. He was a very successful lawyer in New York City and a partner in a relatively major law firm. He certainly got an honorary degree very quickly.

The chairman of the crafts committee was someone called I think Mrs. Vanderbilt Webb. Somewhere in the record, there is I am sure an indication as to how she was found and what linked her to Dartmouth. That committee I think was the most effective of them all. Again, this is before my time. It probably is on Warner's tape or maybe on Mr. Dickey's tape and I have forgotten in the section where he deals with the Hopkins Center.

One of the things that make the Hopkins Center truly distinctive are the craft studios. That was one of the…It was a factor in my finding the place so wonderful. Not that I am much involved in the crafts, but through my father and a couple of other uncles and cousins, I had developed some sense of an inkling of the importance of crafts. As I got into being director, that respect for and admiration for this basic idea and its unlikeliness, sort of made themselves felt very much. The person who I inherited and who remained director of the crafts program through almost all of my time as director was a real salt-of-the-earth person, also an alumnus, a woodworker called Walker Weed [Walker T. Weed II '40]. How could I have forgotten this? He was also of course always at the staff meetings of the Hopkins Center. Very bad

that I should have overlooked him, but in a sense not surprising because he was a very, very modest person, very quietly spoken, not saying a great deal. But he put together a team of people, all of whom I think have now retired, basically teaching woodworking and metalworking. That was pretty well the extent of it at that time.

Those studios, from the beginning, have been – not too strong a word to use – "lavishly" equipped. They have always – as I hope is still the case – been exemplary and they, too, have been a very important factor indeed in some instances, I am positive, a crucially important factor in the lives of students. I mean, there was a student I remember who certainly, as a visual arts major and as a sculptor, certainly went out into the world intending to be a sculptor. I haven't kept track of him. I don't know whether he has had success. Mainly his sculptures involved a chunk of marble into which strips of very flexible but strong metal were fixed. So they were kind of kinetic sculptures, not as complicated and remarkable as the work of George Rickey for instance, but nevertheless, with a genuine feel of art. He was much admired by the art faculty. He told me that the most important person in his four years at Dartmouth had been "Snip" LaFountain [Stanley E. "Snip" LaFountain]. Snip LaFountain I fear may have died because he would be very old anyway. He was…

DONIN: What was his real name?

SMITH: I don't know what his name was. I have no idea. It was presumably on his paycheck. "Snip" was what everyone called him. He was as prototypical a Vermonter as you could ever wish to know. I mean an extraordinary person with great skill in the metalworking business; but with a humanity that was very, very, unusual indeed. A wonderful person whose influence on the students who spent the most time with him was genuine. I haven't the slightest doubt that, if one could pull out all the facts related to the experience of all the tens of thousands of alumni and find who they regarded as important in their lives here, "Snip" would be on many persons' list. For Larry… What was his name? I've lost his name.[·] That particular student was very explicit and it made a very particularly strong human being out of that student.

At any rate, the crafts program certainly was, at that point, unique, I suspect, across the country. I am sure it still is unique within the Ivy League and the elite senior liberal arts colleges. It is a wonderful thing. One of the gifts that came in after I stepped down from being director, but from a member of the board of overseers who I certainly – to use

[·] Lawrence A. Hahn '71

not very happy making jargon – "cultivated"…He added the studio and the backing for the addition of jewelry-making to the program.

I guess also more or less at the point where I was leaving, pottery was added in a house over in Lewiston, across the bridge. I don't know if that still goes. That was, I suppose, one of the very few decisions that was influenced by coeducation. I don't have any recollection of any process here except that it must have crossed somebody's mind and then was shared by others of us, that a crafts program limited to woodworking and metalworking, while it might be attractive to women students, would not be the ones you would immediately think of in terms of what were likely to be the interests of women students. There was certainly a lot of talk about adding weaving. That sounds sexist to say that, but I don't know that that happened. Pottery and jewelry making may well have been as close as we came to responding directly to the arrival of women students. Everything else, I think, was remarkably in place.

That is something which…Just to sort of take us as a side step for a moment, but the commitment that Dartmouth made in the construction and funding and staffing of the Hopkins Center was phenomenal in terms of an institutional commitment to the arts. I think in reasonable measurements that were sort of quantifiable, one could say that Dartmouth's commitment was greater than that of any other institution in these quantifiable matters. A building that large, a set of facilities that splendid and staff that large also on behalf of arts outside the curriculum was very, very remarkable and the fact that the crafts were included adds a particular sort of slant to how unusual this was.

Of course, just to revert for a second to the role that Mr. Dickey played. At the time of the tenth anniversary – I am sure it must have been – a decision was made that there was a lot to be said for – as the Hopkins era sort of went into the past – it was important, especially since the name isn't on the building. Hopkins doesn't appear anywhere, but it would be good to have a formal statement as to why it was named the "Hopkins Center". I think I can take credit. If I can't, it would be something that came out of conversation with Leonard and John Kemeny, that in addition to the plaque which tells you why it is called the Hopkins Center, there should be one for Mr. Dickey. I am certain that I was the person who formulated the wording of this, which, in Mr. Dickey's case, says "This building owes it's existence to John Sloan Dickey".

DONIN: Why is there no signage on the building?

SMITH: I don't know. I don't know. I suppose…I really don't know and I guess I hadn't ever asked. I think I must have taken it for granted that it was such a major addition to the campus that…Not just in terms of how controversial it was, but everything about it says "I am important" as it were and Mr. Hopkins was still alive at the point. I don't know. I mean, there isn't an obvious place to put it except, I suppose, on the concrete stretch from side to side that is above the entryway and below the big windows. You could put the words "Hopkins Center" there. But maybe it…The thought that goes through my mind, though it has no validity beyond my mind, is one of the things that I think Englishmen, English people, Brits, who know about it, sort of get a miniscule bit of pleasure out of is that the name of the country doesn't appear on the postage stamps. It is the only country that is allowed to do that and it is that way because they were the first to issue postage stamps and so they certainly, at the time, didn't think of putting the name on. Whoever came second had to differentiate from that one. There may be just a slight touch of this, that the Hopkins Center is the Hopkins Center and was the Hopkins Center and just is. I don't know.

I would actually, I suppose without any great seriousness, I would argue against putting it on. I mean that little touch of uniqueness and even a tiny touch of mystery or something is entirely appropriate.

One of the other…We will get back to the board of overseers and so on in all of these developments, but I thought of one piece of narrative relating to Mr. Dickey, which I had forgotten until a few minutes ago. On just one occasion while he was still president, I was present at the session with that edition of Dartmouth Horizons with the president. I don't know how it is now. I think during John Dickey's time, it may have come at the beginning. I forget. Certainly at John Kemeny's, it came at the end and this kind of culmination of everything and lots of people could ask questions.

But at any rate, on just one occasion, I was with the Dartmouth Horizons group when Mr. Dickey had his session with them. It was held in the Hopkins Center faculty lounge, as it was then called. I don't know what it is called now. The thing that I remember that was important was that, in the course of the session, I heard what was not a Dickey coinage, but it was a manner of expressing it, a particular truth that I had not heard before, which was, "We all know about the man who wasn't looking forward to… (and "man" would be proper there. In my book about Dartmouth, about the Dickey presidency, it would have been called "Men of Dartmouth" because it was the last

presidency that was totally a male administration. So the use of the word "man" was just automatic.) So we all know the story about the man who wasn't looking forward to growing old until he considered the only alternative. So we have on one side, growing old and, on the other side, not growing old. I was given a lot of trouble over what I – this is Mr. Dickey speaking – over what I certainly know was a decision that I personally…

End Tape 7, Side B
Begin Tape 8, Side A

SMITH: So Mr. Dickey is saying, "I took a lot of flack for a decision with regard to the design of the Hop, for which I would personally claim the credit, which is the decision that inside the Hop, there should be a lot of windows so that people going through the Hop could see what was going on. The reason people told me that was a bad thing to do was that it would encourage dilettantism; that people would think they knew something they didn't really know, that they would get this smattering of this, that or the other thing. So that was the point of view of certain pedantic people who had to grumble about something. From my point of view, the only alternative to awareness is a lack of awareness and I would rather have awareness any day."

He was a great coiner of phrases and some of them are undoubtedly in Leonard's tongue. Some I have held on to and have maintained as tremendously important in decision-making and building the faculty at Columbia. The one that says so much in so few words was one of John's very favorites, one he was very fond of which is "there is no substitute for high voltage." His talent as a builder of the faculty had that in mind and terribly true.

The move from the Dartmouth Arts Council, which wasn't working very well, into a board of overseers came…It may have started actually even in John Dickey's last month. I think it did. I think the question…I think I remember a meeting in John Dickey's office, in the president's office, with Frank Harrington as a kind of preliminary to sort of laying the Dartmouth Arts Council to rest and transmogrifying it into something rather more formal with a stronger sense of itself and modeled on the boards of overseers of the Tuck school and the Thayer school. I think those were the two that existed. There was also one for the Hanover Inn, but I think that was called board of visitors. I think it clearly had a different role.

At any rate, it was thought that…Let's see, there were three criteria. One was to involve those chairs from the advisory committee ranks who wanted to join in or were still alive. I don't know where Mrs. Webb fell into that. She did not become a member of the first board of overseers. Bill Jaffe did and Goddard Lieberson did. Arthur Hornblow didn't. He may have declined or he may indeed have died. But at any rate, this was to make sure that there would be continuity and an acknowledgment of the part played by these people. There would always at least one member of the board of trustees on the board of overseers and the president and provost would be members ex-officio, which had not been I think the case with the Dartmouth Arts Council. The great benefit…I guess I realized, if I hadn't realized it ahead of time, I certainly realized it once we got going.

The tremendous benefit for the Hop was that, whatever it was, two occasions a year, maybe three – I don't remember how frequently it was due to meet – but you had the president's undivided attention in the presence of other people who really knew a lot about what was going on. So there would be someone representing the board of trustees and the president of the Friends of Hopkins Center would be an ex-officio member of the board of overseers. Then there would be the recruiting of some others to strengthen it and to reach out for people who were potentially both able to give some level of expertise, but principally would be generous with their money. I guess I am surprised to discover that I can't just rattle off the names of the first board of overseers.

I do know that the trustees' representative at the time was Richard Lombard, Dick Lombard [Richard "Dick" Lombard '53] and his wife, Jane. Yes. Dick and Jane – that should fall out of one's head – were and, in her case, I assume still is, an important source of support for the Hopkins Center. Jane Lombard, whose maiden name is, I guess we continue to say, was Jane Kettering and the daughter or granddaughter – I can't remember the generations – of the man who invented the self-starter, the thing that transformed the motor industry. I think that was Charles Kettering's [Charles F. Kettering H'39] claim to fame and, of course, I guess it was patented immediately and so it became a part of the automotive industry in a big, big way. He apparently was a wonderful man. I think he was Jane's father. She must be seventy. Anyway, it doesn't too much matter. What was important was that her brother, Chuck Kettering [Charles F. Kettering 2d '53], was a Dartmouth alumnus and was the roommate I think of Dick Lombard and that was how Dick and Jane met. They were a lovely couple.

One thing that I do remember is that there was never one occasion when every member of the board of overseers was present. It almost happened because the inaugural meeting… I think Frank Harrington stayed on it. But there was a general agreement that it would be very, very flattering and therefore very important to Bill Jaffe if he was asked to be the first chair of the board of overseers. I remember we met in the boardroom of his law firm. Everybody who was on it…And I am just remembering that one of the important things that Dick Lombard did was to persuade the then director of the Whitney Art Museum, Tom Armstrong, to be an overseer. Goddard Lieberson asked William Shuman if he would join, so his contact with the Hop was renewed that way. It was a strong body. It really took on a different shape and had the potential and I believe the potential has been, if not realized, it certainly has been kept going.

DONIN: How did it differ from the Arts Council? What was its mandate?

SMITH: I don't honestly remember. It may have had something even possibly identical, but it was the idea of a new beginning. It was the idea of telling those members who were new and had not been on the Arts Council that it had a relationship to the two professional schools' boards of overseers. There had to be some kind of a…Maybe one of the differences was that the president attended. Maybe that the provost was involved.

The Dartmouth Arts Council idea I guess had not been thought through is the way to say it. It came into existence as Warner was heading towards retirement. Allen – lovely person as he was – was no builder and I think the most important thing in practical terms that came out of the Dartmouth Arts Council and Allen being it's secretary was how very, very close he came to Frank Harrington and I think Frank would have been generous to the college for sure. I mean this was one of the things that one has always to take in mind. I don't think that any money came to the Hop from Frank that wouldn't have come to Dartmouth anyway. Though that was not true for many other gifts; but, in Frank's case, his heart would have been giving there. But it was funneled towards the arts by virtue of the closeness that Allen Dingwall had with him. He spent a lot of time with him and he was clearly someone that Frank enjoyed the presence of and so it was well worth it and it was important for Allen, too. Frank was a fine and wealthy person and this was good for Allen's self-esteem. So it shouldn't be set aside.

The first meeting of the board of overseers looked as though it was going to be full attendance, except that on the night before or the morning of even, Chuck Kettering was killed in a…He ran out on…He lived on a ranch in Colorado and followed his dog out onto the road and was hit by a car. So Dick Lombard was not there.

This is a thought that never occurred to me before. It is not terribly significant, but…And I don't know whether Chuck Kettering had children. He probably did. I do remember Leonard saying that Chuck Kettering was the nicest rich person he had ever met. What I was going to say though was that I have no idea whether Chuck Kettering's interests were in the arts. He had, up to that time…They were I mean, comparatively young. Dick Lombard was class of '53, so I guess Chuck was as well. So they were not all that long out of college. What may have in effect been the interests of the Kettering family and the Kettering Foundation, because Jane was now the representative. She and her sister – the two girls and Chuck – were now the representatives…The extent to which Kettering gifts to the college included many major gifts to the arts… Probably or its certainly possible to think that their gifts may have been more diffuse and covering more ground had Chuck become a part of the scene. But that is immaterial.

It's an interesting question why, what on paper was so similar, turned out to be so different. It may have…I don't know the extent to which Leonard took a great interest in the Dartmouth Arts Council. He certainly – I think I can fairly say – was not much involved in hiring Allen, because I don't think he had a high opinion, in professional terms, in work terms, of Allen's capabilities. So it may all have been done sort of relatively quietly involving simply John Dickey, Frank Harrington and Allen Dingwall. Frank, wonderful as he was and effective as he was in his profession, was not a leader. So the dynamics may just not have been right.

The arrival of a new president, John Kemeny, with a new and significant amount of energy, Leonard's own involvement, Bill Jaffe's ambition, the arrival of a few new people who had not in the past been tapped, that may be enough to explain why it was totally different.

I think this is the moment, though chronologically it didn't happen for two or three more years, but the link with the Friends of Hopkins Center is crucial. The Friends of Hopkins Center – as Allen often said – was sort of his creation and that was true. I now suddenly realize I don't know how close to the founding or the opening of the Hopkins

Center, the Dartmouth Arts Council, Allen Dingwall came on board. But, at any rate, it was at some point between ’62 and ’68. When I came on the scene, I guess it was something to do with Mario di Bonaventura’s constant sort of niggling that nobody was paying enough attention to the Congregation [of the Arts], to his contributions to the Congregation. Because I am certain I am remembering correctly that Allen said that he was sort of being got at and had to come up with something that would help or something. What he came up with was finding a group of volunteers who would – this doesn’t sound quite right, but nevertheless, this is how I remember it – be at the top of the aisles in the concerts presented in the congregation with a basket seeking alms, seeking contributions over and above the ticket price. He had rounded up a group of ladies who he had reason to believe would be interested.

The leader of that group and I guess in every sense, the first president of the Friends of Hopkins Center was a remarkable woman called Elizabeth Ballard [Helen Elizabeth Flanders Ballard]. Her husband was a very important person in the biology department throughout his career here. He graduated from the college, went off and got his Ph.D. and then came back and was a part of the life of the college and of the town of Norwich for fifty-odd years and also a wonderful person. Elizabeth’s father had been one of the senators from Vermont, Ralph Flanders, who was, I was told, the first person in the senate to go on the record as disapproving of Joe MacCarthy’s tactics and who was widely seen as a superb public servant. Elizabeth had boundless enthusiasm and a very, very profound love of music and very, very well backed up in knowledge and so on. She was a member of the Handel Society I guess for all of her adult life. So it started out with these very small beginnings indeed and I guess some effort was made with some kind of a membership drive. Allen was sort of the liaison to the Friends of Hopkins Center from the time when it first arrived.

This is probably the appropriate moment to deal with the Friends of the Hopkins Center as an entity and cover all aspects of it that I can think of. I arrived at a time when it probably had – I don’t remember honestly – it may have had a hundred members. It may have had two hundred members. It didn’t do a great deal.

One of the other things that came out of Mario’s wanting to make a success of his program – there is nothing snide about what I am going to say – is that he made Warner aware and then Warner put Allen in charge of this aspect of the thing. He made them aware that there ought to be receptions after the concerts for soloists and the principals

of the orchestra and any important and interesting guests. He and his wife, Dorothy di Bonaventura, did a good deal of this themselves. She was a very elegant and fashionable kind of a woman. They had a very large house on North Balch. But, in addition, one of Allen's jobs was to arrange for receptions of that kind and that tended to mean going to the Friends of the Hopkins Center who had big houses and so on.

Allen was very good at that. Allen came from a modest amount of serious wealth and certainly knew…I mean I picked up at one point that his piece of New York society was such that certainly if they had any guests to dinner, he and his father wore black tie. So there was this little edge, which was very good, which had it's downside, but which nevertheless included a tad of glamour and privilege or whatever the right word is, with which Allen was very comfortable. This is not in any way to minimize that element.

I will interrupt myself to say that something that struck me as a potential danger with the Friends of Hopkins Center I think has come about. I hope I am wrong. I am a member, so I get the publications and I think it is one of Hanover's ways for people with wealth and social pretension or social ambitions or whatever the right word is to sort of have a place to exercise that. It is not terribly unhappy making and it relates to the money side, which is the next piece of this story. But there is a down side to it. I don't suppose anybody too much cares. If they pay their membership and they take part to the extent that they wish to, that element of it probably doesn't grate on very many people and it satisfies a great many more and it makes a difference in terms of money.

But at any rate, it has changed in character and that more or less occurred on my watch. That actually comes from a particular moment. I had I guess seven or eight different presidents of the Friends of Hopkins Center during my time as the director. All but one of them and I didn't include…I mean I wasn't there during the formative years when Elizabeth Ballard was the driving force; but, at my retirement, there was a Friends' lunch for me at which all of the presidents that had ever been of the Friends of the Hopkins Center were there except for a woman who had sadly died who was a Christian Scientist, one of my only contacts. (I hope you are not a Christian Scientist.) I was just totally mystified that…I don't understand it. It is a waste of time to talk about it, but she had cancer and she died and she was not treated. At any rate, all the others were there and it is true to say that, to one degree or another, I had a falling out with all of them. [Laughter]

This is an important part of the record, though in one sense somewhat trivial. It was the matter of who was in charge around here, as it were. One thing I became aware of, but not in time to do anything about it…I guess there was a written constitution for Friends of Hopkins Center by the time I arrived. It was certainly reconstituted along the way. It was only after it had been really formalized with my input that I discovered that the Friends of the Library…Ed Lathem [Edward Connery "Ed" Lathem '51] is a very shrewd person in many, many ways. I had never thought to consult him and I probably should have, certainly at the point when there was an opportunity perhaps to rethink how things were arranged.

The Friends of the Library was never a separate entity. If you joined the Friends of the Library, your check was made out to Dartmouth College. In the memo, you put "Friends of the Library". In every way, Ed and I assume Margaret [Otto] and I assume Margaret's successor were in charge of that money. I am sure that there was consultation. However, the Friends of Hopkins Center had their own bank account. Though that is, in a sense, a trivial thing, it had the makings of and occasionally the makings turned into reality of a sense of you know, "This is our money." I mean never, never in any way that was unacceptable. That sense of autonomy was, to some extent, something that had to be negotiated time after time. So that was a little wearing and there certainly were more times than once when the old-fashioned phrase of "With friends like these, who needs enemies?" But that was always a joke. There was never anything that was detrimental or even truly troubling. The place where the Friends of the Hopkins Center and the board of overseers intersect in a way that has been of great importance and presumably will always from now on be of great importance…

One of the people who joined the board of overseers – I think was one of the original members – was a man called David Picker [David V. Picker '53], who was I think the class of 1950 or somewhere in there, who was a very successful film producer, not super successful and therefore not super rich, but successful. He was the first person I encountered who brought into his dealings with everyone, except I assume his family, some important principles of his corporate existence. The one which hit me first and hardest was a phone conversation lasts no longer than it absolutely has to. "If there is something you want to tell me, tell me. If there is something you want to ask me, ask me. Good-bye." Not even "How are you?" That was a lesson that was important to learn.

That piece of hard-nosedness, as it were, had an important role because some way into the existence of the board of overseers… I guess from the beginning, the finances of the center were reported to them, I mean, just as a matter of course and I don't think anyone was under any illusions, especially if they had money and certainly especially if they were Dartmouth alumni as well, that they were expected to cough up and everybody did.

But somewhere along the way it was David who raised in a very, very hard-nosed way at a meeting…Yes. I guess there were two meetings. There was one in New York and one in Hanover. This was a meeting in Hanover at the Hanover Inn in one of the meeting rooms. So the finances were there and there was probably some statement about our fundraising objectives and all of that and among the items of income was the money that came from the Friends of Hopkins Center into the center's budget. I don't remember what the figure was, but David put his finger on it, I mean literally as well as everything else, and said, "You mean this is all you get from the Friends of Hopkins Center in any given year?" I mean he was very direct. "And the president of the Friends is ex-officio a member of this board?" I don't remember who the president was that year, but she doubtless went slightly red-faced at that moment. "Well I think, Mr. Chairman, this is simply untenable. If there is to be the Friends of the Hopkins Center and if they are to justify their being represented on this board. If this board means anything more than something on paper, this isn't satisfactory and I think we should challenge the Friends of Hopkins Center and, from now on, if they are not adding let us say fifty thousand dollars to the budget at the Hop, then let's rethink the whole thing."

So that was…I suspect that the person who was president at that time was a woman who came into the picture because she and her husband, or her husband retired and they came to live in Hanover. Allen had known them socially in New York. Allen, by that time, had been, as it were, let go and shunted off to a job that he did extremely well as one of the associates in the alumni fund. He stayed until his retirement as part of the development thing. He was a very affable fellow and very gregarious. So, in terms of goosing the class agents and all of that from his era, he was excellent. I think that he was much more satisfied as an associate there than he had been at this rather amorphous job over at the Hop. I think he had already left by then and there was, of course, no replacement, at least not as secretary of the Dartmouth Arts Council or for the board of overseers.

But Fred Appel, he was called, was someone that Allen knew socially from somewhere or another and Ella Appel, Fred's wife, had been very, very active in a very, one might almost say, almost aggressive way in philanthropy in New York City. I think she was at one point the national president of the YWCA. She was very expert and I hope I am right in remembering because, of all the presidents in my time, she was the one who would respond positively to David Picker's challenge, rather than defensively. But she also, by virtue of her wealth and history, tended to think of it in terms of a place that an activity which was closely associated with wealth and social standing. If there is a down side to that development in the Friends, it basically starts from Ella's time. Not because she was in any way unpleasant, pushy, all of those things, but she just took it for granted that there was an obligation that went along with being on the board of such an organization and the obligation involved money and it also involved opening your house and your house was likely to be grand and so on. I think this is a good place to end.

End Tape 8, Side A
(No Tape 8, Side B)
Begin Tape 9, Side A

DONIN: Today is Tuesday, May 13, 2003. I am in Buffalo, New York, at the home of Peter Smith, continuing part two of our interview for the oral history project. So continuing in sort of a linear fashion, not entirely, though, I wanted to hear your thoughts about what you envisioned the role of the Hopkins Center being when you arrived at Dartmouth; what you found it to be when you got there, and what your goals were for changing it.

SMITH: Okay. I think one of… And I will try not to say "and I may have said this before," I'll try not to say that too often because I'm not absolutely clear, of course, about what things got talked about in the previous session.

I think from the very beginning, certainly from the time when I read the publication that was put out to celebrate the opening of the Hopkins Center, I had taken in that it was the college's intention, indeed its commitment virtually, that it should be a regional arts center. That it should provide access to the arts for anybody who cared to find their way there. I think that, on the whole, the problems that arose, certainly in my time and Warner's on tape talking about his....

The problems that arose from that were very few and relatively easily dealt with. They consisted of people in the community not attached to the college who had in some respects taken this commitment to making it a regional arts center to mean that its facilities would be available. Whereas, as far as I know, it was never intended that that would be the case. I think what was meant, and certainly what actually happened in terms of its being a regional arts center, was that virtually everything that it put on to which people could come as members of an audience was available equally to people outside the college as well as people inside.

I am almost absolutely certain that there was only one time, after I'd been there a few years, when Center Theater was the place in which a local theater company put on a production. It only happened once. It was not easy to deal with. I think that it satisfied the people who wanted to put on their show, which was a production of a musical, whose name I can't now remember.· I can see one or two of the scenes; it doesn't too much matter. But I think it was put on by what became – and for all I know what still is – North Country Community Theater or something of that sort.

It was largely a matter of the difficulty of finding a chunk of time when the theater could be used for a production, which inevitably, of course, meant used for at least the last set of rehearsals for that production, in what was already a busy schedule. There was a degree of territoriality.

I felt that it was my responsibility always to negotiate with the theater department, the drama department, for access to the theater. And that meant, almost always, working out when it would be possible for a touring theater group, of which there were a few of sufficiently good quality to bring them in, or, more frequently, visiting and touring dance companies. But those visits, I think, probably without exception, were one-night stands in the case of theater, and a three-day visit on the part of dance companies. So that getting that community theater show into Center Theater, Moore Theater, was a big jump. I don't think there was any… I think there was a good deal of pleasure that came to the community people who took part because they were playing in the best theater space for miles and miles and miles and miles around. And it built a certain amount of goodwill.

And when it didn't happen again, I don't think, at least I wasn't aware of any significant amount of resentment. I think that may be because that coincided with the work that was done, mainly by people in the

· Auntie Mame

community rather than the college, to rehabilitate the Lebanon Opera House and turn it into performing space again. The college helped with that, I think both in terms of consulting with the leaders in the community who took on the work of dealing with the Lebanon City Council, town council, and finding the money. I think there was very goodwill between that group and the people at the Hopkins Center, including the theater people.

And it seemed appropriate to all of us that the Hopkins Center would sponsor the first visiting theater company that occupied the Lebanon Opera House. So that we had a gala opening that brought together everybody who'd worked from the community on that project, as well as a lot of people from the college, including, for the opening night, John Kemeny and Jean. And it was a very big success.

I am almost sure that it was an occasion that ended up costing the college a fair amount of money. We brought in a road company to put on a musical called Light Up the Sky. It had two or three well-known Broadway people in it, Celeste Holm was in it and her husband, Wesley Addy. And so was Joe Levine, who had been the original Nathan Detroit in the Broadway production of Guys and Dolls. So it was modestly star-studded. Now I'm thinking about it, it wasn't a musical, it was a play. I think it was a play about putting on a musical. Something like that.

The arrival of… And I guess if there was anything other than goodwill on the part of the college in encouraging people to work on getting the Lebanon Opera House going again, there was a degree of self-interest in that its availability made the college's policy about access to Center Theater much less relevant. As long as Center Theater was the only place where you could do that and have an audience of several hundred… I think the Lebanon Opera House when it's full has a bigger audience than Moore Theater. But at any rate, it certainly made a very big difference because the refurbished Lebanon Opera House – and I believe it's been improved again since then – really did provide a more than adequate space for community theater.

And I think I'm right that the only time subsequently when the Hop, as it were, rented it… And we must have done that because it had many more seats than Center Theater. There was a touring production of the musical 1776, which brought an equity company to the Lebanon Opera House on that one occasion.

The actors' equity delegate reported back in very negative terms because, although the Lebanon Opera House had been put in good shape for community theater, it didn't meet the standards required in an equity contract. And quite how we got away with it in my case can't have been true for the producer who was a Dartmouth alumnus working in New York theater. He must have known how things stood. I didn't. So in good faith I signed the contract. It simply didn't conform in terms of the number of square feet of dressing rooms; the availability of showers, that kind of thing. And in technical terms they probably tested the resourcefulness of the tech director who came with the touring show because there are not a great many places for lighting instruments and so on and so on.

But it worked. It was a very good show. In spite of the reports, there was no possibility of the company's using that to say they wouldn't perform. They were unhappy, but it worked extremely well. And because of the subject matter, I'm sure we had some children's matinees and so on.

DONIN: Did you consider your primary audience then to be the college?

SMITH: Well, I mean this is the subject on which that after-dinner speech that I gave was meant to offer a helpful set of observations. Because what I wanted to get across was that as far as I was concerned, as director of the Hopkins Center, there wasn't a primary audience except for those people, whether they were students, faculty, administrators of the college or people who had no connection with the college, except for all those people who wanted to be in the audience for whatever events were presented to them, which you may recall… I don't remember the exact way in which I expressed it but I know that in trying to deal with the question of who is the Hopkins Center for, I extrapolated it to who is the university for? And I remember using the fact that on the Harvard… (knowing of course that it was a burr under the saddle for a lot of people to refer to Harvard.) But the only word on the Harvard coat of arms is "veritas", and that is who or what the university is for. So if we're talking about "who" the university is there for… And then I went through this list, which I remember included Niels Bohr, which pleased Leonard Rieser a lot. He was there on the occasion. And as I was going through this list of Aristotle and so on, he was wondering which scientist I was going to pick, and Niels Bohr pleased him a lot.

So although I don't think I did say this in exactly the same mode, my view is that the Hopkins Center was there for Shakespeare and Beethoven and the Beatles, as far as I was concerned. And so what

was important was within the limits of our budget and only within those limits, no others, the thing was to present a program of events in the performing arts which was as good as possible of the events of that kind of presentation in music, in theater, and in dance. That's one element of that. So that the quality of the event was the magnet with which to bring an audience in for music, theater, and dance as performed, as far as the imported events were concerned, by the very best artists that the budget could permit.

The second factor, in terms of the basic policy, was that it was alongside those events and involving a great deal more use of the performing spaces than was required for the imported events were the efforts made by the drama department and the music department to create presentations that were fundamentally performances by students under the direction of professionals. The Hopkins Center's almost exclusive role in that part of the programming was to provide as good a management and house management and presentation, publicity, PR backup and support as to provide those things at the highest level that, again, we could find and could afford.

I think that there was… I don't think that it was ever intended that the director of the Hopkins Center should be significantly involved. Perhaps in the opinion of some or many, that there wouldn't be a case that should not be significantly involved for some members of the faculty in those two departments. I think it was sort of taken for granted that the director of the Hopkins Center wouldn't be involved at all. These were the choices being made as to what plays were put on and what the various musical organizations would perform was essentially the drama department's and the music department's prerogative.

I suppose other people could tell you this differently. But I would say that as far as my memory takes me, I was very respectful of that prerogative. But informally… Well, there were two places where I think the director of the Hopkins Center could have, and in my case did have, input with regard to the indigenous events, as we called them. One was through the informal conversations that inevitably took place between the director and the members of the drama department and members of the music department. And those conversations and the degree of rapport and therefore the degree of influence on the part of the director of the Hopkins Center was, in a sense, indefinable. It depended on the extent to which opportunities for conversation arose. I don't think I was ever – I'm sure I was never – asked to come to a drama department faculty meeting in order to work with them on the choice of the season for the Dartmouth Players.

But my relationship with Rod Alexander, the director of theater while I was there, and John Finch, the chairman of the drama department when I arrived there, was always very good. With Errol, whom I guess took over from John Finch as chairman of the department, it was less good because Errol was, and as far as I know still is, what I would call a literalist. One went by the book, and the book did not include a role for the director of the Hopkins Center in the – as he would very properly call it – the internal decision-making of the drama department. So there was informal contact. But for all intents and purposes, the drama department especially made all the decisions.

I can remember one of the very few times when there was a really angry exchange between me and a member of the faculty in either of those departments. It had to do with my… It had to do with the hiring of a designer for a Dartmouth Players' production, a set designer, at a time when whoever was the faculty set designer was either on leave or had left and the new appointment hadn't been made.

I intervened by taking advantage of the fact that a member of the board of overseers of the Tuck school was a man who was the CEO of Pillsbury, and who came in for a meeting of the Tuck overseers in the company plane. I guess I got to know about that because his son was a student who was among the people I knew, one of the "Hop rats," one of the people for whom the Hop was a very important element in his life, in his case through the film society. Jeff McFarland [Jeffrey J. "Jeff" McFarland '70] he was called. So this level of detail is surely not important; I should be a little more disciplined here.

At any rate, I flew to Minneapolis on the Pillsbury jet in order to talk to the person who I think was the resident designer at the Guthrie Theater at that point. And quite how I intervened… I can remember the man's name, John Jensen [John T. Jensen]. It's not important. But quite what I expected to get out of that visit I don't know, and I think what I expected came about because John did come to the Hop and did design the production for the Dartmouth Players' production of Guys and Dolls. But at any rate, as far as Henry B. Williams was concerned, which probably meant Errol as well because they were very close, I had overstepped the mark.

I remember we had a great big argument in the scene shop alongside the main stage of the Moore Theater, where Henry was sort of, he was very senior, I mean, he was relatively close to retirement at that point. Henry got very worked up, and I suppose wanted to know by what right

I had taken this initiative. Whether it was a good one or a bad one was not important. I had overstepped the mark. We argued for a while, and then I remember that I ended it very disgracefully by quoting something I must have heard in a movie and walked away. I said, "Henry, you wouldn't understand if I drew you a diagram." And so we didn't speak for a little while after that.

So that was an aberration at least in my years. That is the only instance I can think of where I guess really on the spur of the moment that could only be true, because it was a matter of taking advantage of a free flight to Minneapolis. So the Hop had to pay to get me back. It's the only one I can remember where something like that happened. But this, I think, is all worthwhile in terms of this oral history.

The only other time when I exerted what I took to be a prerogative, which Errol, by then the chairman, was very, very unhappy about, occurred in the interval between the end of the Congregation of the Arts where Center Theater had been used by an equity company that the college paid for and the successive director of theater in my time Rod Alexander chose the membership of. When the Congregation ended and before year-round operation came in, which, of course, then led to there being a Dartmouth Players season in the summer. More intense.

Once that got going, it was, I think, one of the best developments in the history of the Dartmouth Players and the drama department at Dartmouth, which was that the summer setup – that is to say, eight performances a week and repertory of three or four productions that had been true during the Congregation with professionals – was now in place for the student actors with occasional guest performers joining them.

But in the time between the one and the other, since the theaters were empty, I believe – and I can't simply have acted on my own. I must have talked this through with Leonard; and indeed it would have to be a part of the budget negotiations for the fiscal years that were covered by this hiatus. But at any rate, in one of those summers and I can't remember whether I took the initiative or whether, as happened in music a bit, somebody else saw that there was an opportunity. But a group of Dartmouth alumni essentially, a smallish group who had launched professional careers in the theater, I guess they came to me -- It's hard to think that I took the initiative – to say, “Can we have the use of the theaters for this summer? Can you put together a budget

that would permit us to come up there and produce plays for you and give you a theater season?" And that happened.

There are two people who were part of that enterprise, who are still professionals. One of them, Jerry Zaks [Jerry J. Zaks '67], is the most successful of our Dartmouth alumni in theater. He's won either two or three Tony Awards as a director on Broadway and has been very successful, and not many years ago got an honorary degree. The other was not an alumnus, was one of the people recruited by Jerry Zaks and, I think, Steve Marcus, Marcus was his surname, who was a contemporary of Jerry's, which meant they graduated in '67, I think. And an actor called John Christopher Jones, who is still very often seen on Broadway stages. Not famous but always working.

They put on a very good season. And I think it didn't sit too well, but nevertheless it was not a source of contention. John Finch at that point was still the chairman. But I guess three or four years later I squeezed into the Bentley Theater, between the end of the school year and the beginning of the Summer Rep, as it came to be called, a production of a play called That Championship Season, where the cast, with one exception, were all relatively recent alumni of the drama department. The only exception was somebody dropped out, and a current student took his place. So it was altogether a Dartmouth affair. I remember it as an occasion when I really did see that Errol's view of what the drama department and the theaters at Dartmouth were for really was different from mine and different from Rod's and maybe others. Because Errol very angrily at one point said to me that he did not see that the theaters at Hopkins Center were there to advance the careers of alumni, even if they were professional. And I think that's the central issue facing any drama department in a liberal arts college, especially one....

End Tape 9, Side A
Begin Tape 9, Side B

DONIN: So Errol Hill....

SMITH: Yes. So that fundamental question is the extent to which the members of the faculty of a drama department should have the professional theater in mind as they teach what they teach. Errol, I think it's true to say, would argue that it doesn't have the professional theater in mind at all. That there are things to be taught in the area of theater which are practical, which go beyond the mere study of the text which is done in the English department, but which are still essentially abstract, as it were, pure. It's like I've never known what the difference is between

pure and applied mathematics, but there is that distinction, and I think that, though I'm sure that Errol or anybody else for that matter wouldn't use the same words, it nevertheless applies.

And I think the dichotomy, as it were, that existed through the decades before the Hopkins Center arrived, where theater activity at Dartmouth, the Dartmouth Players' activity, once it stopped being entirely run by students (if it ever was); but during the years, the 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, when essentially Dartmouth theater was run by Warner Bentley and Henry Williams, that dichotomy existed them. Because Henry was far more, to use my terminology, a purist, as it were, an academic, than was Warner. That showed itself, in part, in the way the season divided itself: Warner was the one who put on the musicals. Henry was the one who directed the classic plays, although he also, because he was a G&S enthusiast, put on productions of Gilbert & Sullivan, and continued to do that right through until his retirement.

In the era that we're talking about, that difference was effectively personified by Rod Alexander and Errol Hill. That particular division, between what one might call popular theater, including the musicals, and the classics was still in place. And a succession of junior people came into the drama department to bring the total up to three of faculty members who directed productions.

On the whole, in my time, that third director was more in the Errol Hill mode than the Rod Alexander. What is striking, and to me not at all surprising, is that although the people who've been successful as professionals in theater – there are half a dozen who've done very well from this era – their friendship, their alumni affection, is or was always in Rod's direction rather than Errol's. Because, I think, they, having gone into the theater professionally, whether it was as playwright or as actor or as administrator, they saw that Rod's approach and methodology and enthusiasm of a certain sort provided a bridge to the professional theater which Errol's, and whichever the younger people they dealt with, did not.

It's not a problem or an issue that has any resolution. I expect that it exists in one form or another and one degree to another in every institution which teaches the practice of the arts to undergraduates. It doesn't, I suppose, too much matter in the long run. Because the people who participate in theater and in the musical organizations in liberal arts colleges end up making a contribution to the art form ultimately in one way or another, more frequently as somebody who

goes to the theater and couldn't live without going to the theater, than being someone who actually earns a living in the theater.

And that being the case – and I think it's in terms of applied mathematics as it were – the activity that goes on in the arts departments in liberal arts colleges went on at Dartmouth – in terms of the teaching of the arts, can be justified in terms of applied by the building of audiences and, more than that, in that the leading liberal arts colleges provide an elite among their alumni who are likely to be disproportionately represented in the professions that are not arts professions, the law, medicine, business. From those people, from the people who've learned to love theater while they were at college, come the boards of trustees and directors of the institutions which make up, throughout this enormous country, the professional world or indeed the amateur world, for that matter, too.

I think that in that sense, in terms of the contribution, the existence, the programs of the Hopkins Center, both indigenous and imported, the contribution that the Hop made to the arts in America certainly included, and presumably continues to include, that very, very important one of educating, either through attendance or through participation, alumni who become leaders in their communities and for whom the arts have become significant.

Just to sort of round out the question of participation as it affected the community, nothing happened except occasionally casting someone in a play who was not a student or a member of the faculty, and that happened relatively seldom. Our friend Bonnie Wallin is a case where even after the place went coed and so on, Bonnie would from time to time find herself a member of a Dartmouth Players' production. But the basic generalization is that, with the exception of that production – (I think it was Mame. I think that's what it was. I can see this woman, whose name I can't remember, it ended in "man."· I know her name; it was one of those that come from occupations. Whether she was or somebody on her behalf was very active in the early years of the feminist movement, wanted her to be called "something person." That's a digression.) With the exception of that one production and a handful of community members cast, the theater activity and space at the Hopkins Center was never community.

In music I think the same pretty hard-and-fast rule applied. There were people who were professionally trained as musicians living in and around Hanover, who came to ask if they could play in Spaulding, if

· Peggy Cooperman

they could give a recital, if they could be part of it. And the answer was always no.

Then I don't know who hit on this. I truly cannot remember. I doubt that it was me. But somebody came up with the idea, at least during the time I was there (I don't know whether it still flourishes) of weekly recitals in the Faulkner Recital Hall, some of which were given by student musicians who were by no stretch of the imagination ready to perform as soloists or in small ensembles in Spaulding, but who should have and wanted an opportunity to perform for an audience.

But in the Faulkner Recital Series, which was once a week, as I recall, in the noon hour, many people from outside the college community got a chance to play before an audience, and that made a great deal of sense. It helped a lot. Unlike the situation in theater, some of the musical organizations that existed because the college existed, most notably the Handel Society Chorus, but also for most of the time that I was there the Dartmouth Symphony Orchestra, would have had a very hard time putting on concerts without members of the community. And certainly at the very beginning, I think, of the expansion of activity by the musical performance groups under the rubric of the music department, at the very beginning there were probably more community members than students in the Handel Society and in the orchestra and the band. The only really sort of pure student ensemble was the glee club, appropriately so.

It's possible, for all I know, that the proportions of community to students in the chorus and in the orchestra is now the opposite of what it was then, that there are relatively few. But I don't know. But I do think that especially the Handel Society Chorus did play an important role in terms of the Hop's contribution to community activity and so on.

There was one instance where there was sort of ambiguity, where the wife of a prominent member of the history department, who for a short time was provost or dean of the faculty, who had trained as a singer and was determined to create an opera group in Hanover, and taught a lot of people, including a lot of students. I'm just remembering the woman who played the lead in Mame was called Cooperman, Peggy Cooperman. Very charismatic member of the community. I don't know how she made a living. But anyway, Mrs. [Ruth] Morton, her husband was a professor of history called Lou Morton [Louis “Lou” Morton], L-O-U, I think her name was Ruth. She made life very difficult for me for two or three seasons, by virtue of making it very, very clear that she

wanted opportunities for her students to perform in the Hop and not just in the Faulkner Recital Series.

I'm sorry to say that I can't remember very accurately how we dealt with that. Except that there were at least two occasions when we fudged it in some way so as not to create a precedent, and Ruth did conduct I guess a pick-up orchestra and singers in Spaulding. And I think it stopped at a point where somehow it didn't meet with a great deal of success. But I could be mis-remembering that. There may have been something far more sort of formal in the way of decision-making and somehow she was talked out of it. Or I as director put my foot down. I can't quite remember.

DONIN: Now last week we touched on, not last week, last interview we touched on the origins of the galleries that obviously started with the Hop. How did the building of the Hood Museum change the relationship of the Hop to the community?

SMITH: I mean just as before the existence of the Hopkins Center there was a concert series in Webster Hall, though there were only, as I recall, a handful of concerts each year with people coming from outside; and in the same space there were productions by the Dartmouth Players in a little theater in Robinson Hall and also the Handel Society performed there, there must have been an orchestra. I think, at least certainly the Dartmouth Symphony Orchestra didn't come into existence with the arrival of the Hop.

Just as the performing arts were made available to the community in terms of audience involvement by the college, subsidized by the college, so there was a gallery program in Sherman, where the art history faculty is. Rather limited because there is relatively little gallery space. But Jerry Lathrop [Churchill P. “Jerry” Lathrop ‘37A] was in charge of that while also being a member of the art history department, a professor of art history. He was called "Jerry." His first name was Churchill, Churchill P. Lathrop. (I remember being quite surprised when I asked him how come he was called Jerry. It was, apparently, a gradual sort of sound that came out of Chervy. So he was called Churchy and Chervy and Jerry, and Jerry stuck.) And there must have been a modest amount of money made available for an exhibition program, even though, I think, it probably most of the time consisted of the relatively small number of objects of art that the college owned that had been given by alumni and so on.

It was obviously intended that the arrival of the Hop should expand their program, should make it very much more accessible because in Sherman you had to climb a couple of flights of stairs, and the only publicity for it was a small little case on the outside. Those galleries stayed functional after the Hop was opened, but essentially showing only, as it were, the permanent collection. The space devoted to the exhibition of visual art in the Hop was not trivial, especially when one took into account the back-room space where the objects were stored and where the staff of the program had their spaces.

At the same time as the Hop opened, I guess exactly at the same time – this is something that can easily be checked within the sort of formal records – the program in the teaching of the practice of painting and sculpture also was expanded within the context of the department of art as it was then called. And to go with that development, the public aspect, as it were, of the development of that curriculum was that the budget of the Hopkins Center included a line item for artists in residence. That was for many, many years… Most of the time while I was there, that phrase applied only to people in the visual arts. It was the prerogative of the head of that program.

I think just about the time that I left the running of the Hop in 1981, that the art department divided, or was divided, and became art history and studio art or whatever that is called. It had been a slightly unhappy marriage, I think. When the whole program in the arts in general, both in terms of the practice of the arts and the study of the history, theory, and criticism, when those programs had been small, the coexistence which for many, many years didn't go much further than having Paul Sample as artist in residence sort of on a permanent basis, there was, I think, considerable harmony.

As the art history department grew and grew in significance, I think one of the things that Leonard Rieser must have felt proudest about in terms of the development of the faculty at Dartmouth was the creation of a first rate, really first rate, in the context, art history department. In terms of numbers, the people from studio art were outnumbered; and, depending on a given day, a given issue, a given response to a given decision, there was either a relatively good sense of collegiality or there was something other than that. And it was, I think, increasingly difficult for the people in studio art, the ones that by virtue of that line item in the budget I had an actual relationship with, it was increasingly difficult for them to feel (I'm trying not to say “un-threatened” because that sounds far too strong), but they were certainly outnumbered and I think perhaps felt they were under-appreciated.

I'm pretty sure that a source of tension came… I know that if Leonard in his tapes talks much about the development of the arts, he probably does refer to the fact that when it came to tenure decisions, the very small group of senior people in studio art seemed to be incapable of bringing their junior colleagues into their tenured faculty. And I think that in itself was a source of tension between the art historians and the studio art people. Because certainly people in art history were brought in as instructors at the beginning of their careers and did get tenure there. And it didn't happen in the other half of the department.

Where I, I guess, certainly in terms of the sort of *de jure* involvement with the visual arts, there's another place where the Hopkins Center had, at least on paper, a role, which was that the artists in residence, the program for artists in residence was a very simple one. The artist in residence was chosen by the head of the visual arts part of the art department with virtually no – as far as I could make out – with virtually no consultation with anyone except the other senior member. We're talking about Matthew Wysocki and Varujan Boghosian[Varujan Y. Boghosian]. That's a mouthful. W-Y-S-O-C-K-I. And Boghosian is still around, so he's.... So the program was very sort of watertight in that respect.

The artist in residence was required essentially to do nothing but paint or whatever else he did in the artist in residence studio. And expected to have his door open for a good deal of the time that he was there and expected to interact with students in the courses in studio art, but always – and I think this was one of the great strengths of the program – these requirements were defined very, very loosely. And I think it was good because it presumably meant that the artists in residence were, on the whole, having accepted this situation, comfortable and didn't feel sort of under the gun in anyway. And as far as I know, the program was, generally speaking, successful.

The other requirement of the artist in residence was making arrangements with the people who ran the studios, sorry, the galleries program, making arrangements for an artist in residence show. Those became sort of built into the galleries program. And in almost all cases, built in in the sense that there was an artist in residence each term. So when I first got there, there were three a year, then there were four a year. And except where the artist worked on a small scale, it was assumed that the Jaffe-Friede Gallery, the biggest of them, would be the site for the artist in residence exhibition, with a little spill over, from

time to time, depending on the way in which the artist made his or her art.

But one of the issues with Matthew and Varujan was that they seemed very disinclined, which is probably a more positive way to say it or a more formal and firm way to say it, very disinclined to pay any attention to women artists. There were many, many men in succession in that slot before the first woman appeared. The number of women throughout that part of the history of the program was very small. Similarly, there were very few women taken on as assistant professors. And nobody, none of the few women who did come in in that capacity, arrived at tenure. So that, too, was a source of some concern.

End Tape 9, Side B
Begin Tape 10, Side A

DONIN: So the Hood?

SMITH: Well, before the Hood arrived, we got into a little bit of a crisis in terms of the visual arts within the Hop. Because the person who had been appointed to run the galleries program when the Hop opened, a man called Truman Brackett [Truman H. Brackett, Jr. ‘55], a Dartmouth alumnus, and I think something of a protege of Jerry Lathrop's, and a very good colleague, an interesting colleague, very low-key in personality, came into an inheritance – I think it was as basic as that – which enabled him to stop working. I mean I don't think it was a huge one, but it did enable him. And I think to the surprise of many of us, Truman took the opportunity to stop running the galleries program.

By then the visual arts at Dartmouth were sufficiently prominent, both in terms of the college itself, within the college, and also in the world outside, that it was appropriate to have a serious search for Truman's successor. We appointed someone with a pretty high profile within the art museum profession. The search committee must have included people from both halves of the art department and perhaps somebody else from some other arts & sciences department. And I guess I chaired it or possibly, yes, I probably did. But it was obviously an important appointment to be made because it essentially reflected the growth in importance in the arts. Quite apart from the fact that there was no such thing as affirmative action, I'm sure that at the point where Jerry retired, stepped down, it was simply a matter of his saying, "I think Truman Brackett would do this very well." Maybe Truman was even an assistant to him before that; I don't know.

But when it came to Truman's successor, it was a serious search. And the person appointed was whatever the opposite of “retiring” is in terms of his personality. He was Dutch, though he'd lived in the United States for a long time, and came to Dartmouth from being the first director of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Chicago. So we were into if not the major leagues, then certainly triple-A. (I don't know how the minor leagues work.) But anyway, he was an important person, and he had publications to his credit. Very soon after he got there, Abrams, the principal art book publisher in America, brought out a large book by Jan [Jan Van der Marck] on the sculptor George Segal.

There were two things of unavoidable tension coming out of Jan. One was that he was a national figure in terms of the arts and very prominently in terms of the *avant garde*. He was well known in this respect. He worked in the field of the visual arts *avant garde* with great conviction. So that was one thing. The other thing was that in terms of personality, he was a case, I think, of arrested development. He was in the less good sense of the word, child-like. He made his decisions very quickly. He stuck to them. He wanted everything when he wanted it. He had very little in the way of tact or subtlety or nuance. I mean it's not unreasonable to say that much of the time his mode, his method, was to act like a child, though, he wouldn't, of course, have accepted that.

DONIN: Did he report to you?

SMITH: He reported to me. Yes, he did. His budget was part of my budget. Jan was one of the most important people in the arts at Dartmouth during my time there, but it cost a lot. Within a matter of days, I think, of his arrival… And of course the candidates for the job had met the various people within the program, as well as on the search committee. It was a very small staff. I think there was one curator and one registrar and one administrative assistant.

But very, very, very early on Jan came to me to tell me that he wanted to get rid of the curator. It took a lot of skill – though I say it myself – to get beyond that situation without doing a good deal of harm within the institution. The main reason being that his curator, Margaret Robinson [Margaret I. Robinson] she was called, was a first-rate colleague and was… I don't think one had ever heard anything at all about her except what was complimentary and commendatory and so on. She was quiet, and she was, I guess, in terms of her taste rather conservative. Another important factor and important for lots of reasons was that she was married to one of the stars of the art history department. Quite apart from the intrinsic un-wisdom, if there is such a word, of firing her,

the effect in terms of relations with the art historians would have been terrible. And he had no very good reason except that he, I guess, very quickly had come to the conclusion that if he'd had any say in the matter, she wouldn't have been appointed in the first place which is, in a way, a valid point of view. But it's very, very irrelevant. So he was talked out of it. And I think subsequently never regretted being talked out of it. I mean between them, with the assistance, I think, of a very bright woman who was the administrative assistant, very good in terms of people skills, things sort of calmed down, and I don't know if Margaret ever knew that she had been headed for the gallows.

But the much more tumultuous aspect of Jan's arrival, compared with what had happened during the Truman Brackett years, was in relations with the studio art people. Because Jan found it very, very difficult to have to live with a requirement that a significant fraction of the time available in the galleries was devoted to artist in residence shows in a program in which (a) he had no say except that he… [Laughter] I mean, he had no formal say, but he had a great deal to say about the inadequacy of this program and the inadequacy of the people that Wysocki invited.

It was a serious battle because Matt was a highly experienced person in the field of the arts, of the visual arts, in this country. He also was fairly conservative, and, as happens in all of these programs – and it is not a criticism to make that point – for the most part the people who came to be artists in residence at the Hopkins Center were people he'd known all his life and from his own student days, from his previous occupations. He was in charge of the adult education side of the work of Cooper Union when he was appointed to Dartmouth. He was very well connected. Varujan Boghosian was much more celebrated as an artist, was someone with regular exhibitions in New York City in one of the most prestigious commercial galleries. They knew a lot of people, and they were – certainly as far as I could judge, and I got to be fairly well informed about such things – they made very sound judgments about who they brought in as artists in residence.

The problem was that they had virtually no professional interest in the *avant garde* nor did they have very much in the way of direct connection with the people who lived in that world. And during these years, some parts of what I guess is no longer called the *avant garde* were becoming increasingly prominent, especially the minimalists. So Jan knew all of these people, counted them as friends, was in New York frequently going to the galleries. The people who were his closest friends among the gallery owners in New York, his closest

friends, were the ones who put on the most outrageous or far-out or whatever other word we want to use for *avant garde* artists.

DONIN: Didn't you know all this, though, or didn't the art history people know this before they hired this guy?

SMITH: We must have. I mean we can't have. I mean, even if we didn't know it through the means that occur, I mean the elements that go into a search. I mean you get a vita, you get lots of letters of recommendation. So, yes, we had all that. And I have no doubt, though I have no memories of it at all, that when we met Jan, when he came to be interviewed, and my guess is that he came twice, that is to say we talked to a handful of people, and then when the consensus moved in his direction we brought him back. I think that's true. So in addition to all the other ways of getting informed about him he talked about himself a very great deal. So, yes, we knew.

But in a way the appointment of Jan, the choice of Jan (and I don't now remember who was the runner-up) helped to exacerbate the tension in the art department because the art historians, especially one of the people that Leonard had brought in as a kind of star as indeed he was; he was a very senior person when he arrived. He became during his years at Dartmouth something of a burnt-out case. His name is Jake Jacobus [John “Jake” Jacobus]. He's now an emeritus professor. He was, more than anyone else in the department, certainly more than the people who were artists in the department, he, too, was in touch with the New York scene and had lots of friends. He was there as a single person, a divorced person. He spent a lot of time in New York. He, too, saw Wysocki and Boghosian as relatively reactionary and middle of the road at best. He became something of an ally for Jan. Whether he was on the search committee or not, he probably was because he came in as a full professor, he came in at, as I say, something in Dartmouth terms of a star from, I think, Indiana University, but a major institution. Whether he was on the search committee or not, I'm sure that he would have spoken very favorably about Jan to whoever was representing art history on the search committee. And it was never resolved.

This is odd. I can't for sure remember the circumstances of Jan's departure. I know he was not fired. But I guess it must have been made clear to him and I would surely have had a role in this, as would Leonard. It must have become clear to him that this autonomy that Wysocki and Boghosian had was not going to change. So I think things became somewhat frustrating for him. I think he probably felt almost

from the beginning that though he was sort of in charge of this program, the fact that he reported to me rather than directly to the provost, whereas in Chicago he'd reported directly to a board of trustees, it must have struck him fairly soon that this wasn't exactly a step up in his career.

He was married to a very extraordinary woman, a German, who was as outlandish in terms of her style as Hanover had ever seen. Having said that, I ought to be able to talk about it. She was very, very, very untactful, if that's the right word, tactless. She made even less of a secret than Jan did of her regarding virtually everybody in and around Hanover as provincial, to say the least. She was flamboyant. She dressed flamboyantly. She was a part of a world culture in a way that very few other people in Hanover were, certainly not Jean Kemeny, for instance. So there was a lot of unhappiness.

And the other problem that came with Jan was that in the exhibition program that he was in charge of, which was all of it except for these large chunks of time when Jaffe-Friede was, when he was merely servicing artists for whom he had no time at all, but that still left a lot for him. He brought in two exhibitions, I guess, or created – in one case I think largely from his own collection – two exhibitions that focused on the *avant garde* at its most inaccessible. There is, I think, still, or there certainly was, a movement known as fluxus, f-l-u-x-u-s. And that's beyond me because I don't know enough about art history, and I don't have an appropriate vocabulary. It's beyond me to characterize it at all, let alone in relatively few words. It's very far out. It's a kind of visual arts equivalent of the theater of the absurd. It involves outrageousness, you know, that was the 1970's version of Dadaism, and its exponents are a long way out of the mainstream. So there were these exhibitions which only a handful of people could get enthusiastic about.

I was about to say that one of the other exhibitions which caused a problem was also his, but in fact it was not. I guess a man called [R. B.] Kitaj, K-i-t-a-j, I think, who is an American but who lives in London and has spent almost all his career [there]. I would think that that person, I think he was known by his initials, which I think are R. B. Kitaj. He would have been the only artist in residence who spoke Jan's language. I'm smiling to myself at the thought that Jan must have thought this was an accident. How did Wysocki know Kitaj? That caused a lot of trouble because though his artist in residence exhibition was in the Beaumont May, which no longer exists but which was a small gallery in the downstairs floor of the Hop opposite the workshops,

the student workshops (the place that is now the music library) It was the second-largest gallery, but it was only half the size.

Kitaj's exhibition, which was largely, as were many of the artist in residence exhibitions, a display of recently done work and possibly work that was done at the Hop, included a number of erotic paintings. And while one would have assumed that that wasn't going to be a problem for anybody by then, it certainly became a subject of some contention. Not that anything was changed, but some of the more conservative people on campus – and I remember Ort Hicks, famous Ort Hicks, was one of them – were really quite, quite shocked that these things should be there in public view. I don't remember what they consisted of very much, but there was a little storm which I suppose, since the director of the Hop was still in a sense in charge of that program, that was a part of what I had to deal with.

The great thing about Jan was that he really was an expert. He was very, very good at what he did, apart from interpersonal relations, as it were. Although that also settled down really quite quickly. But he was highly professional in terms of the breadth of his knowledge and his interests, in spite of what I've said about his being devoted to the *avant garde*. He brought in exhibitions that were very accessible, but nevertheless were not mainstream, and had the contacts in New York City particularly and a kind of… He had a lot of energy. So that I remember, for instance, it was a source of tremendous excitement for those of us who cared that within weeks of there being an exhibition in New York which was written about by everybody in terms of here is a new major artist on the field, a woman called Bartlett. I can't remember her first name, and it doesn't too much matter. I mean if anybody wants these tapes about the Hop as a source to be drawn on for whatever, the backup is all there in terms of the catalogs and so on. I think she's called Jennifer Bartlett. But literally within weeks a great deal of the exhibition which had created such a stir in Manhattan was there in the Jaffe-Friede Gallery. I mean displaying not only the energy, but the flexibility, the ability to get his staff excited, etc., etc. And it was a coup. I mean it brought somebody who was at that moment something of a sensation in the art world, he brought her work to the Hop. And it was very, very accessible and for want of a better word, very, very attractive.

So there was quite a lot that redounded to Jan's credit and made Dartmouth a better place to be. But there was always basically a stalemate in terms of his relation to the studio art side of the art department. And I guess his departure… He went to work in Miami for I

think a new museum that was being created by some wealthy man down there. He ended his career as a senior member of the staff at the Detroit Institute. But was always somewhat controversial.

At the point where he left – and I don't have the timing precisely in my mind – by the time Jan left, the college had decided that the creation of a free standing art museum was the appropriate next step for the arts. Though I didn't know it at the time, I don't think I even sort of guessed, at one of the major occasions of the year, probably commencement I suppose, but I know that I found myself sitting next to Harvey Hood [Harvey P. Hood II '18], who was someone I'd heard a good deal about as one of the best people ever to be a trustee of the college. And I'm quite sure that that wasn't accidental.

It was John Meck [John F. Meck Jr. '33], who was the principal go-between for the college in the negotiation for the gift from Harvey that made the Hood possible, who had put us together. I'd like to think that both then and in a few contacts subsequently before Harvey died, I think we hit it off very well together. I certainly became quite close to Barbara, his wife, and also to his daughter, Libby, Olivia Parker, who was, by the time I met her, she was married to a Dartmouth alumnus. But by the time she came on the scene, she was already a quite well known and fairly widely exhibited photographer, professional photographer. And she was a nice person.

As I say, I can't reconstruct, certainly not from what's inside my head, the sequence of events and the precise timing of all the decision-making that was eventually consummated by the announcement that there would be a museum and that it would be called the Hood Museum of Art. That Harvey's principal gift to the College from his position as a retired, quite elderly man would be in the creation of this space.

DONIN: Just pause here while I turn over the tape.

End Tape 10, Side A
Begin Tape 10, Side B

SMITH: And a part of my inability to get all these pieces together in terms of the exact sequence of events is that I can't quite remember at what point Jan disappeared from the scene. I think it may well have been at a point where a decision had been made and was known to have been made – although it was not a matter of public knowledge – that there would be a museum. I think that may have been there, but I can't be

absolutely sure. At any rate, he saw this opportunity as the one to take. It occurs to me as I'm sitting here that I may be forgetting something in terms of not being pushed out. I think I would remember if there had been--if I had been involved in telling Jan that he should be looking for a new job. But I think it's possible that I'm forgetting some degree of its being made clear to him that things were sufficiently unsatisfactory and there was not going to be any change of any great significance in the immediate future on the studio art front. I mean he may have gotten the message. I can't remember.

I do remember that by the time we were searching for his successor, we certainly knew that that person would have a significant role in the development of the Hood, or of the museum, even if it wasn't then known who the benefactor would be. Of all the searches I've been involved in, I think both at Dartmouth and at Santa Cruz, for that matter, I was to some extent involved in some important searches, and certainly the many searches that I was involved with at Columbia. None turned out as badly as the one that I'm talking about now. It was something of even more than ordinary significance because the museum was definitely in the picture. Again, I'm not keeping in my mind the details of who the other candidates were or very much about the sequence of events.

But what is particularly memorable to me personally about this search and this appointment was that at some point fairly soon after the appointment was made, I ended up feeling that I'd personally been badly let down by one of the people I'd admired most. The person who was appointed at this juncture, and who was, I guess, the first director of the Hood, was a man called Richard Teitz, T-e-i-t-z [Richard S. Teitz].

[Interruption in Tape]

So to come immediately to that point about feeling let down: Richard Teitz, at the point where he applied for the job at Dartmouth, was the director of the Museum of Art in Worcester, Massachusetts. And Worcester, Massachusetts, was the place where Frank Harrington had lived practically all of his long life. And of course he'd been much involved in the Worcester Museum.

So it was essential, I mean it was obvious, that Frank had to be talked to. And I suppose it's a sign of my standing with Leonard that it was left to me to talk to Frank. It was only later that it hit me that Frank had either been feeling compassionate in some way *vis-à-vis* Dick Teitz or

that he was expecting me to read between the lines. But I think that I'm not being unfair to the memory of Frank Harrington to say that he can't possibly have been as frank as he should have been.

The phrase that's stuck with me and is still in my head, because it was a phrase that I hadn't heard before and yet conveys something precise, was that he said that it was his impression that with Dick Teitz, his "springs were always tightly wound." So I sort of took note of that. I guess that I took it as saying as much as I needed to know in terms of what Frank had to say about his personality.

What the situation was, however, was that Teitz was essentially neurotic in terms of the… Richard Stucker [Richard L. Stucker] and I… Richard was my associate director at the Hop, and a quite remarkable person. (I'll remember where I was, and I'll come back to where I was.) He came to the Hop at the point where my business manager who, while I was there – while he was there – was given the title of assistant director.

I'm pretty sure that I spoke about John Goyette last time. And I'm fairly sure that I spoke about handling the situation with John rather badly and leaving him so unhappy that he left. By the time he left, Jan Van der Marck was my colleague. When the search started for John Goyette's replacement, Jan brought to my attention a guy called Richard Stucker who had been his business manager at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Chicago, and who had moved on from there to be the person in charge of the administrative side of things at the Indianapolis Museum, having had some time between Chicago and Indianapolis working at the Wadsworth Atheneum in Hartford, Connecticut. He was very well qualified for the job, and we hit it off very well, and we're still very good friends. He knew a lot of people in the art world, in the art museum world, as did Jan. He came to mind because it quite often occurred that we would comment on… I mean, I'm taking an absurdly long time to talk about this just because it's so ridiculously childish in a way.

But Dick Teitz was truly uptight. To use a slightly coarse phrase, he was a tight ass, and this applied to everything he did. He was a fanatical runner. He ran many miles every day. He was patently mistreating his long-suffering wife; I don't think they're together now. He was mean. He was always with his springs tightly wound, had very little in the way of give about him, and was just not an easy person to do business with. I guess eventually he was asked to leave just because it came about that virtually no one who had to deal with him

found it, well, certainly didn't find it pleasant; but in lots of ways didn't find it sort of easy in the standard way.

Perhaps if I had realized in the last couple of weeks thinking about this session, that I would be bound to talk about Dick Teitz, I would have worked out rather more precisely what there was to say about him. There was an element, too, of a kind of dishonesty, that this closeness, this very self-centered, very self-absorbed way of dealing with other people sort of led to his not being fair in his assessments of his colleagues, that kind of thing.

DONIN: His title was still..?

SMITH: No, I think he may have… I'm slightly embarrassed by this aspect of my forgettery, as it were. I think he may have been designated as director of the Hopkins Center.

DONIN: Of the Hood.

SMITH: Sorry, of the Hood. Freudian slip. Now I'm even more embarrassed because one of the things that I certainly want to talk about is the selection of the architect for the Hood Museum. I was the chair of that committee, and I guess Dick must have been on it. But I'm sure – I think I'm sure – that he wasn't there when it opened. Well, this definitely, for whoever has to cover this in any place other than the oral history archive, the facts are easily findable.

DONIN: Exactly.

SMITH: Yes.

DONIN: The dates and the titles don't really matter.

SMITH: It's hard for me to think that he wasn't on that committee. And by the time he came… I'm pretty sure of this in terms of the interweaving of different activities. By the time he came, I had decided that I was going to give up the Hopkins Center; I'm pretty sure of that. It was certainly while I was in effect a lame duck while the search was going on for my successor that the process of choosing the architect was carried on. I must have had… I don't think the budgets were separated until the Hood itself opened. But I think that in terms of nomenclature, Dick Teitz had that element of separation from the work of the Hop and from my titular heading up the galleries program.

DONIN: In terms of planning the Hood, you must have been very heavily involved.

SMITH: Well, yes. More involved was Richard Stucker. And although I know that…(And I have to admit that I've still not written my letter to Jim. I've been telling myself that it would be much better if I waited until after this session so that I can lay it on thick. I promise you I will write as persuasive a letter as I've ever written, and I've written a few that got stuff done. I do believe in the great significance of this oral history archive and I hope that it will be sufficiently extensive that it's reasonable to include spending some time with Richard because he was in the thick of it at this point.) He was fired, effectively, by my successor at the Hopkins Center; it was a very unhappy-making event indeed, especially for Richard but certainly also for me.

It came as a great shock to him. A further shock at the point where nobody in the administration – this is by now the David McLaughlin years – would investigate, would look into the decision-making and so on. He left very disillusioned. And for a period of a few years actually lived in Buffalo, actually in the suburb in which SUNY at Buffalo exists because he worked there as the right-hand man of the dean of arts & sciences at SUNY-Buffalo. And then, to his great joy and everybody else's, as far as I know, he was appointed as the right-hand man of the director of the Montshire [Museum], which is where he still works and presumably will work until his retirement.

Richard was… Oh, yes, now this comes back to me. Yes, Richard for a spell was the acting director of the galleries program or of the Hood? Did Teitz come and go so quickly? Richard was certainly very deeply involved in the work that Dartmouth did with Charles Moore, the architect. I bowed out quite… I mean my actually leaving the Hop was delayed while the search went on and while I was still the director and still had that as my occupation, Charles Moore was chosen. And I guess I was there in the very, very first stages of the implementation of what then transpired. But Richard was… Maybe it was between Jan Van der Marck and Dick Teitz's arrival.

One of the things that I remember, because I admired Richard for it, though I thought he was wrong and I certainly was very, very distressed, that in the course of the time that Richard was in charge of the galleries program, as well as being associate director of the Hop, I wanted very strongly to arrange an exhibition of the work of an artist I greatly admired in New York. Richard said, no, and he had the right to say, no. I was surprised and annoyed, but it was not to be argued with.

He, as acting director, he had the last word. Maybe Teitz wasn't on the search committee for the architect because he wasn't there yet. Sorry about this.

DONIN: It's all right.

SMITH: The process, though, of the search was probably the most interesting thing of its kind that I was ever involved in, and I would say the most successful, too – the one that worked best – as it started and led to the right decision and the beginning of what I believe was an ideal relationship between client and architect, client being the college as represented by Richard Stucker and Leonard Rieser. Then probably…This doesn't make any sense because I was certainly in there in the search and probably chaired the search for Jan Van der Marck's successor. On paper the committee that chose the architect would seem to have been ridiculously unwieldy. I can't remember how many people there were on it, but there were a lot. I mean certainly the art history faculty were represented by more than one person; same for the studio art. The faculty outside of the arts must have been involved.

I think it was my idea – I hope it was my idea because it certainly turned out very, very well – that there should be a trustee on the search committee. Walter Burke [Walter Burke ‘44] was involved I think from the very beginning. And I know it was my idea to have an architect on the committee who was a professional in a fuller sense than the person who was the college architect, so-called, at that time, George Hathorn [George T. Hathorn]. George may have been in the picture; I don't remember. But I made the case to Leonard that with a decision that was of great significance potentially, finding the architect for a building that, if we were fortunate, would be a building that people came to see just in and of itself, that we should have an architect there. And Lo Yi Chan ['54], who then became the sort of master planner for the campus, Class of '54, I think, he was appointed, and he was a part of all our decision-making.

It was a long, drawn out process. Everybody who had any… Certainly everybody on the committee who had any suggestions to make, made them. And some, presumably Richard Stucker and I and our respective secretaries or assistants, were involved in taking suggestions to the next step. There was a point at which this very large committee had to sort through a very large number of statements about the work of the architects who had been suggested and whose work was sort of tracked down in one way or another.

I remember being in a room I think in Baker Library where the first crucial decision was made with a very large grid on a blackboard where this relatively large number of people who someone or other on the committee wanted to see in the running was down one side, and all the names of the members of the committee were down the other, and we did it in some arithmetical way. And as far as I know – I'm almost certain this is the case – to everybody's satisfaction. It worked remarkably well. And our decision had been made earlier; I guess this must have been something that Leonard had had to ratify because it involved expense. I think we'd agreed ahead of time that we would in fact bring to the campus and interview six architects. My recollection is that through this arithmetical process, six people sort of selected themselves. I mean there was something approaching consensus as to who the frontrunners were. They included people, architects, from essentially all parts of the spectrum. They were all but one world famous, which was very gratifying for me.

One of the things that struck me at Dartmouth as I was becoming, as the years went by, a relatively senior member of the community (and Leonard and I must have had conversations about this), was that considering the great significance of the buildings that an institution puts up, significance in terms of their effect upon the people who live and work in them, considering all that, it was rather surprising… Well, two things were surprising. One was that I'm pretty sure that this choice of the Hood architect was the first time that there had been so elaborate a decision-making process. I'm pretty sure that that's the case. The decision-making prior to that… Obviously it had ended up involving the trustees, so it must have involved the president and the provost always. But I'm pretty sure I'm right in saying that effectively it was the choice of, through the relevant years that we're talking about here, it was the choice of Dick Olmsted [Richard W. "Dick" Olmsted '32], who actually should also be interviewed. He must be 90 now. He was a prince of a man. He was wonderful. I don't remember what his title was. But the person who was in charge of buildings and grounds reported to him. The person who was in charge of everything to do with the maintenance of the physical plant, all of that, reported to him.

DONIN: He was the business manager.

SMITH: He was the business manager. Mmmm hmmm. And he was very, very good. So one thing that was surprising was that the… And I'll bet John Meck had a lot to say on that. I mean Dick reported to John, I'm sure. One thing was that the choosers were very few in number. I think this was something that people on the art history faculty especially, but

perhaps generally throughout the place, were not very happy about it. The choice of Wallace Harrison for the Hopkins Center must have been made by Mr. Dickey himself because of the very, very close association between Wallace Harrison and Nelson Rockefeller. But otherwise, I think Dick did most of the choosing. I think the one really world-class architect who had worked at Dartmouth in Dick's time, and may have been of Dick's choosing, was Pier Luigi Nervi, the architect for Leverone and the Thompson Arena.

DONIN: How do you say his last name?

SMITH: N-E-R-V-I.

DONIN: N-E-R-V-I.

SMITH: Yes. It was the first time that – I'm sure of this – that Dartmouth employed a....

End Tape 10, Side B
Begin Tape 11, Side A

DONIN: So you're saying Luigi Nervi was the first foreign architect?

SMITH: Yes. And he was Italian. He worked out of Rome and came to the attention of the average intelligent, educated person because he was principally responsible for the buildings that were built specifically for the Rome Olympics. What year that was I don't remember now, 1956 possibly. Somewhere in there. And he was, as you can see when you go into Leverone, especially because Leverone is very large, had to be large enough to make it possible to play football indoors, he was the world's leading architect at enclosing very large spaces without columns. I think it was probably the high point of Dick Olmsted's professional life, working with him. I don't know who the American architect was who was the liaison and obviously a very important decision. But it worked extremely well. And Leverone is one of the buildings, maybe the only building still at Dartmouth which has what I think of as the "Wow!" effect. You go through the door, and you say, "Wow!" At any rate, one of the surprising things, as I say, was that the number of people involved in that decision-making was so small.

The other surprising thing is that there is so few duds. There are many worse buildings at Columbia than there are at Dartmouth, apart from the Berry Library and maybe the Berry Gym there's not much that the average person will turn his nose up at at Dartmouth. But with the

process… And as I'm sure I said in the earlier taping, I'm one of the people who thinks that the Hop is a wonderful piece of architecture. Not quite wonderful in terms of the “Wow!” effect but certainly remarkable in terms of how well it works and how excellent the two large gathering places are.

So we got down to six, and we invited them all to the campus, I think, in three lots of two. I think that's how we worked it, but that's an unimportant detail. My personal involvement in terms of me as a person rather than as the chairman of the committee was that the name that I threw into the hat was another foreigner. The thing really was done democratically, but enough people got interested in my candidate that he made it through to the final six, which was very, very gratifying.

I had never seen any of this man's work except as photographs. I came across him in a very, very large exhibition that was put on at MOMA, the Museum of Modern Art in New York, dealing essentially with architecture from around the world. I remember being struck by the fact that it came out at some point early on in these proceedings that Walter Burke had also gone around that exhibition and had taken in this, that, and the other thing. The architect's name was Gottfried Boëhm, B-O-E-H-M, working out, I think, of a not very large town close to Frankfurt.

What was striking about the buildings, the photographs of which were my first contact with him, was how the buildings themselves were patently works of art. I mean you said "Wow!" on the outside as well as on the inside. What I first saw was a cathedral in Germany. That was the one that was displayed in this MOMA exhibition. Once we got to… I think we also had three stages. We must have had some degree of knowledge about oodles of architects, and then we got slides and submissions of portfolios and that kind of stuff from a second group, say, 18; I forget, something like that. And it was that group that finally got narrowed down to six. When it came to tracking down more of Boëhm's work, it became even more exciting because he clearly wasn't somebody who'd built one great building.

So we had six architects. Not only did they cover the spectrum from the very modern to the rather, how should I say it? Not ordinary, but somewhat prosaic. But once we got to meet them, they turned out to be very, very different people, too. Once they had been told that they were one of six, they were also given the opportunity to do.... [Phone

rings] (I hardly ever pick up the phone and not around now because that will be a telemarketer I think.)

DONIN: Right.

SMITH: So they were told that they would be in the running. They were told that they would be interviewed in X weeks' time, and we worked out that schedule. And they were free to do whatever they wanted to do in the way of coming to Dartmouth and doing whatever they wanted to do on their visits, and we would give them any help we could just in terms of logistics. I guess the most fashionably famous of the group we chose was a man called Richard Meier, M-E-I-E-R, who'd done a good many things. And I think I'm right in saying that a number of years after – yes, I'm almost certain – a number of years after he didn't get the Hood job, he became the architect for the designer of the Getty Museum out in Malibu or wherever it is. One of the people on the search committee thought of him as essentially a fascist architect, a person, a designer, who imposed a kind of....

[Doorbell rings. Tape stops]

So Richard Meier up to that point had… I guess he'd done the museum in Atlanta, I think the High Museum it's called there. All of them had some connection with previous works of some sort or another with the museum business. So Richard Meier did the least and was the only one of the six that we interviewed who left us with the impression that he didn't really care whether he got the job or not, that it wasn't really all that special as far as he was concerned. And the buildings that we saw in slides and so on were all very cold, very, very imposing and uninviting.

The most sort of theatrical of the people was an architect called Hugh Hardy, who did send some associates up ahead of time to look around and case the joint, who'd done probably more work than any of the others in terms of cultural facilities; and who, when he came for his session with the search committee, flew up in a rented jet and brought an array of models that were rough outlines of how the problems involved in putting the Hood where it was might be solved. And he's a very engaging and extremely articulate person.

The man from Germany, Boëhm, came to present. His session I remember was held in the Moore Theater. They all had slide presentations and other things to offer. I have never at any point had any scintilla of unhappiness about the choice of Charles Moore and the

museum that he created. But I still held onto a degree of regret that Boëhm had not ended up getting the commission. At that point he had not designed any building in the United States. And I think he might have had. He might have come out on top if he had not made a rather strange choice of presenting his, of offering his presentation himself, in spite of his limited English. I think he may have had an associate who helped him when he got stuck for words. But I remember hearing that his son, who was in his firm, was fluent in English, and I couldn't figure out why he hadn't come. It's also true that in the presentation he made with the slides there were more recent buildings than the ones that first caught my attention and that we'd all been very excited about as we discovered more and more about his work. The most recent work seemed strikingly different in appearance.

Our safest, the least idiosyncratic of them was a Boston architect called Graham Gund, who I think may have done work at Dartmouth since. I'm not sure. Who didn't make a very, very strong impression at all. Now, I'm really embarrassed because I'm sure there were six, and I've remembered four plus Charles.· Doesn't matter.

DONIN: It doesn't matter. I can find that from the records as well.

SMITH: Exactly. There was no question at all of which of the six had worked most diligently to get to know the situation exactly. One of Charles' partners had spent a lot of time in Hanover. One of his more junior staff people had been almost resident, and they had without our involvement done a quite intricate study of traffic patterns of who came from where into the Hop, where they went in, where they came out, what was the importance of, you know, where the post office was, the obvious thing, but who did more than simply come in, go to the mailbox, and go out again. It was very, very striking, a degree of serious study of the situation. And in addition to making clear how thoroughly they'd investigated the status quo, they also in their presentation showed a combination of a pretty ingenious kind of imagination at play, combined with a degree of open-mindedness that was very attractive. They seemed to combine the strongest awareness of the peculiarity of the assignment, the need to put so many thousands of square feet into a very particular site, in conjunction with a building that to a certain extent dominated its part of the campus.

DONIN: Was it always the plan to connect Wilson Hall and the Hopkins Center?

· Charles Gwathmey was the sixth.

SMITH: I'm not sure. I should know the answer to that. It certainly was in the plan to link the Hop with the new building. Whether, or to what extent, Wilson was in the picture, I do not know.

This is certainly the time, however, just to put into this particular record a point of view that I have about the arts at Dartmouth, which I have… There's been no reason nor occasion for me to articulate, but which is nevertheless, as far as I'm concerned, something to get into the record, as it were. Whether Wilson, or the extent to which Wilson was, as it were, up for grabs as this project went along is something I can't remember. It was not very high on the list of issues that were important to me. If, as I hope, you get to talk with Richard Stucker, it will probably come out as to how exactly it came to be an important part.

What I want to say is that at the point where I left the process, left the directorship of the Hop, but with Charles chosen and with a certain amount of involvement in the conversations about at least the basic outlines of how this would develop, I had… I guess it's fair to say that I had taken it for granted, which is something one should never do. I interrupt myself to say not that there's any reason to think that what I took for granted would have eventually led to something based on what I took for granted but I had definitely assumed that an effort would be made to have spaces arranged in what was to be built new in this project. That spaces would be arranged that would put the administration of the Hopkins Center and the administration of the Hood Museum side by side. To the extent that I had any kind of an idea of what exactly, of how that might be effected, and I had thought about it a great deal…

I went away from the campus (I had sabbatical time) and I went away from there thinking that there really was only one solution to that *desiratum*. There was one way in which it could most easily be achieved, and that would be that in the space that was built that actually links the Hop and the Hood, the space that is essentially an extension of the snack bar and sits on what had been an outdoor patio at the back of Center Theater. That that would be a two-story affair with the administrative offices for the Hop over the end of the snack bar and linking into the part of the Hop which is just outside Alumni Hall, just outside the faculty lounge. And that the link with the Hood would be more or less what it now is. But that it would be two stories, and that the Hood Museum offices would be in that end of this two-story thing.

What never occurred to me, so I certainly didn't take it into account, what never occurred to me was that the administration of the Hopkins

Center would be moved out of the Hop. And it is something I very, very much regret, though I've never, as far as I know, spoken these words out loud. Maybe I did to Leonard at some point. It seems very strange indeed to me. And I don't know enough about what went on in the decision-making as Charles became more and more at the center of the decision-making. I don't know whether something resembling what I've just sketched out as a way of satisfying what I would have seen and still do see as the essential requirement, that the administrators of the Hop should be in the Hop, I don't know to what extent those things were discussed. I don't know to what extent costs became a factor.

All I know is that I've always seen it as about the only thing of this kind that had I stayed on as director of the Hopkins Center, I would have made it an issue over which I would have resigned rather than see it happen as it has happened. I mean it was always from the very, very beginning… Any discussions, formal or informal, about the creation of the museum right alongside the Hop, it was taken for granted that Shakespeare Alley, which had been shared by the Hopkins Center administration and the drama department from day one, that that would revert to the drama department. This was the obvious thing to do.

Most of the members of the drama department, three or four of them at least, two or three of them, I guess, were over in Bartlett, and this was going to be the way in which the department could be unified in exactly the right place, which would mean that the head Hop people had to go somewhere else, and the Hop administration was also somewhat bigger than it had been when the Hop was designed. So it would be a means for bringing all of us, as it were, into one place to make the work of the Hop administration more coherent. But it didn't happen.

I mean both at Dartmouth and at Columbia, though I guess to a slightly lesser extent at Columbia, having left the scene, I realized the sensible thing to do was to have relatively little to do with where I had been or where I had a successor in both places. And it was appropriate for me no longer to be in any significant way involved in decision-making. The fact of the matter is that I never did inquire of anyone, of Shelton Stanfill or I think even Richard Stucker, about the process that led to the placing of the Hop administration in the basement of Wilson. So I don't know what the issues were. It's possible that the strong feelings I have just expressed might have been modified if I'd been a part of the scene.

I guess that I should admit that even though I am ignorant of what exactly transpired, that doesn't stop me from laying the blame at Dave

McLaughlin's [David T. “Dave” McLaughlin ’54 TU ‘55] door. This isn't the right time to segue into my view of the McLaughlin years because there's still quite a bit to talk about with regard to the 13 years that I was director of the Hop, or twelve and a half, and there's still some more things to say about the Kemeny years in general. It's possible that in this respect I am quite out of line in terms of the extent to which Dave was very active and decisively active in terms of the planning for the Hood, be that as it may.

DONIN: How active was he?

SMITH: Don't know. That's another reason, actually, for… I mean if the oral history archive project is to be as comprehensive as I think it's reasonable to say it should be, then clearly some time should be spent with Shelton Stanfill. And on the matter which I think is important, that is to say the development of the program for the Hop, with Richard and probably with Jackie Baas [Jacqueline Baas], as well. I mean certainly Jackie was the most important person in terms of the early history of the Hood, and was a wonderful colleague and an important person in the history of Dartmouth as a result.

DONIN: Okay. End of this tape. I'll turn it over.

End Tape 11, Side A
Begin Tape 11, Side B

DONIN: ...set some sort of fantastic goal for yourself in the campaign for Dartmouth. I think it was eleven million dollars?

SMITH: Yes.

DONIN: Can you talk about your fundraising in general?

SMITH: Okay.

DONIN: That particular campaign and who were the foundations that supported you.

SMITH: Not very much from foundations, as I recall. I know that when I first arrived there, the Rockefeller Foundation was very much involved in the arts, much, much more than it is now or has been for probably 20 years or so. But at that point, in the late '60s and into the '70s, it was very active.

It was, I guess, assumed that before the Campaign for Dartmouth got off the ground – yes, it must have been – it was I'm sure assumed that this would be a foundation where we'd find an open door and where we'd get a good hearing. Mr. Dickey was on the board of trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation I think for a good number of years. But it didn't happen.

One of the things that I found about fundraising for the arts in higher education (it certainly applied at Columbia as well) is that one sort of falls between two stools in terms of foundations and trust funds which have specific goals, in that the foundations that support the arts tend very, very strongly to say, “We support the professionals. We are in the business of helping those institutions and individuals for whom this is their entire life. And you've got to tell us something. You've got to give us something quite, quite unusual in the way of a rationale for why we should support you, given that this is our priority.”

On the other stool is that foundation which supports higher education and tends to give their support to the more mainstream enterprises within the institutions of higher education. So a foundation like the Rockefeller or the Ford at that point, both of which were very much into the arts and as I mentioned last time, I was sufficiently close to the Ford Foundation arts program to be offered a job there. Nevertheless, they were unwilling to create a precedent by giving any kind of general support grant to an arts center within a university. They have more than enough requests coming from other institutions, symphony orchestras. And the Ford Foundation effectively built up the program of regional theaters in the '60s. But the famous and time-honored reason for not giving money is that, “If we give it to you there's no reason why we shouldn't give it to all the other places that are doing what you're doing.” The Mellon Foundation or the Kenan Foundation, which have been in a very systematic way supporters of higher education, have very strongly centered their giving on the humanities as such. I spent a fair amount of time with the person in charge of the arts at the Rockefeller Foundation in those days, whose name was Howard Klein, coming to grips with the fact that – to put it one way – I couldn't think up any program that made sense to them.

Interestingly enough, at that same time – almost exactly, I would think – the Rockefeller Foundation, through Howard, put a great deal of money into this new SUNY campus at Buffalo. And they put the money in essentially to enable UB to have a resident ensemble in modern music. What I'm about to say, I guess, is a sort of rationalization, after the event, of the facts of the matter, which is that Dartmouth was

basically not in the market for that. That kind of a development was ahead of the state of affairs in the music department and also would have almost certainly reached a much smaller audience than was the case in supporting something within a university in a large urban, metropolitan area.

I think if I went back… If one were to go back to the records of the grants made by the Rockefeller Foundation in those years, one would see that although grants were made to institutions of higher education, they were made to places that were far bigger and centered in far bigger populations than was the case for the Hop and Dartmouth and Hanover.

Had the Congregation [of the Arts] stayed in place and had things turned out differently, which among other things would have meant that Mario di Bonaventura was no longer the conductor of the thing, that might have brought forth sizable monies for at least a period of time from the Rockefeller Foundation. I know… I mean I was certainly on the receiving end of a good deal of complaint from Mario that nobody in the fundraising office at Dartmouth had ever gone after sizable amounts of money in support of his program. And if they had gone after them, they hadn't succeeded.

Another thing which was a disadvantage then and essentially still is, is that even in the days when the federal government was putting money into higher education, the same problem arose: The NEA tended to avoid like the plague giving support to the teaching of the arts in universities and colleges, and the Department of Education had no sense, certainly in higher education, of making the teaching of the arts a priority. So that one was again sort of stuck between two apparent sources of funding, neither of which saw the arts within the college as something that was important to them.

I don't think of myself at any point as being a particularly successful fundraiser. The extent to which money came into the Hopkins Center from sources totally unconnected with Dartmouth was very small. There were annual grants for a while from the New Hampshire Commission and for a longer period of time, annual monies coming in from the Vermont Council on the Arts specifically, almost entirely, to support the outreach program, which was in every respect the right thing to ask for money for and the right thing for them to give money for. I'm certain that money would not have come from either of those state arts agencies without that program. Again, there's no reason why, even though the Hop represented a source of programming that

transformed a fairly wide swath of New Hampshire and Vermont, it wouldn't have made the cut in terms of the grant making just on that account alone. But nevertheless, there was relief to the college budget once it had committed itself to having an outreach program.

I think it would be hard to claim, although this may have changed because – as we touched on at some length last time around – the Friends have been transformed in terms of the amounts of money they raise. So maybe by now the money coming into the program and I think there is a.... When I left the directorship (this was mentioned last time, too) somebody, an anonymous donor, gave a quarter of a million dollars which I'm pretty sure was intended – and I assume is still used in this way – to help offset the cost of the outreach program. This was something that frankly came into existence during my time, and that I was very strongly for it, led, I think, to that designation. As far as I know, even in these very poorly funded years, both the VCA and the New Hampshire Commission still put money into that program. And, of course, the Friends. Maybe it does cover itself now.

The only very significant attempt to get money from a place where Dartmouth had no entrée was the challenge grant that came from the NEA. Where money was raised during my time and in, I guess, most instances through my direct cultivation was within the Dartmouth family.

One of the gratifying things I think that was something that made me, that led to my being seen by the fundraisers in Blunt as part of the team, was that there were notable instances where money came from mainly alumni which it was reasonable to believe would not have come to any other entity within the college. That is, I think, certainly true of the money that was given over the years by Howard Gilman [Howard L. Gilman '44 TU ‘45], even though his family, his father had… Both Howard and his brother were alumni. His father was not. As far as I know, his father didn't go to any college. But his father, by virtue of being impressed by the education that Howard and Chris [Charles “Chris” Gilman, Jr. ’52 TU ‘53] got at Dartmouth, sat down with Mr. Dickey, it is said, one day and just wrote a check for a million dollars for the life sciences building.

Howard was not very close to the college at all. Chris was, I think, to some extent, but mainly just sort of backing up what had been done by his father in the life sciences. Howard, on the other hand, at the point where I was first made aware of his existence, had had nothing to do with the college for a long time, but was in the national press in terms

of being a patron of the arts in New York City. The first time I heard of him, I recall, was Ad Winship [Addison L. “Ad” Winship II ‘42] showing me an article in Time magazine, I think, which was devoted to the settling in America of some of the notable defectors from the Soviet Union. So this was essentially about Rostropovich and Baryshnikov. In the Time article there was a reference by name to Howard Gilman as one of the leading lights in New York cultural life, who had helped to fund the various things that had made it possible for these people to settle and get accepted and so on. So Ad said, "This guy's an alumnus in the class of '44. None of us knows him. We never hear anything about him. We see Chris once in a while. Would you like to make an effort?" So, yes, that happened.

A moment that made me very happy that came a little while after the board of overseers had been established… I think as one of its founding members, Howard Gilman was there. Another person on the board at that point was the director of the Whitney Museum, a guy called Tom Armstrong, who was a friend of Richard Lombard [Richard D. “Dick” Lombard ’53 TU ‘54] (a strange way to get into the art museum world at the top) who had brought Tom there because he was in the stockbroker business, and that was where Dick had gotten to know him. Then he changed his career altogether and found himself very quickly running the Whitney. I remember Tom, in one of the first times I met him said, "You know, you have on this board someone that everyone in my position in New York would like to have on the board. That's Howard Gilman. That's gold and he won't take any kind of position on boards or anything here. But you have him."

The people who, for the most part, ended up giving money that went to the arts at Dartmouth, who were already members of the Dartmouth family, were, for the most part, people who had had no reason to give or at least no reason beyond basic loyalty. I imagine that Howard had put his thousand dollars a year into the Alumni Fund. I don't know. He was one. The guy who put up the money for the electronic music studio, Jerry Bregman [Gerald M. “Jerry” Bregman ‘54], was another. People for whom Dartmouth had been something of a wasteland when they were there.

In fact, just last week I was in New York and went to see the woman who is still employed by the Gilman company, who was Howard Gilman's right hand, the person through whom virtually everything that was done was done. She had never… It's the first time I had seen her, actually, since Howard died. There was no reason why she should ever have been as frank with me as she was on this occasion and

said, you know, in terms of his years there, “Howard had every reason to hate Dartmouth. There he was in the early ‘40s, a Jew, and gay, and loving the arts. That put him behind the eight ball three times over.” I mean it wasn't said within a sentence saying, “So you turned that all around.” But that is, in effect, what happened.

Although the Howard Gilman Foundation at the moment is in rather a sorry way because its fortunes depend on the paper company, and the paper and lumber business is down the tubes and so on. One of the grants that it made in its last and, for the time being, final set of grants was back to the Hop, in addition to bringing the challenge grant up to a quarter of a million. Howard put in the money for the jewelry studio and every year since has paid for the salary of the jewelry instructor, and so on.

The biggest money that came into the Hop during my time came from the woman who had married Bill Jaffe was the… Jaffe and Friede. She had been Mrs. Friede. He, as Mr. Jaffe, had had a son go to Dartmouth and she as Mrs. Friede had had two sons go to Dartmouth and that's how the Jaffe-Friede Gallery came into existence. When Bill Jaffe died, it didn't take a fundraising genius to know that the important thing to do was to cultivate Mrs. Jaffe, who very soon after she was no longer Mrs. Jaffe, was Mrs. Hall.

DONIN: Oh, you mentioned this in the past, yes.

SMITH: Yes. And Mrs. Hall, I suppose, would have given money if she'd been asked or when she was asked. But I think that it was for me the most successful and gratifying experience in the fundraising within the Dartmouth family that I had because we hit it off. She joined the board of overseers though she didn't come to many meetings. I think she's still on the board of overseers. I'm sure she doesn't go out of her house in Palm Beach any longer. But we did hit it off. And then when her granddaughter, John Friede's daughter, applied, I was involved in that. It was a source of great relief to discover that she had every right to be at Dartmouth in her own right.

Mrs. Hall had a great favorite within the Dartmouth community in Jerry Lathrop, who had at the time that the Hopkins Center was being built, brought Bill Jaffe into the fold and had made him the chairman of the so-called Art Advisory Committee. While as part of the bicentennial in 1969, when I was still very wet behind the ears and knew very little about the art scene in New York, Bill Jaffe took the lead in arranging for a rather swanky show. I didn't at the time know that they're not

exactly ten a penny, but that most colleges and universities that have any kind of aspirations to being seen as a cultured place will get its alumni to create an exhibition that will be put on in one of the commercial galleries in New York, the Protean Century as it was called. Which was certainly hair-raising for Truman Brackett, who, quiet and unassuming person that he was, was taken advantage of by Bill Jaffe, ordered him around as though he was a servant kind of thing. But he stuck it out. I guess I had very, very little indeed to do with that. But it meant there was a black-tie dinner and a black-tie reception and all of that that kept Bill Jaffe very happy. He was the center of attention, along with John Dickey.

DONIN: Did you have to travel much for fundraising?

SMITH: No. I traveled a fair amount for alumni affairs and enjoyed that. There probably were… I'm trying to think whether there was any.... Oh, yes, yes, yes, yes. There were some. I guess it's more likely that one will hold onto one's memory the things that succeeded rather than the things that didn't.

DONIN: Did the development office send you out?

SMITH: Yes, yes. We did quite quickly, I guess, get to look at the prospects, as it were, in terms of alumni whose giving was not what it should be. Howard Gilman would be one such. And one that does come back to me as an effort being made very specifically to cultivate a disaffected alumnus in the hope of bringing in lots and lots of money took me to St. Louis (the one and only time I've been to St. Louis) where Morton D. May [Morton D. “Buster” May ‘36], class of, I think, '36, somewhere in there, was a big tycoon in a great big house, a generous benefactor of the St. Louis Museum of Art, and with a world renowned collection of German expressionist art. And it was my encounter with Morton D. May that first brought me up against the phenomenon of… I don't remember what he called it. I don't know what it's called technically but what I discovered was something I had not known up to that point, which was that when it comes to tax deductions for charitable giving, you can only claim under that deduction a certain percentage of your income. Mr. May assured me that he already was in the custom of giving that percentage and Dartmouth was not significantly among the people or institutions that got it. And naive and inexperienced guy that I was, I guess I knew enough not to say, but that still....

End Tape 11, Side B
Begin Tape 12, Side A

DONIN: Today is Wednesday, May 14, 2003. We are in Buffalo, New York, at the home of Peter Smith, and this is session 3 of our interview for the oral history project. So, Peter, we're going to carry on with some more budget discussion.

SMITH: Yes. Well, and....

DONIN: Fundraising.

SMITH: Fundraising, yes.

Last evening, having had my memory jogged about the trip to St. Louis, I realized there were a few other trips that I made that I guess were also unsuccessful. And then there was one fairly major success story, which I hadn't thought about and am rather proud of. But I remember that… This is an important basic matter to refer to because you asked me yesterday whether the professional fundraisers, people in Blunt, had sort of fed me prospects and ideas. And I realized, thinking back last night, that that was actually pretty well standard operating procedure if there was any person within the Dartmouth family, especially, of course, the alumni, who were known to have an interest in the arts, then I was indeed expected and did find my way to them and try to at least build a bridge.

I remember going down to Newport News to somebody, a man who had given the money that created the Hinman Post Office, one of the few instances that I've come across where somebody gave a sizable amount of money and dedicated it, as it were, named it, for someone other than himself. In this case the man who lived in Newport News… I've forgotten what his line of business was, but he was very prosperous. He had given the money when the Hop campaign in the late '60s was in place, the [Third] Century Fund, and named it for the person who had suggested in the first place that he go to Dartmouth, which was rather nice. So Mr. Hinman has his name perpetuated, memorialized, and Mr. Noland [Lloyd U. Noland, Jr. ’39 TU ‘40] himself does not.

There may be others if I stop to think, but the basic principle is that most of the work that I can think of didn't actually lead anywhere. Nobody was inclined to make a new and significant gift. Somebody who hadn't been much involved lived in Chattanooga, Tennessee (my one and only trip to that state). I don't think he was much involved with

the college. He's an alumnus from, I guess, a class in the '40s. But it was understood, somebody had told somebody in Blunt that this guy, who was a banker, was a patron of the local art museum and was said to have some kind of a collection himself. So I went to see him. I was brought face to face with an aspect of what it was to be a Dartmouth alumnus that we all knew about, but which I'd never encountered in so gross a form, which is the basic misogyny of people who, having gone there when it was all male, wanted it to stay all male.

So my visit there must have been in 1974 or '75, somewhere after the women had started to be admitted. The first question when I went into his sumptuous office – and a young assistant came with me – was, "Well, what's exciting up there in Hanover these days?" And I said, "Oh, well, obviously the principal change is that there are now women on campus." And he said matter-of-factly, "Well, you know, I don't like it. But on the other hand, I think that's pretty good because it means the guys don't have to go down to White River Junction to find a waitress." And I said, "There are other reasons why women are now at Dartmouth." And he said, "Do you think so? I'll tell you, without pussy there'd be a bounty on them." And, yes.... So that ought to be in the Dartmouth record somewhere. It's not something that I put in anything I've ever written about the place.

DONIN: That sort of stops the conversation, doesn't it?

SMITH: Yes, it does. Yes, it does. And at the end of it, I walked out with this young assistant, and he said....

DONIN: Who was male or female?

SMITH: It was male. And he said, "Well, I guess we know now why he sent to his daughter to Tulane." Or to Sarah Newcomb [College] or whatever the women's institution down there is. As you say, it's a conversation stopper. There was no other option. I mean this was, these were....

DONIN: Do you assume, though, he was not alone?

SMITH: I'm sure he was not alone, no. But it was certainly the most repugnant sort of manifestation. But, no, without any question, the going coed, I guess, was inevitable. I mean even before there was any possibility or likelihood of a suit, I think that the thing which finally persuaded the board of trustees, and John [Kemeny] made it clear, as I recall, in his inaugural address in March of 1970 that this was a development that he was going to make sure happened. I assume that even those on the

board who held out and I seem to recall that it was known that this was not an absolutely unanimous vote. But those who weren't happy about it nevertheless could vote for it because it was very persuasive that this was happening in all the good male institutions, and that far from sort of giving in, which some alumni argued, of course, that if they were the only ones that didn't change, that would give them great distinction.

The fact that I think everybody had to accept in the end was that Dartmouth would lose out if it was not along with all the others because the best students would be, to a great degree, the best students would go to the coed places, and Dartmouth would not be what it should. And, of course, we all know, and various people must have said this along the way, that some of the people who had, among the alumni, been most vociferous about not going coed, were very quickly reconciled to it when it was clear that their daughters and granddaughters could now be men of Dartmouth, as it were.

DONIN: When you were raising money, was it up to you where the funds were applied? Or was that up to the development office?

SMITH: It was, I guess… I don't think the development office was much concerned about it except when they knew that there was an interest in a certain area, it was assumed that that would be what you would cultivate a person for. But the decision as to where it was applied as the cultivation went on and one became more sort of focused – one of my success stories involves that – that would have, in the case of any really significant gift, I guess, ultimately been decided by the provost and the president if it was major. But always if it was… I don't know what a token amount would be thought to be in those days. $50,000 maybe was the cutoff. The provost and Greg Prince, who was there as the arts & sciences fundraiser, at a certain point they were involved in sums under that; they were not...

The thing, the event that I was proudest of I guess involved the Hood Museum. And certainly this was a case where there was intuition on the part of somebody in Blunt. There was a man involved in the garment business who lived in New York, sorry, who worked in New York. He had his space in the garment district, and lived, I guess, close to Philadelphia. (I think that was my first realization that New Jersey was sufficiently small that it was a manageable commute to work in New York and live in or near Philadelphia.) I can't at all remember who it was that thought there might be some point in my getting to know this guy. I am really blocking on his name, though, again, the outcome is such that it's easily… And it may come back to me. It's easily known

because with a good deal of visiting and I guess one visit by the teammate presumably on the Horizons weekend with his wife, led to his putting up enough money, which I guess was at least a quarter of a million dollars, to have his name on a gallery in the Hood.

I remember getting a little note of congratulations from Ad Winship because Vene Gutman [Alvin P. “Vene” Gutman ‘40], is his name. I don't know what his actual first name was, but he was known as V-E-N-E and turned out to be a lovely person. And the little note from Ad referred to the fact that although he'd been out of the college for 30 years or so, his previous highest gift had been I think under $10,000. So this was a case where sort of leading somebody by the hand towards doing something for the college that was truly significant and that he could afford, actually paid off. And I guess there are many instances of that, but that was the one I was principally involved with.

One of the things that the two guys, Wysocki and Boghosian, in the visual arts program, did by way of cultivation that also paid off handsomely: I don't think that their association with Ivan Albright sort of began with money in mind because he was a very famous painter who lived very close to Hanover. He lived in Woodstock. But Ivan had had the great good fortune to marry a woman who was a part of the Patterson family that owned the Chicago Tribune. So they lived in great style. She was a poet, a remarkable person, a lovely person.

It's from her that I heard one of the nicest quips I'd come across. I went to see her once in Woodstock after Ivan had died. She said, "What are you doing over here?" And I said, "Well, actually I came to the funeral of John French [John French Jr. ‘30]," class of 1930, Nelson Rockefeller's roommate, famously, was involved in the arts and became a member of the board of overseers. He died. And I said, "Well, I came up for John French's memorial." She said, "Oh, that would be at the Unitarian Church." I said, "Yes." And she said, "You know what I call a Unitarian funeral? All dressed up and nowhere to go." [Laughter] Isn't that sweet?

DONIN: That's great. [Laughter]

SMITH: Great. So the Albrights came through with a very large sum; and there is, of course, an Albright Gallery in the Hood. I guess I know all the people whose names are attached to galleries: the Harrington Gallery, and there's one for Vene Gutman, there's one for Ivan. And the largest sum I guess, largest single sum, that I was responsible for.... Except that I mean there would have been a gift anyway, but maybe the fact

that I did hit it off very well with Mrs. Hall, Mrs. Jaffe, Mrs. Friede, and that she remembered in her encounters with Dartmouth while Bill Jaffe was still alive how much she liked Jerry Lathrop, I'm not sure that we… This sounds so cold-blooded, but that's what fundraising is about to a certain extent.

I don't think there would have been a Lathrop Gallery, though he certainly deserved one because he was the pioneer in terms of that kind of work at Dartmouth, I don't think there would have been a Lathrop Gallery if we hadn't thought that this might be a way to have people who were admirers of Jerry give out in his honor and give to the college. And Mrs. Hall, as she by then was, was one of the most enthusiastic.

I used to go to the mailbox that was close to my office down there on Shakespeare Alley and get the mail myself, and go over to the snack bar and get a cup of coffee and go through the morning mail. One day there was this little handwritten envelope, just basic stationery store common envelope, handwritten, which handwriting I didn't recognize; I don't know if it had a return address on it. At any rate, I opened the letter and there's a very tiny note from Mrs. Hall, just a very few words, and a check for $250,000, which I don't think I'd ever seen before. Then there was – I think I'm right in remembering it – there was another one that followed that a little further down the road, but it was a handwritten check, too.

DONIN: Fantastic.

SMITH: I mean it was just amazing. I'm now remembering, but again, without the name of this one, a wonderful man who lived in Minneapolis. The reason for including this is simply another iteration of many that are bound to be on tape of alumni who regarded their lives as having been changed by a given teacher. This man told me, quite fervently, that his life would have been very different if he hadn't gone to Jerry Lathrop's art classes. And a beautiful and sad thing is that he hadn't, I think, stayed very much in touch. But people in Blunt must have sorted out as they looked through. I don't know if they went to the trouble of… I don't know. They may have asked Jerry, for that matter, because Jerry knew the value of fundraising. But this chap, I think, had not been much involved with the college until the Lathrop Gallery came along. And the beautiful and sad thing is that having come back in touch with Jerry and visiting Hanover and seeing it, it came out in conversation that Jerry and Dotty (his wife), had never visited the Monet estate in Giverney. As Jerry said, "Well, you will now" because he was ready to

pay for the whole thing. And by then Jerry was, or believed he was, too frail to make the transatlantic journey. But it's a lovely story in terms of this relationship that at the time, presumably, Jerry was not aware of and perhaps, in terms of its intensity, wasn't aware of even in retirement until this opportunity came along for naming the gallery.

I don't know if there'll be a way of putting my thoughts about the Kemeny presidency in some kind of form. It may be… I don't think I had spoken to him. Yes, I had because, as is documented, I'm sure, all over the place, John wanted to be the president. And during the Third Century Fund he had the sense, while still being a member of the math department, to be the chairman of the foundations effort, the foundations committee.

I guess the first time I met him was in connection with that, in terms of his coming in that capacity while John Dickey was still president, to talk, to meet this new guy at the Hop and talk to him about fundraising in that respect. What I remember is from the first encounter, whether it was that or whether it was at the point where he was president-designate and also came around to talk to people… I told him that I'd been looking forward to meeting him because I had been told at UC-Santa Cruz, when I had told people that I was going to go from there to Dartmouth, that John had been the first choice of the founding chancellor to lead mathematics at UCSC, and had been courted and had said no. So I said I'd heard of him in that capacity and therefore was looking forward to it. He said, "Well, it was, of course, tempting in a certain way. But I've known for a very long time that the only job I really wanted was to be president of Dartmouth. And there was no way I was going to be deflected from that until John Dickey's successor was named."

DONIN: So he was being courted by Santa Cruz while he was at Dartmouth, not while he was at Princeton?

SMITH: Yes. No, while he was at Dartmouth.

DONIN: Okay, while he was at Dartmouth. I see.

SMITH: I mean Dean McHenry, their founding chancellor, was very, very astute when it came to what we now call head hunting, I guess. He was very, very good at knowing whose recommendations he could rely on. And indeed they also had their eye on Walter Stockmayer [Walter “Stocky” Stockmayer ‘25A], who was in the chemistry department at Dartmouth; and at Dartmouth, I think, still the only member of the science faculty

who is a member of the National Academy of Sciences. And it was rather sweet, in a way. I think they had invited Stocky to at least come and visit. Maybe he'd visited and was sort of still, in a sense, on a thread.

Somebody at Santa Cruz knew enough, presumably in the science division, knew enough about the situation at Dartmouth to know that Stocky was very, very, very close to a now retired professor of chemistry called John Wolfenden, who was a very striking character, an Englishman, who was regarded very highly by the college. Indeed, during John Kemeny's presidency, before Jim Freedman [James O. Freedman]… Sorry. McLaughlin. I don't know whether this is Kemeny or McLaughlin.

One of the things that Jim Freedman stopped was giving honorary degrees to retired members of the Dartmouth faculty, which I think was a mistake. There used to be almost every commencement an honorary degree given to a retired member of the faculty. At Columbia it's *de rigeur*. There is always one. John Wolfenden received an honorary degree not because he was a great scientist but because he was a wonderful teacher. Somebody at Santa Cruz knew enough about Stockmayer's regard for Wolfenden that they asked John to come out and be a visiting professor and sort of really know about how close to paradise UC-Santa Cruz was. It didn't work. Stocky stayed put, and John had a very nice three months in northern California. Somewhere, I'm not sure that I know where I can put my hand on it, but somewhere I came across.... I was reading a book review about… Yes, here it is. This is where I copied it down.

DONIN: Well, done.

SMITH: There was a book review in the New York Times. Oh, sorry, in the New Yorker. I even made a note of that. A biography of a cellist called Emanuel Feuermann, who, had he not died very young would have been more famous than Casals. He died in hospital from complications out of some operation. His name is spelled F-E-U-E-R-M-A-N-N. So somebody had written a biography of him. Within the review were these words: "The book reveals a personality in which artistry, careerism, and naiveté crowded out any glimmer of self-doubt." "Difficulties do not exist for Mr. Feuermann," the critics said of one performance.

It struck me that all of those words could apply to John Kemeny. I mean that he was ambitious and that he made no secret of wanting the

presidency. And I remember his telling me (which is probably in his own contribution to the oral archive) – it ‘s not the kind of thing you would forget – that at the big dinner that was given in Leverone to celebrate the bicentennial… On the day of the bicentennial, as I recall, which is December 13, 1969… I do remember it because my father died on the 6th, and I got back to Hanover from England on the day of the dinner that I would have been at but for the fact that I really wasn't there.

I guess Gwenda picked me up at Lebanon, and we drove past Leverone, and there was all this festivity. John Kemeny said that he went to that dinner with considerable trepidation because the rumor was rife, it was very strong, that the name of John Dickey's successor would be announced at that dinner. And so he said, "And of course I had some interest in what that announcement would be." In fact it wasn't. But I guess he had an evening of some degree of anxiety. I'm sure he pointed out that had it been him, he would have known.

DONIN: Right. Going back to that bicentennial year, though, do you have any memory of what the campus was like? I mean, here the college was trying to pull off this big bicentennial celebration. Lord and Lady Dartmouth were invited and all.

SMITH: Yes.

DONIN: And yet it was the end of a very tumultuous time for John Dickey in terms of campus protests.

SMITH: I don't, actually. My recollections of that are sort of the culmination of those celebrations. I guess the earl and countess came over not for that celebration and dinner, but for the commencement in 1969 because they both received honorary degrees I recall. My recollection is that commencement… Their visit sort of coincided with the college at its best and most relaxed; that is to say, around commencement time.

I think that in my own mind I linked the celebration to the things that had preceded it or maybe they hadn't at that point. I don't remember when the occupation of Parkhurst was. I know that I was not very close to anybody who was involved in that demonstration. I don't really clearly recall my own stance, except that I was a good old liberal, and so I certainly was on the anti-war side. But I don't remember being very much involved.

DONIN: Parkhurst was occupied in May, and commencement was the following June.

SMITH: Mmmm hmmm. Yes.

DONIN: Well, back to John Kemeny's.... Oh, I'm sorry, go on.

SMITH: I guess it's typical that one's memories of a given event are colored or are centered upon one's own involvement. Mine was very modest and consisted, essentially, of showing Lady Dartmouth....

End Tape 12, Side A
Begin Tape 12, Side B

SMITH: She's a very unattractive person. The earl was very modest and rather shy and she was anything but. And I guess, if I had stayed in England, I would have known her as a television personality. Because before he succeeded to the earldom, he was, as the oldest son of an earl, a viscount. The system there was that an earl, in effect, has two titles because his son becomes automatically a viscount. So the Earl of Dartmouth's older son is always the Viscount Lewisham, which is a district in London. And Lady Lewisham, I discovered – once I was in this sort of picture – discovered when I next went to England and shared this, she had apparently been a panelist on some popular TV program or other, and was a very, very flamboyant and domineering kind of person.

She divorced the Earl of Dartmouth some years after that time in Hanover, and married the Earl Spencer, so she was Diana Spencer's stepmother. "Acid Raine" I think they called her. [Laughter] Raine was her first name, the daughter of Barbara Cartland. All of these things sort of going together. I was very… I mean for me she was in spades the kind of person I had left England to get away from. And the story was around, I'm sure it's talked about in other people's tapes, of how she nearly drove Jim McFate [James T. McFate] , the manager of the Hanover Inn, crazy. She just was extraordinarily demanding.

DONIN: So back to John Kemeny.

SMITH: Back to John Kemeny.

DONIN: Were you aware of the process of the actual search for John Dickey's successor?

SMITH: No. No, I don't have any clear recollections about that except, I suppose, to the extent I have a recollection, it is that one didn't know how the search was being made. I mean it certainly was the last time when the search was, as far as I know, effectively a trustees' search exclusively. I don't remember… I don't now have any recollection of any scuttlebutt as to who was in the running. I was relatively new, after all. I didn't know a great many people. I guess that I… It's entirely possible that as a relative newcomer, I was told rather than realized this for myself that John was the first Jew to be president of an Ivy League institution.

That actually brings a memory which says something about John,says something about the other people involved, too. It struck me one time when I was in New York and went to the theater. Indeed I remember what I was there to see. It was a show that Dudley Moore and Peter Cook put on as the two members of the Beyond the Fringe group who had sort of stayed in show biz. They had an evening of two-handers.

I remember at the intermission, presumably, looking around from where I was sitting, which was relatively close to the stage, and realized that two people not very far away from me, in very good seats, were Kingman Brewster and McGeorge Bundy, who at that point was the president of the Ford Foundation, and Brewster was still president of Yale. I remember having a strong feeling that John Kemeny was not a part of the east coast establishment in the way that both of those people were.

I guess there was another manifestation of that. While John was – especially in respect to computers and BASIC – famous in a certain way, and by virtue of being president at Dartmouth was at the point, especially when he was appointed, that added to his stature. When the Hopkins Center was designated as one of the two beneficiaries of a very, very big testimonial concert in honor of Goddard Lieberson when he died in 1977 which event actually played a very important role in my own career because the two entities which benefited from this splendid event in Carnegie Hall, with ticket prices very high for a lot of people, and a very high percentage of the… Oh, I'm just remembering someone else I raised money with, but it's in the Kemeny years. A very high percentage of the board of overseers bought these very expensive tickets and I don't remember what the net was. But by virtue of Goddard's career at CBS Records, a lot of very major people were performing in this.

The person who was arranging it was Schuyler Chapin, who had been for a number of years Goddard's right-hand person at CBS, and who had obviously had some say in who the beneficiaries were going to be because in addition to Hopkins Center, there was the Professional Children's School, I think it's called, a high school in New York, of which Betty Chapin was a trustee. And so although Schuyler did all the arranging in terms of who performed… And one thing I remember from that was… and I must have been in on the discussion when all of this was sort of being mooted and initially planned because Schuyler, who thought big, always did until he was dean at Columbia (I'm sorry to say), was toying with the idea that he might be able to persuade Rudolf Serkin and Vladimir Horowitz to play four hands, one piano. It didn't come off, and in fact neither of them was there. But they were both CBS stars. At any rate, the concert was splendid.

DONIN: Rudolf Serkin and who else? I'm sorry.

SMITH: Horowitz.

DONIN: Right.

SMITH: But Leonard Bernstein was very much involved on that evening, and Isaac Stern. And I guess there was a big chunk of the New York Philharmonic, but with some kind of name attached to it. It was a grand event. And beforehand there was a dinner, I guess, at Essex House, within walking distance of Carnegie Hall, for the board of overseers.

And I'm forgetting one of my successes in fund raising because more or less dominating that occasion was a formidable woman called Katherine Filene Shouse, S-H-O-U-S-E. Kay Shouse was, I think, the only daughter of Lincoln Filene. Mr. Hopkins had had some connection with the famous Filene of Boston. And I guess, yes, it was, a large gift, I think a quarter of a million, which came about undoubtedly as the result of my cultivation of Mrs. Shouse, who is a very difficult person, and who offered me the job of running her great big enterprise of Wolf Trap, the Wolf Trap Performing Arts Center. And indeed my successor, Shelton Stanfill, eventually went there.

DONIN: Right.

SMITH: I remember going to a dinner in Boston at the Ritz Carlton, at which I was talked to, was grilled by the board of trustees of the Filene Foundation, all of whom were related in one way or another to Kay Shouse. And the only specific thing I remember from that also

deserves a little piece of being on the record, and it's not likely to be anywhere else because Kay…

I was asked eventually… I guess while I was at Columbia, I got a letter from the woman who was her right-hand person and also her lover, who wrote and asked if I would be interested in writing a biography of Kay Shouse. I wouldn't have done it, but I certainly had a very good excuse for saying, no. And at the same point in the discussion, I guess it wasn't a formal meeting of the trustees… But in my presence there was discussion about the basic idea, which was that the most useful thing for the director of the Hopkins Center was to have a discretionary fund which would be truly there, which would enable him to do things or arrange things or initiate things that otherwise couldn't be done. And the proposal was that this quarter million – it may have been more – would go in that direction. What I remember is worth remembering in this context, which is that a member of the generation junior to Mrs. Shouse, in fact I think everybody there was either of her children's generation or her grandchildren's generation. Anyway, one of the son-level generation said, "Well, I know how enthusiastic you are about the arts, Kay. But I find it hard to believe that Granddad would have wanted the money to go in this direction." And she said, "You had a grandmother, too." [Laughter] Yes, yes. I guess at that point I knew we were going to get the money. How did we get onto that?

DONIN: Oh, well, you were talking about John Kemeny.

SMITH: And the establishment.

DONIN: Right.

SMITH: Yes. And the Carnegie Hall event. Just a tiny detail: All the people who participated, I mean the Bernsteins and Isaac Sterns and all of that and their buddies, you know, Adolph Green and Betty Comden, all of that section of New York cultural society went off after the concert and had a big party somewhere. And I was just amazed and angry that John and Jean were not invited. I remember thinking that it's fair enough, they all know each other, and of course Goddard was close to all of them and so on. But it was, it seemed to me, required that the president of the college would also be there. That didn't happen.

How can I put this? It wouldn't have occurred to me, either when I saw Brewster and McGeorge Bundy or in connection with that particular event, that this was because John was Jewish. I don't think it was. But then I didn't realize that Goddard was Jewish until I went to his

memorial service. It's been something which… But I guess it's conceivable, although....

DONIN: But not with that crowd.

SMITH: No, no. Not with that crowd. Of course not. No. Of course not. Then it was a matter of being one of the gang, yes, of course, Bernstein. Of course that's true.

DONIN: It's been said, though, that he was very shy.

SMITH: John? Yes, I think--I wouldn't call him shy. But I think he… The remark that one often heard, and I guess to the extent that I was, as I was in various contexts at various times, in his presence, he was famous for not having any small talk and of being at a bit of a loss, considering the position he held.

I guess that is a form of shyness, though one doesn't think of John as shy in general terms because one of the things I remember is something which I didn't agree with. I thought he was wrong to have this attitude. But he had it, and he stated it in so many words that, "As far as I'm concerned, modesty is not a virtue." So it's not that kind of shyness, not by any means. I think it was a discomfort.

One of the most difficult to pin down aspects of John Kemeny, for me, was that although he was extraordinarily fluent. I mean the lecture that he gave… He gave a public lecture in Spaulding Auditorium at the end of the proceedings of the Kemeny Commission on Three Mile Island disaster. It was a masterpiece. I mean without a single note but only a blackboard, he took the audience through the complexity of what meltdown or the threat of meltdown at Three-Mile Island had meant. Without any notes and without any pauses and without anything other than complete sentences. I mean it was brilliant. It was as good a lecture as I have ever been to.

So he's very fluent, but it seemed to me always not very eloquent. That there was something – as is in that little quote about Feuermann – something very, very naive about John, I think. Maybe naive isn't the right word, but something like innocent is, again, when he's dealing with something that is very, very subtle. But I think one could… I guess I would say in my estimation that John was not very sophisticated. Here you have a man with a brilliant intelligence, who is never stuck for a word, who was remarkably articulate, but whose thinking even and whose expression of his thinking somehow didn't go deep enough or

far enough. And this is something that I have thought about a lot without being able to find the right words.

I mean if a gun was put to my head and I was told that I had to write about this aspect of my sense of John Kemeny, perhaps I would burrow away. I'd have my Roget's Thesaurus beside me and so on and I might be able to get the words exactly the way I wanted them. But it struck me as a very, very peculiar in the strict sense of the word, very unusual, combination of intelligence and articulateness, but of a kind of absence of really sophisticated thought. I'm not doing it very well. But it's still there.

I think I thought what I'm about to say before I was involved in the account of the Dickey presidency, at which point I did come to know John Dickey very much better than I could have known him. But a very big difference, for me, in an area which means a very great deal to me, which is the use of words, I think I could say that I never heard from John Kemeny a sentence which surprised me, whereas one did with John Dickey all the time, almost. I mean they're two extremely interesting people and very different from each other. And John [Dickey] was not famous for being one of Einstein's assistants and so on. But he had a wonderful mind when it came to choosing the words to express what was on his mind, and for me John Kemeny didn't. I've chatted with a few people. In fact, I had with me when I came to Hanover for these interviews this same quotation that I've just put in there, and I shared it with one of the people I spoke to. And this notion that John was naive didn't sit at all well with this person. Okay.

DONIN: Now, what role did Jean Kemeny play in the presidency? It's been said....

SMITH: She made up for John's absence of small talk with a kind of energy that was almost embarrassingly direct and buoyant. I mean a real *joie de vivre*. And I guess that a reference point is that as a faculty wife she was played Daisy Mae in the production of Li'l Abner. I mean she was no shrinking violet.

There is a slight difficulty here in that I know I talked to you about the visit of the Chicago Symphony Orchestra, but I don't know whether I talked about it on tape. But at any rate, it was an instance to me of Jean's style, that at the dinner that we had at the president's house after the first concert, that she could just come right out with Georg Solti and say, "You're a Jew. How come you're still playing Wagner's music?" And even more direct, in a sense, although that was a very big

topic, at one point she said, "You know, Peter's always telling me that Barry Tuckwell, whom he knows and whom he's brought here and who is part of the Congregation of the Arts, is the best horn player in the world. I thought that I read somewhere that you said that the Chicago Symphony was made up of the best. So is Barry Tuckwell better than your first horn player or not?" And Solti did extremely well because he was very, very, very sharp-witted, and basically said, "Dale Clevinger is the best horn player in any orchestra in the world as far as I'm concerned. But Barry isn't in an orchestra. Barry is a musician of a different kind and is the best...."

I remember having a thought which I felt unhappy about, which I thought was sort of unworthy of me, that was that one of the impressive things – or one of the unexpected things, I guess – about that transition was that at John Kemeny's inauguration in the gym, where, again, he made a very important speech about coeducation and about reverting to the Native American population. It was a good speech, but it was a very flat speech as far as I was concerned.

I mean, in this thing that I'm trying to articulate, one of the surprising things about the event, though, was giving an honorary degree to Chris Dickey [Christina Dickey], although God knows it was deserved. She had been first lady for 25 years and a very different kind of first lady, different from Jean, that is, and different from Susan Wright [Susan Debevoise Wright] in terms of what is seen as what is required. But very, very standard kind of president's wife for the period, you know, presiding over faculty wives' teas and that kind of thing. But Chris was a very remarkable woman, and it was a bright idea.

What is unworthy, I think, maybe of me, as it were, is that it struck me not on the occasion but later that that was bound to mean that Jean would get an honorary degree at the point when John stepped down. And so the unworthy thought is that that was something that they knew. And that's assuming that it was their idea that Chris should be honored, which, I have to say, I've never examined that, but I've always assumed that that was a gesture that came from them rather than a suggestion from anyone else, as it were. And of course now it's standard. So Jean got her honorary degree, and Judy McLaughlin [Judith McLaughlin] got hers, and I assume that Sheba Freedman [Bathsheba Freedman] did, and that Susan will. And there's a lot to be said for it.

But my unworthy thought, as it were, ties in with a different kind of ambition, as it were, that was Jean's. Jean was a highly successful first

lady and admirable in terms of the principles on which she based her contribution to the running of the institution. There were people who, of course, found it very unhappy-making that this was the case. But in important respects and valuable respects, John Kemeny could have said what Bill Clinton said, "You get two for one." I'm sure that she made a lot of people that she had to meet feel very good about the encounters. And I would assume, of course, without there being any way of quantifying it, that many more people found Jean an attractive person in that position than found her....

End Tape 12, Side B
Begin Tape 13, Side A

DONIN: Okay. So we're talking about Jean Kemeny.

SMITH: I mean in terms of sort of personal involvement and having some degree of need, as it were, to have the arts in one's life, there was much more of that with Jean than with John. There was, I think – I must have mentioned it before – this rather strange thing that here you had a Hungarian Jewish mathematician who didn't like music. I mean he had no time for music at all. If I talked about the Chicago concert last time around, this is already on tape. But if I didn't, it's worth saying that he didn't go to the concert that the Chicago Symphony gave. That was not the way he wanted to spend his time. And so at the dinner afterwards, Solti's manager, to whom I mentioned this, said, "Well, I hope for God's sake that this doesn't come out. Because Georg won't understand that. You've got two very big egos here, and they could clash." It didn't come out, mainly I'm sure because Solti took it for granted that everyone in Hanover would go to that concert, and certainly the president.

DONIN: Wasn't it obvious that he wasn't there, though?

SMITH: Uh uh. I mean it was to everyone else. I mean Jean was there. But there was no way that Solti could know. I did the ushering there and the thanking afterwards and all of that. And said, "And the president's going to give you a dinner afterwards at the president's house." And so on.

John came to Dartmouth Players' productions somewhat. But mostly, if I'm remembering rightly, only to musicals. And I can't think of an occasion when I knew or was in any way involved in John's paying attention to the visual arts. I don't think that happened.

I think he was very well aware, I think, of the importance of the Hop, both in terms of its contribution to the lives of the students and faculty. It was. I mean it's something that I'm sure I haven't spoken about. Maybe it's not something that anyone else will have seen as worth mentioning in the oral history project. But the recruiting of very high-quality faculty was helped in instances – and again impossible to quantify – by the existence of the Hopkins Center. And though I says it meself [sic] and I shouldn't, the program that I built up became a major recruiting tool. I mean they could point to what you would have in Hanover that you wouldn't have in Williamstown or even in Princeton, for that matter.

One of my favorite memories, as it were, in the mean-spirited side of me was the season after the Chicago Symphony played for the first time in Spaulding, which was the first concert on the first tour that the Chicago Symphony made with Georg Solti as its music director, and which came our way at an exceedingly low fee because his manager knew me well, knew the Hop well, and knew that he would be playing in more or less ideal conditions. And which he found out, I guess, from the first chord of the first piece on the first program that this was a very attentive audience, that the acoustics were superb, etc. At any rate, on that first program was a performance of the Mahler Fifth Symphony.

The next season the man who ran the cultural program at Princeton arranged for the Chicago Symphony to come there, and Princeton does not have, still does not have, a Hopkins Center or anything remotely like it, so a performance by an orchestra had to take place in the gymnasium. The story was… They must have had this from his manager, Ann Colbert herself, that when Solti arrived and looked in the gym… (It was certainly not the only place where the only large enough space was the gym. I went to hear the Chicago Symphony, probably that second season also, at UVM, where the gym was used for that kind of occasion.) At any rate, Solti arrived and saw that the gym included these very large units for heating and ventilation, HVAC, heating/ventilation/air-conditioning and said, "So those won't be on during the performance, will they?" And he was assured, of course, that they would not, absolutely not. I mean, you're not going to have to play with that noise going on.

As bad luck would have it for the Princeton people, he played on that program, too, the Mahler Fifth Symphony. At the quietest part of the *adagietto*, the ventilators went and started, and Solti walked off the stage. They had a very, very hard time persuading him to come back on and to assure him that indeed these things had now been switched

off; this wouldn't happen again. So good old Hopkins Center, good old Dartmouth, is what I say about that. [Laughter]

And it is, I think… Yes, it is still true that the Hop is the only facility of its kind in the Ivy League, though I don't know the situation at Brown. But certainly at Princeton, Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Cornell, and I think at Penn, there is no central cultural facility. One of the most gratifying things for me at Columbia was that within a matter of weeks of my arriving there, I think without any reference on the student's part to my arrival, which may have gone unnoticed as far as he was concerned (the undergraduates had virtually no contact with the school of the arts at that point). But this guy wrote a lengthy Op Ed piece for the student newspaper complaining about the fact that Columbia didn't have a Hopkins Center and that it should have.

And a little piece of patting myself on the back, but in relationship to this matter of the Hopkins Center and its program's contribution to the recruiting of faculty: when I was at Columbia, I went to Carnegie Hall, as I did many, many times, for a concert, and ran into a member of the classics department at Dartmouth who was also there enjoying the concert. We ran into each other at intermission and talked through the intermission. Then we said our farewells. And as I was walking away, he sort of shouted after me, "We all think of your time at the Hop as the golden age," which was a lovely thing to hear and was very related to this aspect of the Hop's success. That it made its existence and its program, made Hanover less of a desert, as it were, in *clamatis in deserto*.

I think I was aware of that and saw it as an important aspect of the life of the place, as indeed, of course, it did a similar thing for a section of the student body. There are people who were very, very explicit, either as students or subsequently meeting them as alumni, very explicit about the fact that the Hopkins Center was the most important place on campus for them and the activities there, the ones that they valued most highly. It may have been on the other tape… This is one of those awkward things because this happened soon after I got there, and it may have been as I was describing my settling-in process. It was the first time that anyone said to me (he's a student in the visual arts program, the brand-new visual arts program more or less at that point) he said to me in so many words: I would have gone crazy here if I hadn't had the Hop.

DONIN: Yes. You did say that last time. Which is wonderful.

SMITH: Yes.

DONIN: Did any of the campus unrest spill over into the Hop in any way?

SMITH: No, I don't think so. I don't think there was any. Let me think. I can't recall it. I mean the Top of the Hop presumably was a place where meetings were held and perhaps there were demonstrations. I don't remember. I might be quite embarrassed to be shown copies of the Daily Dartmouth that make it clear that I'm forgetting rather than that it didn't happen. But I don't think there was any use of the facilities.

Oh, yes, I do. Yes, I do. But it was a fairly long time. The "yes, I do" comes from a memory of an event which it was very exciting to be a part of, at the same time as being aware that I would be in very big trouble if the Hanover fire marshal showed up. Because Spaulding was full to the gills with people sitting everywhere and in the aisles for an appearance by Eugene McCarthy. And I introduced him in the sense that he stayed in the little anteroom there, and at some point I had to get to the moment of saying, "And so I welcome the junior senator from Minnesota." Then he came on, and there was a huge, huge reception, roar of approval.

DONIN: Did you sense a change in the students that you interacted with from when you first arrived?

SMITH: I suppose. Again, I think my personal memory is particularized rather than general. And there was certainly a handful of students whom I had come to know well for whom this cause was galvanizing. And I think this is on the other tape. The beginning of the outreach program, which became a very important part of the Hopkins Center, came via somebody who was a conscientious objector and who needed an alternative service, and asked if he could perhaps start to organize ways in which the school children could involve themselves with the Hop.

I think I am probably forgetting rather than being a reliable witness to the phenomenon you're asking about. I'm sure that I was, in the broad sense of the word, politically engaged. I didn't just sit in my office while the whole anti-Vietnam picture was unfolding. But I don't have a sense of having played a part in it, nor of dealing with taking in what the effect of all this was on the student body.

DONIN: Or the effect, for instance, not just of the anti-war movement, but of coeducation and the growing diversity of the students not just with women but more Native Americans and people of color.

SMITH: Right.

DONIN: You know, I'm thinking, for instance, I gather--

SMITH: Oh, wait a minute, yes, yes. Sorry. Keep on.

DONIN: Hold that thought. There are a couple of videos that we've got of performances done by women's groups on campus that took place at the Hop. One comes to mind that was particularly moving, I thought, a play called You Laugh.

SMITH: That's after my time.

DONIN: Oh, is it after your time? Ah hah.

SMITH: I'm almost sure of that. But certainly during the time that I was director of the Hop, the need, the desirability, the rightness of diversifying the program certainly became apparent.

I mean while I was there, there was the organization of BUPA, an acronym which I guess was Black Underground Performing Arts, or something like that. There were at various times during my tenure, as well as there have been during the six years that Warner was the director of the Hop, there were students within the student body who were not willing to have their experience of the performance of theater dictated exclusively by the drama department. So there were sort of splinter groups from time to time.

I know that one of the things I heard about when I arrived there, though he had just left, that Bob Reich [Robert B. “Bob” Reich ‘68], the guy who became secretary of labor in the Clinton administration and is somebody I admire tremendously, he had been very active in theater and very good, a very, very striking actor apparently. But I remember hearing that a group that he was associated with, or maybe even led, put on productions in the Grange Hall on Lebanon Street, which is now Rosey Jekes or it least it may be no longer be Rosey Jekes because everything changes on that street so quickly.

DONIN: No, Rosey Jekes is still there.

SMITH: And during my time there was a little group of rebels who thought that the drama department's choice of what the Dartmouth Players did was too conservative, and who put on productions in the parking garage behind the Fleet Bank, that two-story unit. Once Collis came into existence, there was, I think, a fairly long-lasting group of students who gave themselves a name of some sort who were concerned with improvisation or improvisatory theater, which was not something that happened within the drama department.

I had a dream that became a reality on just one occasion, which was that there should be a chance for cabaret, as it were, to flourish, and the sort of musical theater outside of the relatively small number of musicals produced by the Dartmouth Players, which was diminishing as things developed and which, I suspect, has more or less disappeared altogether with Rod Alexander's departure. I don't think there's much in the way of it. I mean as a Friend of the Hop, I get the program, and I don't think I see that anymore. So I guess it's not serious enough, not academic enough.

But at any rate, with the money that came… I guess I must have used the money that came from the memorial concert for Goddard Lieberson as a kind of discretionary fund. I formed an entity which, had I stayed, I would have done my utmost to keep alive, which I called All Goddard's Children. [Laughter] And they did an astoundingly good production of the musical Working, based on Studs Terkel's thing. Which was totally student run. I mean the director actually was someone who'd graduated the year before. In fact, so was the musical director. They were both brand new alumni who were determined to remain in the profession and both of them did. As far as I know, both of them are still, in one case acting and directing and the other case working with music in the theater.

It's an aspect of the relationship between the office of the director and the department of drama. I don't think there was any significant resentment about that production of Working. I think it was such a huge success it became the hottest ticket in town. It was done in Bentley. It was presumably done after negotiation with the drama department as to access and so on. I don't remember any down side in that case. Maybe by then the point had been made that the Hop director was entitled to take initiatives, provided that they didn't get in the way of the activities of the department. But I don't think anything of that sort has happened since.

Roughly at the same time, I founded another entity, which had only one moment in the sun; and being fond of catchy titles, this was called the Hopkins Center Opera Cooperative, which was shortened to Hop Op Coop. In some ways this is… I mean one of the nice things, one of the gratifying things about looking back at one's time there is that it's not easy to say this is the thing that I'm proudest of, but this was among them.

It occurred fairly soon, I guess, after the instrumental and vocal instruction program was begun in the music department. I guess I became aware… I don't remember now how. Probably it was, as much as anything, it was musicals were a regular part of the Dartmouth Players' presentations in those days. So one got a chance to hear student singers. And that, along with scuttlebutt or maybe consultation, made me aware that there were a goodly number of undergraduates who could have a very good shot at operatic performance, too, provided it was not too challenging. So I determined that there ought to be a home-produced opera production.

And another strand in this… I mean, had all these pieces not sort of fallen into place, it might not have happened. But one of the things that made it happen was that the man who was, I guess, full professor in the theater department by then was the technical director, the person who supervised the building of sets and the hanging of lights, and was, I guess, without much of a credit for it, the lighting designer on virtually ever production that was done there. He was married to a woman who every summer had accompanied him to the Santa Fe Opera because he was the tech director for the Santa Fe Opera. Made life very interesting for him, and kept his foot in the fully professional world. And his wife, in the course of many summers at Santa Fe, had become involved in their apprentice program one way or another.

At any rate, I became convinced, through whatever source of information, that Veronica McMullen would be a good director for an opera production. And I did a lot of asking around, people in the New York music business, as to what we might choose to do that was something that would bring people in but not be too terribly demanding, I mean not be outrageously demanding on the singers.

With all the consultation in place, with Veronica in the picture, and with the man who was at that time conducting the Dartmouth Symphony Orchestra, a man called Efrain Guigui, E-F-R-A-I-N G-U-I-G-U-I, who at the same time he was conductor of the Dartmouth Symphony was music director of the Vermont Symphony for a decade or so. He was in

the picture as being very anxious to conduct the pit band for whatever we ended up doing.

It turned out to be a production, with English text, of the Merry Wives of Windsor by Otto Nicolai, which is an opera I barely knew. Everybody knows the overture because it's one of those pop items with a very good tune in the middle of it. Perhaps by then I had a recording of it. I certainly have one now. We, Veronica and Efrain, auditioned anybody who wanted to be involved. Although it sounds as though we weren't as successful as we wanted to be, the fact is we realized that while there were singers for the three lead roles of women – the two wives, Mistress Ford and Mistress Page, and the young woman, Nanette, those could be cast with great confidence – we were short of strong voices among the males. So we ended up having three professionals come up for I guess a two-week period or whatever....

End Tape 13, Side A
BeginTape 13, Side B

SMITH: ...who wanted to play Falstaff and Ford and Page. No, Ford and.... Yes, Mr. Page isn't in there. Fenton, the young man who's in love with Anne Page. But there were three sort of character roles which were sung by undergraduate males. Of course the chorus was entirely, apart from me, undergraduates as well.

DONIN: So you were actually in the chorus.

SMITH: Yes, in the first act. I wanted to have the experience. I guess that, though he doesn't have any solo lines, he's out there as the owner of the Garter Inn where we first meet Falstaff. So I had that role, as it were, but he doesn't sing anything separate from anyone else, and he only appears in the first half. So I had the best of both worlds because I watched the second half from the audience.

Another important factor, actually, though I almost didn't refer to it here, was the dance program at that point within the drama department which was under the guidance of a married couple, Pepe and Vicki De Chiazza, C-H-I-A-Z-Z-A [Joseph “Pepe” and Vicki De Chiazza]. Wonderful people. I think referring to them reminds me that they were a case, perhaps Pepe particularly because Pepe had a real rank within the drama department, I think, associate professor or something like that. It was an instance where I did more for the morale of a member of the faculty than his colleagues did. Pepe, I had reason to believe just in terms of what I could see, though I'm no expert, but also in terms of

knowing from the students I got to know, was someone who was very, very good at what he did. But he was not very secure in terms of the place of dance in the curriculum, and I guess it's a difficult life anyway. I think he would agree that he saw me as an ally, and that as long as I had any influence within the college, with the provost's office and so on, the cause of dance would be championed. I don't know that there was ever any possibility that it would go under.

But one of the considerations that come into play when you have a program within a department is that when push comes to shove, if at times of crisis you're told that you have to lose a position, it's all too easy to sort of undermine the junior partner, as it were. I think to a certain extent, quite apart from the tensions that were built into the situation, the studio art people throughout the number of years that they were integrated with the art historians were always in a minority, and in that sense had to rely on the goodwill of the art historians at times when difficult decisions had to be made about budget and numbers. At the same time dance (and initially the film studies program was not separate) was an element within drama. But I guess it was never in the cards that dance would become a separate department.

At any rate, Pepe and Vicki were also involved in the production. It turned out wonderful. It was as close to perfect as something of its kind and at its level. It was another of the splendid moments for me. At the end of one… I think we did three performances. The visual arts involvement – I wanted to make it a three-department effort – was manifested in Boghosian's designing the poster and the front of the program, a little extra attachment.

At the end of one of the performances, I found myself, as we were dispersing, as we were coming out of the theater, beside a man called Arthur Wilson [Arthur M. Wilson], who was among the most distinguished scholars that were ever at Dartmouth. As far as I know, the biography that he wrote of Diderot is still seen as unassailable, as the important text on him. I walked out beside Arthur, and he looked my way and said, "I don't think I ever expected to see anything as good as that at Dartmouth." So...

Another important moment, because it involved a definition, as it were, that I saw at the time and still consider to be the biggest compliment that I was ever paid in my capacity as director of the Hopkins Center, came after I had stepped down and had my sabbatical in London mainly, and had come back intending to use the evenings and weekends to write this biography of Wilfred Lawson.

I had a conversation with Boghosian, which had one topic: What was his advice with regard to the thought that was going through my mind that I would go to one or more of the very wealthy people that I'd gotten to know to see whether they would bankroll me for a year which would enable me to have a year of leave on my own resources (I think there's a technical term) in order to write this book? And Varujan counseled very strongly against doing it because in his experience, he said, "People who can be very generous towards institutions shy away from doing the kind of thing that you're hoping. And I feel pretty confident in saying that you would be terribly disappointed that they wouldn't come through." And we talked about cases. "So I think it's better that you not ask." So I didn't.

But talking about this conversation with Richard Stucker subsequently, as I was settling back into my new life at the college, I said, "And what was very lovely for me was that Varujan was talking to me as though I was an artist." Richard said, "But you are an artist, and the Hopkins Center is your instrument."

That insight really is true and carried over to the years at Columbia, where the school of the arts became my instrument. I think one of the spells of relatively serious depression that I ran into in retirement after I'd left the deanship at Columbia, was a sort of particular version of the standard difficulty of going into retirement where you don't have a place to go at nine in the morning. I sort of came to see that as in my particular case that I could only express myself through an institution, and I wasn't going to have an institution again, and that is still a matter of adjustment.

I mean Wilfred's book will include a very few, and in one or two cases quite important contributions from people that I got to know after that sabbatical year, but not to the extent that prevents me from saying that had the book been written when I got back, which was theoretically my intention – I even had a publisher at that point – it would not be significantly different from whatever book shows up now. But this particular version of procrastination I think perhaps is there in part because of what may just be a slightly neurotic look at the picture of needing an institution rather than acting on my own, as it were.

I do think that in terms of my attitude towards my job at Dartmouth and in terms of the Hopkins Center, that I definitely saw it as – and I would say that I was encouraged to see it as at the point when I was first appointed, and at various points along the way – I saw it and was

meant by Leonard and the institution, as it were, speaking through Leonard, to see myself as proactive. That there was a role and I talked last time about how that creates problems.

I guess I said last time – if I didn't I certainly want to say it now – that it's my observation that with each new appointment, and there have been three people as director of the Hop since I left, the room for initiative-taking by the director has been made less and less. And although I think Lewis is by far the best of the three and because he came to the job from the faculty has, as far as I know, on the whole good rapport as a result of that with especially the music and drama departments. I think that he doesn't see himself quite as the ringmaster, to use a not particularly good metaphor, that I saw myself.

I mean it was the art of administration. When I responded to the welcome that I got by the faculty of the school of the arts at Columbia – there was a little party for me when I first arrived and a couple of speeches were made, and I was expected to make a speech – I remember saying that I wasn't sure whether a serious claim could be made for the argument that there was such a thing as the art of administration. But if there is such a thing as the art of administration, it's a performing art in that you're writing on water as Keats said. It actually isn't true of poetry, of course, because the writing actually ends up in print, and the books end up in the library, and you're there.

But if you're an actor or an instrumentalist or a vocalist, even since recordings of all kinds are now made, still the actual performance, what actually happens in live performance can't be recreated and does disappear as soon as it's over. And I think that the art of administration is full of that: initiatives that might have been followed up on by my successor at the Hop, like a deliberate effort to make a commitment to non-departmental, cross-departmental work, like All Goddard's Children and the Hop Op Coop. They don't exist. And so some aspects of my contribution ended up being ephemeral. And there are, I guess, many initiatives that are taken by administrators have a certain life and then don't. I mean others, like going coed, are indestructible. They are, in that sense, they're not passing. But the Great Issues course is something that ended up disappearing, as it were.

DONIN: How difficult was it for you when you left the directorship to stay around watching somebody else do what you were doing?

SMITH: It was not easy. I think this was on the last tape. If it wasn't, it should be there, that I was, as one would expect, not a member of the search

committee. But I met with the search committee initially when it first began its work and talked about what I thought one should be looking for. And I must have met with them at the point where they had narrowed down to the people they were going to interview because I have the distinct recollection of, before any decision was made to appoint Shelton, I had his vita in front of me as part of a session with the committee. And presumably there were others whose names I have now forgotten.

I thought he was the best of the bunch. I don't now recall at what point and for what reason, once I had stepped down, I came to be unhappy about his appointment. It wasn't, though, a seriously difficult thing for me to be there, and I definitely tried to make sure that my presence there didn't make anything difficult for him.

I mean the same had happened with me and Warner. He stayed around. He doubtless had to bite his tongue occasionally. He was deeply, deeply hurt by the disappearance of the Congregation of the Arts. But there was only one occasion when he was angry and in public about something that I had done, and I felt that it was very important that I should stay out of Shelton's way. I don't think this is on the other tape, though it might be because there was the part of the interview that dealt with the disappearance of the Congregation of the Arts.

The one and only time that Warner lost his cool was in a program… There was a concert that constituted the last occasion on which a very distinguished chamber music group called the Hungarian String Quartet were playing for the last time together. They had been together for decades and they all had decided that they should give up rather than have the youngest members do what many quartets do and sort of keep replacing one at a time. So this is a highly emotional occasion. It also came under the same management as the Chicago Symphony Orchestra. It was another occasion when a manager figured that what was bound to be a rather solemn occasion for them, it would be good if it happened at Dartmouth. (I must hold onto one thing that comes to mind as I say this that I very much want to have in the record.)

So they included in their program a string quartet by their fellow countryman Kodaly. For all I remember there may have been something by Bartók, too. It would be appropriate if there were.

I do know that when the concert was over and they were applauded, and the printed program stated that this was, in effect, their farewell

performance, they came back on and played, both as an encore and as a swan song for themselves, a movement from one of the late Beethoven quartets which, I subsequently gathered, is from time to time used for exactly this point. It's a movement called a *cavatina*, and if my memory were better, I could tell you which opus it is. But I think it's the next to last of all the Beethoven quartets. It's an extraordinarily beautiful piece of music, very quiet, with a real elegiac sound to it.

It was a moving experience that these four elderly gentlemen were saying goodbye to their world this way. So I think everybody in the audience was moved except Warner Bentley. He was moved in a different way. And he immediately broke the spell that I was under as a result of listening to this farewell performance. He came up to me and said, "How dare you have a program…" He was shaking the piece of paper. "…with a work by Kodaly, and you choose not to mention that he was here as composer in residence during the Congregation of the Arts. That's taking it too far." And stormed away.

By that time the program notes were being written by (I had another thought I'm sure I won't lose track of) an assistant that I had brought in to help in just this way, an Englishman who was a graduate in music from Cambridge, and who had a lovely time in this, his first job in arts administration which was what he wanted his career to be. He hadn't taken in the fact that Kodaly had been here, and I didn't read the program notes ahead of time. And certainly Warner was right. I mean it should have been mentioned. It would have been entirely appropriate, and it would have made other people besides Warner happy to have a reference to that. But this is by way of saying that Warner stayed out of my way.

The reference to Tony Burton [Anthony G. Burton], this young man who wrote those program notes, reminds me that one thing I have not talked about was, I think, thought by most people who cared about the Hop to be a very good thing, and it was something that was suggested to me by Leonard as soon as I got there, conceivably even as a part of the negotiations where I was hired and where my title was chosen and all of that. He had said, and I don't know whether it was his idea or something that he had been made to think about by someone else in the college community. But Leonard said that he felt sure that a good thing that I should inaugurate, initiate, was the printing of a monthly newsletter, in which all the activities of the month would be listed and described and, as it were, pitched. And that became a very important element in my sense of myself as director.

From the beginning, actually not the very beginning. The very first one was printed by I forget who or where even. But I think almost immediately it may have been that there was more than one, but there were certainly not more than three in that original format. Then I guess, because Rocky Stinehour's [Roderick D. “Rocky” Stinehour ‘50] Stinehour Press had a branch at that time in Hanover where letter press printing was being done, run by his brother, almost from the start the newsletter was designed by and printed by the Stinehour Press. Its appearance and its elegance, as a result of Rocky's genius and his picking good people, that became, as far as I was concerned, a very important part of the state of affairs.

I think there were those – and this would be very understandable – who thought that its appearance reflected a conservatism on my part, which spilled over into other areas there. There were people who thought it was altogether too, not academic isn't the right word, but too classical, as it were. Even when Rocky sort of joined in the pride that I felt about this and one of his colleagues up in Lunenburg produced a little drawing every month to beautify the front page of that, and I wrote this introduction, for a certain number of people there in the community and in the student body, there was… It was awaited. I mean it became something that a lot of people used a magnet to keep on their fridge doors.

DONIN: Right.

SMITH: There was a real down side to it, though, which I guess I never got beyond holding onto the impossible dream that ultimately everyone would love the arts at Dartmouth, and that every student would come and spend time or go to events there. And that....

End Tape 13, Side B
Begin Tape 14, Side A

SMITH: The down side was that a copy of the monthly newsletter was put in every mailbox in Hinman. So once a month I would walk through the area getting to the snack bar, and I would see hundreds of copies put in what eventually became recycling bins. It was, of course – and of course I knew this – unrealistic to think that every student would at least take it back to the dorm room. And I never made any kind of survey, I've no idea how many did do that. But the evidence of those who didn't do that, who in fact… I mean, I would also on occasion be there as kids emptied their mailbox, took the mail out, and put it in the bin without looking at it. We all have in the mail that comes into our

houses things which we regard as junk mail that other people regard as essential communications. And there never was in the time that I was there, and I think it died out more or less when I left, there never was a time when the Hinman post office on the right day of the month did not remind me very, very forcibly that for a lot of people this was of no importance whatsoever. But being rational about it tells one that that was bound to be the case. But it was easy to be discouraged.

The reason that came back to mind was that once Tony Burton came on the scene, Leonard was very easily persuaded, at the point where I'd justified the existence of an assistant with relatively low pay and intended for entry-level people interested in arts education, in arts administration, I mean… Once that position was established, Leonard was very willing very quickly to allow me for the first appointment to offer to some young English person the opportunity I had had to come to North America at the very beginning of their career. So it was only advertised in British journals, and there were several good applicants, and... I'm hesitating, but I think I'll go ahead.

This is a kind of personal thing which I guess doesn't really quite belong on here. But I'm launched into this thought that the person that impressed me most – but in this context, what does it mean? – was a very attractive young woman. And this is a kind, an aspect of chauvinism or sexism which is deplorable. I didn't offer her the job because I thought I might be in danger of finding her too attractive.

The interviews were held at the house of Joseph Losey, this filmmaker who had come into play. I'm sure there's stuff about him on the other tape. He had a beautiful house in Chelsea and agreed that he would… He and his wife both and Jon Appleton who worked in London at the time that the interview took place. The four of us became an interviewing committee. And when it was all over, I said… We didn't make a decision as a committee; it was understood that we would join in the interviewing so as to be able to put our heads together afterwards. So it wasn't as though they came expecting that they would help make the decision.

It wouldn't have been possible for me to share this with Jon Appleton. But it was possible with Joe, who was a kind of father figure for me. So I shared with him this dilemma that I had. I think he said something along the lines of, "If you think you could do the wrong thing, it probably means that you could. And since you know that you shouldn't, I think you're perfectly entitled to make a decision with that in mind."

Tony Burton was the beneficiary and has never known that he wasn't first choice, anymore than the woman, whose name I've now completely forgotten and more or less whose appearance I've forgotten, knows. Tony, on the other hand, has remained a close friend, was a very popular member of the community for the two or three years that he held that job, was a very good musician. Eventually he ended up in a fairly senior position in the music department of the BBC before he decided X years ago to go freelance.

Some of the work that he did for the Hop was the beginning of work which now makes him reasonably good amounts of money, which is writing program notes. He very often writes the notes that accompany CD recordings in little booklets and so on. He's had, I think, on the whole, a very satisfactory life coming out of that, and I think is still in touch with one or two people whom he knew here and sees in London when they're there. It was a good decision. And he was really quite brilliant in terms of writing about the arts and certainly about music in particular. And within a little while of his arrival, he was writing the blurbs for most of the events. The introduction was always mine, and it was always carefully worded. It was something that I took pains over.

Tony's successors before… There were two, one of whom was a graduate of UNH who stayed around for a little while. I don't know what became of him. The third was a Dartmouth student who filled that job pretty well on his graduation, who has now spent a life in arts administration.

At the point of… I mean it's a rather shocking thing to think that he is now in his 50s and thinking about retiring. But he made a decision somewhere along the way, I think, to get out of the stress of a very big job, which he had as the person running the program at the University of Arizona, where their concert hall, which got added onto so that it's also a theater place, but their concert hall was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright. And it's one of the state universities. And there are several which play a very, very important role in the life of their state and certainly their immediate region. So he has had a good career in that.

But the point where he left, maybe because… Yes, yes, it would have been at the point where I had been given a line in the budget to appoint a fundraising associate. I mean somebody whose job would be entirely to raise money. And he was around in that job for a number of years.

Then I think this was another of those awkward matters where I know what I want but don't handle particularly well. I saw this colleague as not being as effective as I thought he should be, and in some way organized a shift whereby he became a part of the central development staff in Blunt, and was well thought of there. He was in charge of one of the divisions, I don't remember which, like corporate, not alumni but friends or something. At that time they were broken down into foundations and corporate giving and that kind of thing, and he was put in charge of one of those.

The process whereby he was let go was handled in terms of – which was a perfectly reasonable thing for me to say – that maybe it would be more effective if I were the principal fund-raiser. But that would mean that I needed an assistant, a fairly well paid assistant, in terms of programming and arts events management and so on. A very, very impressively good person was recruited for that job, a woman who had just stepped down from a fairly senior post in the National Endowment for the Arts Dance Program. Her name was Janet Oetinger.

Whereas the two people who followed Tony Burton in this sort of personal assistant role were not equipped to take over the writing of the blurbs for the thingy-me-bob or music program notes. I went back to doing all this stuff for the newsletter. Other people did program notes, I guess; I can't remember.

But Janet – Jan as she was called – was a Stanford graduate, I think, maybe even *summa cum laude*, and also a graduate of the Yale Drama School, and a very, very impressive person. A very difficult person in terms of personality, but she knew it, and things worked very well though not quite as amiably altogether as had been the case; she stepped on toes a fair amount. But she was very good at what she did, and I think she was still there when Shelton arrived.

At any rate, she went straight from the Hop to be in charge of the cultural program at UC-Santa Barbara and stayed there until her retirement just a couple of years ago, and had a wonderful life. And by virtue of being involved in the programming at the Hop for I guess maybe four or five years, got to know a lot of people on the scene, and is, I think, universally seen as one of the best people in that business. So there are, in a sense, Hop alumni who aren't college alumni, and one takes pleasure in their successes. And she also became a well-liked member of the Hanover community; she was very vivacious. So that deals with the business of getting the newsletter into the record.

One of the personal benefits that came out of that newsletter was that at some point after it had been going around for a couple of years, I think I got a phone call from David Godine [David R. Godine ‘66], G-O-D-I--N-E, who has had a wonderful career as a protegé of Ray Nash [Ray Nash ‘41A] and the Book Arts Program that he ran and that Rocky Stinehour's a graduate of as are many other people. We talked, I think, a little bit about the disappearance of that and how unhappy it made a lot of people. But it was not a Wysocki priority and so on and so on.

David has run his own publishing firm almost from the point when he arrived. So I think it was a phone call just out of the blue to thank me for the newsletters. He was on the mailing list for the Hopkins Center publications. He obviously recognized the quality of the printing, but he also wanted to thank me for the writing and came out with the rather astonishing words, "So I also want you to know that when you want to write a book, I want to publish it." And when I got, as I was planning my sabbatical and thinking about writing a book about Wilfred, I sort of took him up on that offer. And, cutting a long story short, because there was a fair amount of negotiation about what the book would be, eventually it was settled that it could be a biography of somebody that nobody had ever heard of. I had a contract with David, and I got an advance from him, which was part of the money I had in hand before my sabbatical in London, and I had a deadline, I guess which must have been November 1983, at which point I hadn't written a word. Sent him back the advance with interest, and it sits out there now.

DONIN: Did you time your sabbatical… Was that at all tied to John Kemeny's retirement?

SMITH: No, it wasn't. The reason that I gave out was exceedingly complicated in terms of my sense of myself and my sense of what I wanted to do. It was triggered, without any question, though it wasn't a simple cause and effect, but it was undoubtedly triggered by the fact that in the summer of 1980 I got involved in acting on a much larger scale than had been the case ever before. I'm sure I talked about this, getting cast in The Country Wife and playing the lead role in it opposite Meredith Baxter Birney, as she was at that time called.

In what I think my friends and probably my ex-wife would say was a typically romantic state of mind, I decided that I was in danger of being in a rut for the rest of my life, and that if I didn't give up running the Hop relatively soon, I'd be there for life, and that deep down I didn't want that. So I had this what I was able to recognize at some later point,

fairly early on in time, was that I would try to earn a living and be able to earn a living as an actor and as a writer.

So that a significant element in terms of my resigning from the position was that I expected my career to change, to go in a significantly different direction. But I guess that between having first thought of this at the end of the summer of 1980 up to the point where I actually stepped down, which was almost a year later, I realized that this was a rather ridiculous notion, and that I should be thinking about something much more sensible. And I don't now recall precisely how it happened, but I think it was John Kemeny's intervention that led to what turned out to be a formal agreement. I think it was John's response to getting the news from Leonard that I was going to step down.

Whether it was John's initiative or Leonard's, it was highly gratifying. Which is that if you actually don't know what you're going to do in the future, what I would like is for us to understand that when you come back from your sabbatical, there will be a job for you here even if there's no way of knowing what that job will be. And there must have been a formal letter of agreement, that came certainly from John, which put that in writing, which also attached to it a minimum salary of exactly half of what I was making as director of the Hopkins Center.

It's so long ago, I can't remember what those figures were. But it was probably something along the lines of my salary was around $60,000, and the salary I would get when I came back would be around half of that. It was as big a compliment as I ever had and made me feel very good because I was indeed very fond of Dartmouth and knew that Gwenda and Morgan, too, liked life in the Upper Valley. And I don't think any of us gave a great deal of thought to what would happen next.

I know that I was very taken by surprise by John's announcement that he was going to stand down, for two reasons, one of them being that I hadn't seen any… I mean I had seen how being president had been very, very demanding in many ways. And of course it was during John's presidency that the Dartmouth Review was founded and started its disgusting activities. And there had been a good deal of stress for the major initiatives that John took.

First of all, coeducation. Then the rather brilliant way of dealing with what seemed to be the thing that would stop it (which was the very strong sentiment against making the college any bigger) and moving into year-round operation, which was brilliant and which, I'm surprised,

has been taken up by virtually no other institution. It makes a huge amount of sense not just from the economic point of view, but the variety in terms of the time you'll spend there, both for the students and the faculty is a real plus.

I think I'm right in remembering that there was some resentment on the part of the person who I think believed and still believes that going year 'round was his idea. Resentment on his part and of his friends. He left not long after year-round operation came in and went to join the faculty at UC-Berkeley. Resentment that it ended up being known, as far as the general public and the general population of the college was concerned, as being a Kemeny idea.

I think Arthur Luehrmann [Arthur W. Luehrmann Jr.] would dispute that, and I don't know what the truth is. I feel sufficiently strongly about John Kemeny's sense of himself and his worth that not in a deliberate way, but if it became clear that everybody thought it was his idea, he was not going to say it wasn't. That's a terrible thing to say because that implies that he did know. I don't know.

I do know that – and this is a significant thing to get into the record, I believe – I do know that increasingly the faculty, to the extent that you can talk about the faculty as a unit, but an increasing number of members of the arts & sciences faculty became less and less enthusiastic about John's presidency for one particular reason. It was brought home to me… It came as a big surprise to me. I generally am programmed, as the saying goes, to think the best of every situation and the best of every person and, you know, Pollyanna is a great hero. [Laughter] So it came as a big shock at the end of one of the faculty meetings, well into John's term but certainly not close to the end of it, and it was one of the occasions when – maybe this was true of all of the faculty meetings – John, of course, was in the chair. Refreshments were provided before we broke up and went home.

So I remember very distinctly, because it was such a shock, finding myself at the table with the coffee and cookies, alongside Jim Cox [James M. “Jim” Cox], who was a professor of English and I think almost, one could say, universally admired. A very, very, very good teacher and a wonderful human being and, in general terms, a very amiable type. I certainly have no recollection of what was on the agenda. But I remember very clearly, because it was such a surprise, that Jim Cox and I were standing apart from anybody else at that particular moment, and Jim said, "I'll tell you one thing. I'm sure this faculty is not going to allow (I’m sure as strong a word as that) another

member of the faculty to be appointed as president." And along with having had that thought put into my head, it sort of came into various conversations with members of the faculty, and probably with Jim himself. I'm pretty sure at the time I didn't ask him to explain that. But once I cottoned on, I realized that indeed this was a very, very valid point, along the lines of…

One of John Kemeny's, one of the great things and good things about John Kemeny was also one of the least satisfactory or on occasion could turn out to be among the least satisfactory things about John Kemeny, which was that in almost every situation, he was the smartest person in the room. And more than that, he knew he was the smartest person in the room. And what Jim was referring to, and I would expect this will be on other tapes, was that John didn't take in the extent to which he was assuming that he could speak for the faculty because he was a member of the faculty. And knew that he was indeed in the most general, but also profound, terms, admired as a member of that faculty.

There's no question at all that my recollection tells me that when his appointment was announced, it was thought by the faculty in general – to the extent that one can generalize – it was received with great pleasure. It was seen as a splendid appointment, not only because it had come from the faculty, which I guess had never happened before in the history of the institution. He wasn't the first real academic, because Nichols [Ernest Fox Nichols] was that, I guess. But there was great rejoicing.

DONIN: Let's turn the tape.

SMITH: Okay.

End Tape 14, Side A
Begin Tape 14, Side B

SMITH: Cox's verdict was shared, was in place as the down side of the Kemeny presidency.

DONIN: What exactly was it about the presidency they weren't happy about?

SMITH: About their sense that they were taken for granted. That although, of course, all kinds of decision making came to the faculty to make and was made along the way by faculty committees, that there were too many occasions when John seemed to believe that he really didn't need to consult the faculty because he knew what the faculty wanted.

This is not something that I've articulated to myself but does follow on perhaps. I think one of the issues, maybe the issue above all others, where the faculty was left very, very disappointed and dismayed was on the matter of the abolition of the fraternities. It may be that some degree of the disappointment and distress sort of spilled over onto John's inability to persuade the trustees.

This was a very big issue. It was one of only two occasions when I spoke at the faculty meetings. I was there as one of the relatively small number of administrators who were ex-officio members of the faculty of arts & sciences. And on the whole, I didn't speak. But I did speak at the very well-attended and very long and very stirring meeting of the faculty which led to the resolution which passed overwhelmingly that the faculty recommended that the fraternities be disbanded. My contribution, I remember, came in the form of a reflection on one particular moment in the film Animal House, which was relatively new at that point, and which I am sure we had all, everybody, in the faculty practically had been to see. And at a point well into the discussion where this particular matter that I was struck by when I watched the film had not been raised, I thought that it should be raised. Which was simply that I hadn't known myself until I was told by a member of the med school faculty, I think, with whom I had been… I guess we'd walked out of Animal House together.

At any rate, somewhere between seeing the movie and this debate, I had been told, had become aware, that the consumption of a lot of alcohol in a short time can, in fact, be lethal. And so I referred to the point at which the John Belushi character in the film downs a whole bottle of whiskey, I mean at one go. And how that had been cheered by the largely student population who were watching the film. And that had made me think that they were as ignorant as I had been at the time. That the character basically couldn't have done that without at least falling into a coma. So that was my little contribution. Jim Epperson [James A. “Jim” Epperson III], who was an extremely popular member of the English department, proposed the motion--

DONIN: Who wrote the report.

SMITH: He wrote a report, yes, yes.

DONIN: Right.

SMITH: And who started the discussion, spoke very, very strongly. Obviously those meetings were tape-recorded, so this is all there to be referred to, and there's really not much point in my saying much more. Except that…

I don't think this is on the other tape, though the beginning was very rambling there, and I may have referred to it in conjunction with the times when I spoke with Mr. Dickey after his retirement. It's worth putting in though it'll be on John's tape for sure. But the fact that he was so entirely ready to say this in public is another aspect of the same thing because I remember being at the relatively short-lived faculty club that was there in Choate House. And as I was leaving, John Kemeny was also in the corridor leaving with somebody who was not on the faculty, somebody I didn't know, who was talking with John, and who said, "So, John, I guess you have every reason to think that you've achieved everything that you wanted to achieve."

DONIN: Oh, yes, yes.

SMITH: And he said, "Except for getting rid of the fraternities."

Let me just come to the second part of why I was taken by surprise by John's announcement because I still personally think that it has a great significance, and that was his obsession with the number 13. The fact that he would be the 13th president of Dartmouth was undoubtedly an element in what was the drive to get that job. And I'm sure I can't have been alone in assuming that he would be president for 13 years. And he stepped down after 11. And I guess he was worn out. The difference in appearance between the guy who's on the cover of the alumni magazine sitting beside John Dickey when his appointment was announced and the person who was there at the end is more striking than most such contrasts.

But I personally see the significance, and I guess it's unlikely that I'll ever know whether I'm right to think this, that David McLaughlin also assumed that John Kemeny would be there for 13 years. Which would have meant that the presidency became available a year or so after Dave had stepped down from the board of trustees. I think he's an intelligent enough person to have known that the chances of his getting the presidency could well be affected by the issue of his being a member of the board, indeed the chairman of the board at the point where the job came around. I don't think there's any circumstance in which I would ever be likely to ask Dave if that's true. And there's no reason why he should give me an honest answer.

I'm going to take a break.

[Interruption in Tape]

DONIN: Okay.

SMITH: So I think that's… I mean I suspect that as I talk about other things, I've been reminded of points that I want to make about John Kemeny and his presidency. But one thing to do with my directorship of the Hopkins Center that is a matter of great importance to me came back to mind at the point when I mentioned that the manager for the Hungarian String Quartet knew that the Hop was the right place for them to give their farewell performance.

DONIN: And John Kemeny didn't come to that?

SMITH: No.

DONIN: Amazing.

SMITH: Yes, yes. No. Yes, it is amazing. He had no interest.

I mean one of the things that… Perhaps for the first time ever in my life – I think this may be true – John was the first person I knew well who was able and who I knew to be able to concentrate intensely.

I mean John had the capacity that I certainly don't have of shutting everything else out in order to concentrate on whatever was on the table. It's one of the things, along with sharp-wittedness and an extremely good memory and a good heart and a good attitude towards the work that he did, those are the things that made him a great president.

He was very, very effective and very able to achieve what he wanted to achieve, with the exception of the fraternities. Which, I think, was a reflection of the old-time Dartmouth still present on his board. I mean at the time that the board refused to go along with the idea of ending the fraternities – this could easily be checked out – my guess is that the majority of them were, yes, the majority may well have been still people who had been undergraduates during Hopkins' time. And one of the things I used to find really repellent was that there was a member of the board of trustees who was from my adopted class of 1935.

For a long time there were two people, both of them from '35, one of them I thought much less appealing than the other. Ralph Lazarus ['35], who owned Federated Stores and Bloomingdale's and all of that; the other one was a person with much less achievement to his name called David Smith [David Parkhurst Smith '35]. And I used to find it repellent up until Dave Smith died – because I went to all the reunions of the class of '35 – that he would get together with a few of his buddies in the class who had been, as he was, a member of the Glee Club, and they had to sing all the old songs, and I think fundamentally were still sorry that the place had gone coed.

So that hangover, I think, was as much as anything responsible for the fact that that didn't go through. That can't be true for the most recent go-around, at that. I certainly thought--and I'm sure that other people thought; I know that Bob Reich, who was by then no longer on the trustees--really did think that this time the fraternities were going to disappear. But they didn't.

DONIN: [Inaudible.]

SMITH: Yes. And other things may come back about John. The point is that almost without having made – no, not almost – without having made a conscious decision that this is what I wanted to see happen, I created an audience for classical music at Dartmouth, which once I'd seen, once I was aware of it, I saw was what I considered to be the ideal audience, which is, in a phrase, made up entirely of people who actually want to be there.

I remember vividly, and, as I say, it wasn't a conscious decision that referred back to this, but I remember vividly the first time I came to New York City, I guess the first time ever, was while I was still in Canada, still at McMaster. And when I was going out with Gwenda but before we were married, we had a vacation where we spent many days in New York City. It was the one time that I went to anything at the old Metropolitan Opera House. But Lincoln Center was brand new, more or less, at this point. So we went to Carnegie Hall, we went to Avery Fisher Hall, Philharmonic Hall as it was called then, to concerts. And I can't remember what we saw at Carnegie Hall. But I know that at Philharmonic Hall we went to a concert that was given by the Philadelphia Orchestra conducted by one of the great names in conducting at that point, a man called Otto Klemperer, who was by then very old, but venerated.

At all three of these occasions, but most especially at the one involving Klemperer and the Philharmonic, we were both staggered. I've seen this written up many, many times in one context or another. We found it unbelievable that there were so many people there who clearly didn't want to be there. Mostly men who were there with their wives, subscribers to events and all of that kind of thing. With shuffling, of opening and closing of programs, with trying to find something in the program, just.... Then something that I had never ever seen in all my concert-going in Britain up to that point: people just leaving when they had to leave. Not even waiting for the end of a movement, let alone the end of the concert. And as I say, I'm sure I didn't link that.

But somehow, from the beginning – so I say it wasn't a conscious decision – But from the beginning, in spite of my desire, a very strong drive, to get people to come to these concerts… It was important for all kinds of reasons that as many people as could be, as it were, would show up, and I would describe what the concert was going to be and the people giving it in ways that I hoped would make it attractive. But I know – and was I aware, was there also something about which I was self-conscious? – I know that I never sold an event as being a place where you ought to be for some reason other than the enjoyment of the event.

And long after that had become the mode, even if it meant, as it did from time to time, having a very small audience in Spaulding because either the nature of the program or because the person was not well known… I mean all of those things because fame to a certain extent spills over. But as I guess I'm sure that this got on tape before, the fact that both Pavarotti and Springsteen appeared in Spaulding and didn't fill the house was something which in terms of my career as a whole is something to be proud of. And as it happens, the one occasion which showed me very, very clearly that what I believed had happened: that I had created an ideal audience, which was something managers got to know, and the attentiveness with which the musicians were received was something.

I know that on at least a couple of record sleeves that I got inscribed by people who had performed there, one involving Georg Solti and one involving a wonderful Dutch soprano called Elly Ameling, the expression is "and thank you for your public." Which when I first saw it I didn't quite understand, but then I figured out what was going on.

And the event that… The thing that made me totally aware of what I'd done, and my pleasure at having done it, occurred on the one occasion

when I presented somebody who really was world famous, up there with Rudolf Serkin, and in some people's minds up there with Horowitz and one of the great living pianists, was a Chilean pianist called Claudio Arrau.

I had thought – because his recital was fairly late on in my term as director – I thought that by then there were enough people living in the Upper Valley, enough people in the student body also, who would recognize that name, and they wouldn't have to be persuaded to come, that it would be a wonderful event.

And then at some point fairly close to the event I checked the box office and realized that we hadn't sold half the house even. And the Campion family, who at that time owned a good percentage of Main Street for their clothing store. Although none of the Campions had graduated from Dartmouth, they were very attached to the place out of enlightened self-interest. I mean it made their prosperity what it was as long as Jim and Dottie were running it. I think it changed when the next generation came in.

But at some point quite early on, I guess through my publicity person, Marion Bratesman, Jimmy Campion had said, "Whenever you absolutely need it, when it is something that is very important to you, I'll be happy to pay for a full-page ad in the Valley News with just my little logo at the bottom to show that I've paid for this. But it's your space; use it any way you want." The first time I used it, I remember, was indeed when the Chicago Symphony came because there was nothing… I mean it was so important that it succeed that it was not to be risked.

So I remember that the ad. I can't remember what it looked like, but the headline was “106+1.” 106 being the members of the orchestra and the one being Georg Solti. And actually I think it's true to say that every time – I guess there were four or five over the course of the years – every time that the Campions sponsored an ad, which was always designed by our design studio in the Hopkins Center, they won an award in New Hampshire, among PR people and all of that.

And so this was an occasion where we were only a few days away from Claudio Arrau's appearance, and we hadn't sold half the house. One of the things about running the Hop was that I became a very good copy writer. [Laughter] So I wrote a very, very persuasive ad, pointing out that this man was world famous, and that people queued up to hear him, and all of that.

As a result, the house was full. But it was full of people who were there because the ad had told them if they were "anyone" they'd be bound to be there. I mean it was definitely pitched in that direction, and it worked, and it was a rotten audience. I don't think people left before the end. But it was not a Hopkins Center audience, I mean without any question.

So I was glad that that happened. As far as I know, that basic approach was maintained and is still there. And it was certainly something that the musicians recognized.

DONIN: So it's really a question of quality over quantity.

SMITH: Yes. Exactly. Yes, which is always the important thing.

DONIN: Right.

SMITH: And I suppose it's another way of saying that I regarded the central role of the director of the Hopkins Center as being the role of an educator. That was what the center was there to do and not only the student body, but everybody.

At Columbia I made two speeches, occasionally something extra, but two speeches every year. Eventually three speeches because we started what no one had done beforehand of having an orientation program at the beginning of the academic year. There was at that time – I think it's been discarded now – but there was at that time a provision where every faculty, each of the 16 faculties, had to have a formal annual meeting over which the president of the university presided, and the dean was expected to make a formal statement at that time. Then also it wasn't going on when I first arrived, but very quickly instituted having a speech at commencement or at least at the graduation ceremony for the students from my school.

It comes back to mind because I was about to use a phrase which is loaded, and which I brought into the very first address at the first annual meeting of my faculty at Columbia, which used a quotation from something that has been written down very often, that Handel, George Frederic Handel, is said to have… Well, he must have said it because it's recorded by the person to whom he said it. Some member of the British aristocracy congratulated him on "Messiah," and had said how much he had enjoyed it, and how much he had been entertained. Entertained had a different meaning in the 18th century. It was more

than a, it was being presented with something to appreciate. Handel said – I wish I could quote it exactly – “My lord, I had in mind not just to entertain the members of the audience, but to make them better."

And in quoting that, especially in front of the president and provost of Columbia University, I went on to say, you know, a phrase "to make them better" is something that in a certain sense we would all be embarrassed to use. It's not something that anyone would say very often in any context. But at the same time, we all know what it means. And we all, or almost all, would say that that is an appropriate thing on which to use your talent.

End of Tape 14, Side B
BeginTape 15, Side A

SMITH: By the time I became dean at Columbia, I was more self-conscious about what it was I was doing. But in terms of running Hopkins Center, I didn't create… I certainly didn't go there with and nowhere along the time did I create, as it were, a formal manifesto of what I was there to do. But it became evident to me and to other people, I think. I mean it was one of the, in a general sense, a consideration with the monthly newsletters and the introduction to them. And somewhere I have a set of them and I feel very proud of them. And they're there somewhere in the Archives, too.

So that audience and that public contribution to the life of the institution and the life of the Upper Valley is important to me. And I think it's fair to say that… I mean there's no need for me to make a comparison. But I think it's fair to say that I wouldn't think that that was something that even unconsciously Warner was doing. I think that Warner, as a theater director, absolutely saw the whole range of benefits that come from engaging oneself in theater. That that's a serious thing.

But I guess one of the things that I have come to realize is that something that I used to take for granted is in fact something that is comparatively rare. It was brought home to me absolutely directly by a conversation that I had with the associate dean of the journalism school at Columbia, a very successful man in his field. And we were talking away. I don't remember quite how we came in contact. But we enjoyed being together. I think maybe at the very first meeting this guy said, "Are you one of those people who gets up in the morning thinking that you're going to make the world a better place?" And truly, my initial reaction was: “Doesn't everyone?” And though I didn't say that, I answered in such a way that the conversation then went on to

convince me that indeed everybody did not. I mean not everybody did. Which is a different thing from everybody did not.

I'm sure that… This maybe is a segue. I could not fail to believe that John Dickey and John Kemeny were of that company. They had a quite self-aware sense of mission. I don't know that Dave McLaughlin did or does.

One of the people I got to know through running the Hopkins Center, got to know fairly well, and with whom I stayed in touch until the comparatively recent past, was Walter Burke. Walter was the chairman of the search committee that chose Dave McLaughlin. (I won't lose the thread here by going back to talk about one specific thing I remember from my association with Walter Burke.) And he and the Hopkins Center were closely tied in a way that was pretty self-conscious, as it were. Walter was made a member of the board of overseers, as I think we both came to realize, as a sort of trial run for whether he should join the board of trustees. Because although he was clearly a person that it would be on paper very good to have on the board, not only because of his wealth but because of his experience running Sherman Fairchild. John Kemeny and presumably whoever was chair of the board at the time wanted him on the board of trustees but didn't know enough about him to sort of just call him and ask him if he'd serve. So they asked him if he'd be an overseer.

So I spent quite a lot of time with Walter. It was during the time that he was new to the life of the Hop and, in a sense, new to the life of the college, that we instituted a program which was certainly, I thought, very, very well worthwhile, and I'm sure it has paid for itself many times over, which was to have our own version of Horizons.

I don't know if that's still done. If it isn't, they're missing a bet. It was a question of reaching out to alumni and more particularly parents of students currently there. It lasted as long as the regular Horizons because we chose it for a weekend when it would be possible for the people who came on our Hop-Horizons Program to attend the Dartmouth Players production and a concert by one of the musical organizations so that they could see what students' involvement was. And, of course, they toured the place, and they had a session with Matt Wysocki; perhaps, on occasion, with the artist-in-residence, too. It was very, very worthwhile.

Walter came on the first of them. I think maybe the first of them was somehow tied in with a meeting of the board of overseers. It may well

be that this was an appropriate way of inaugurating the program. So Walter became very knowledgeable. As I mentioned yesterday, he was on the search committee for the Hood architect. Somewhere during the time I got to know him… He was one of several trustees in whose house I was a houseguest. I think not an insignificant thing to say in this context, whether it was in connection with my speaking to an alumni club near where a trustee lived or whether it came out of a specific invitation. I guess by the time I left, I had been a houseguest at four or five, at the houses of four or five members of the board of trustees.

At Columbia, one of the most significant differences was that I'd been there several years before I even met a member of the Columbia board of trustees. The president made a great point of keeping them as his band, until one of the trustees, who eventually voted for that president being pushed out, resented it so much that he set up his own special one-day program at his house on the Connecticut coast so that he could actually meet all the deans. Almost all of them he'd never seen before.

However, Walter Burke was among the people with whom I stayed, in that case more than once. Something came up that showed me that he, as a manager… I should say that after the first meeting of the board of overseers, or maybe it was after that first Hop-Horizons, he asked me to come and see him at his office in New York – although he had retired, he nevertheless held onto an office in one of the buildings in the center of Manhattan – because he wanted to share with me his take on what he'd seen. That was a very valuable event and it helped me in terms of how I presented myself and how I represented the Hop. But it must have also included a meeting of the board because it made me aware, through his observation, that I should be using especially Richard Stucker in a more sophisticated way. And that he ought to be present at all of the board meetings because it was important that they should know that there was somebody as competent as he was at my right hand, and he should be given a chance to show what he knew, etc., etc.

And just a segue (I don't think I'll lose track here). Just a segue into the McLaughlin years. The practice of having the senior members of the staff attend the board of overseers' meetings was something that then came about and then was continued. And I remember after I had left, in a conversation with Richard Stucker before Shelton Stanfill fired him, he told me how… I'm trying to find whatever the verb is that goes with suddenly realizing you're in the presence of someone who has ice in

his veins. At any rate, he had been shocked, but in a very particular way, because at this board of overseers' meeting… The most important thing about having a board of overseers, I think the most important thing, was that twice a year you had the president's undivided attention because it became *de rigeur* that the president was always at those meetings.

So McLaughlin was there at this meeting in the offices of the Gilman Paper company. Apparently the guy who at that point with Shelton was still looking after fundraising had performed badly, and McLaughlin took off after him. And Richard said, "As I sat there feeling wretched, I thought to myself, 'This man, David McLaughlin, has to be someone who doesn't care what other people think about him. Because if he did, he couldn't possibly behave as cruelly as he did on that occasion.'" Because he apparently ripped into whoever it was, in a way that, as I say, Richard, who had also lived throughout most of his career in the sheltered world, as it were, of the arts and the educational institution, had never seen this, and felt it was unbearable.

DONIN: Well, those stories are legion now about David McLaughlin.

SMITH: Yes, yes.

DONIN: The firings....

SMITH: Well, I guess I had never seen Dave do that in public, as it were, and that is what had shocked Richard. That this other colleague had been dressed down in front of everybody.

I'll get back to the thing that made me aware that Walter Burke and I lived in a totally different world. One of the elements in the Hopkins Center in my time that I was most proud of, and felt made a very, very valuable contribution to the life of the region and the life of the students, was what came out of the Hopkins Center design studio. We had a fulltime person, a part-time person, and a couple of interns doing, in a sense, "nothing but" create posters and design programs for special occasions and that kind of thing.

One of the things that made me very proud and very glad about this was I believed this was in every respect a good thing. And I also knew, or discovered, in the course of the years that the Hop was one of the very few places, at least in the world of the arts in higher education, that had this. And indeed out there, there is a large portfolio full of Hop posters that are unframed, and in the garage there's a whole slew of

others that are framed and that will eventually got up around these walls. And I think we could have, if we'd made the effort, through the world of graphics in terms of the graphic arts as understood in terms of advertising, public relations, and all of that, I suspect that had we made the effort we could have won a great many prizes and indeed become world famous. And it's still one of my little dreams that I will write a piece that gets published in the Swiss magazine called Graphis which is indeed the place to do all this.

And so at some point, because it was the appropriate thing to do, I told Walter how proud I was, and how proud I was of the fact that we were one of only two or three universities that had this. And he made it clear immediately that as far as he was concerned, if everybody else didn't need one of these, then why did we need one? And I'm sorry to say that it is one of the elements that has, in fact, by now disappeared from the Hopkins Center as part of balancing its budget, I guess. I have not kept in touch with anyone. I spent no time with Shelton or with Lynn Britt or with…?

DONIN: Lewis?

SMITH: Lewis, exactly. Ever talking about money, about the budget. So I don't know whether the thing I pointed out in the first go ‘round of these sessions of my efforts to keep our budget tied to the athletics budget; whether that's still true. I don't know whether.... I doubt that it is. I think that in Shelton's dealings both with McLaughlin and with Ag Pytte [Agnar “Ag” Pytte], who was the provost after Leonard and throughout all of the McLaughlin time, I don't think any of them, either of them, could be said to have been as strong supporters as Leonard and John Kemeny. John Kemeny actually was a strong supporter because he was a strong supporter of Leonard.

My involvement with John, in administrative terms, was virtually not there, except for one occasion when we'd overrun the budget by a very noticeable amount. And so when John was taking in and dealing with the college budget as a whole and this stood out like a sore thumb, he wrote me a formal letter saying that he wanted an explanation of what had happened. And I wrote an explanation. I was able to refer to a series of… It's wrong to call them series because they weren't related, but a number of specific instances in the course of that year where for no fault of ours the income generated at the box office had been much less than we had budgeted for. I think one of them had to do with a blizzard or whatever. But also among them was undoubtedly my

having guessed wrong as to how many people would want to come and see a couple of the things that I had put on.

I remember ending the… I mean John eventually sent back a letter explicitly saying that he was satisfied with my explanation. He saw why the budget was overrun to an unacceptable degree, and realized I'd had no control. But the way I ended it was saying that he must remember that in a sense the Hopkins Center is in the business of show business. And that if I were someone who could always bring in the audience that I said I would bring in, and that was implicit in the budget expectations for income, I would be unique in the world, and he wouldn't be able to afford to have me on his staff.

But having just said that I never talked with Shelton about money, actually I don't think I ever… I stayed in touch with Richard Stucker. But I also kept a distance from him for obvious reasons.

I don't think I know anything about the finances of the Hop in the 20-odd years since I was there. I felt that we were very well supported financially. I felt that we were seen… Although I made this point, and Leonard knew that I was making it, and I assume that perhaps he had it in mind, too, because he was involved in the budget-making for the whole institution… Although I referred to athletics in terms of that relationship, I also referred to the library in terms – not financial terms – but of the role that the Hop played, and that it was an element in the educational endeavor. So, as I say, I don't know how my successors fared in that respect.

And yet at the same time I'm also saying it wouldn't surprise me at all if the subsidy provided out of the free funds of the institution went down, and noticeably, during the McLaughlin years. And that, of course, was to a certain extent the result of the split off into the Hood and the fact that because the Hood now existed and had not a gigantic staff but a bigger staff than the galleries operations had ever had, that more money in toto was being spent.

So Walter Burke thinks like an industrialist and thinks like a capitalist, and he is now someone I neither like nor respect. I've been with him enough times, indeed since leaving Dartmouth. While I was at Columbia, he became a member of the board of trustees of Columbia as well. And I owe him because the president of Columbia, when I was appointed dean, had told me that a clinching consideration in terms of the… He was the president – I don't think either of his successors at Columbia has been – but [Michael] Sovern regarded the appointment

of deans as the most important thing he did, and he was very, very much involved. I didn't know this, but part of becoming aware of this was finding out that he had himself had done a good deal of the calling around once the search committee had recommended me as one of the three people who should constitute the short list of the group that met him. And he told me that his conversation with Walter Burke was very important because at some point…

He didn't tell me everything that Walter said, of course. But he did tell me that at some point he had broached the matter of "the 41st president division" thing (vision), and Walter had said, "That's one thing you don't have to worry about." Mike at the time told me the phrase, and it was exceedingly gratifying.

So I owe him. But he represents for me, in spite of having been the president of a major foundation that has done an enormous amount to support higher education and having been generous himself out of his own money which has been built from the legacy he received from Sherman Fairchild, he still represents for me the cold, cutthroat aspect of the capitalist system as we know it in this country.

One of the vivid memories of the arrival of Dave McLaughlin, which I hope other people have also brought up or will bring up, was that after the announcement that Dave had been appointed president and I guess almost immediately afterward – on the same day it may well have been – there was a meeting of the faculty of arts & sciences, maybe it was the general faculty of the university which occasionally, very, very occasionally, met as a unit, at which the chairman of the search committee would present the new president, and they would both speak. And so that happened. And one of the phrases that emerged in the course of the PR about Dave's appointment may have been a Walter Burke coinage to the effect that there are few people who can walk this campus as Dave McLaughlin can walk it, in that it's been a part of his life throughout his life both in terms of undergraduate and being head of Palaeopitus and all that kind of stuff, being a Tuck graduate, being on the board of overseers at the Tuck School, being a trustee and deeply involved in alumni affairs. All of that was true.

I think it came as a great shock, especially that early on. I truly think just on the basis of the feeling in the room and the look on Walter's face… I think he came in there having convinced himself that this was the ideal appointment. And when both of them had spoken, I guess Walter was, in effect, chairing the meeting. I can't remember. One or the other of them asked if there were any questions. And I think my

recollection is right that immediately Bernie Gert [Bernard “Bernie” Gert] stood up, being professor of philosophy and one of the college's principal exponents of the matter of ethics, and I think one of the early people (others are more prominent now), but I think Bernie was the first person engaged in the activity of what one might call "practical ethics." And Bernie got up, and I think he said nothing more elaborate than, "Mr. Burke, did it not occur to you that this is a blatant conflict of interest?" And clearly it had not occurred to Walter. And I think the resentment that he felt showed immediately. And the fact that he wasn't prepared to answer it… Or at least the answer really was, “No, it never occurred to me, and I don't believe there is, effectively, a conflict of interest.”

I cannot remember whether Bernie came back, or whether this was just an internal conversation or something that I had with myself, or in conversation with others. But the follow-up, whether it was actually articulated or not – and maybe it was; that's doubtless all on tape as well – was along the lines of, “But how could you expect this board of trustees not to appoint this man? They surely had no choice.” I mean blah blah blah. So it got off to a very rocky start.

DONIN: That set the tone, right?

SMITH: Yes, it did. It did. And it made clear, it made, I guess, abundantly clear that....

End Tape 15, Side A
Begin Tape 15, Side B

SMITH: ...who I suspect was never reconciled to the departure of Dave McLaughlin, that he lived in a different world. And it became very clear very quickly that Dave lived in a different world, too. I think Dave… I hope this is on other tapes, and I expect it will be.

A vivid phrase, maybe he used it in his conversation with you and the recorder when you interviewed him, a vivid phrase for me came from Frank Smallwood. Somewhere along the way into the McLaughlin era, I remember running into him right outside Parkhurst. And as any meeting of two or more people on the Dartmouth faculty at that time and by that time I mean basically all six years of the McLaughlin presidency… Any time there was a conversation, it was likely to include some reference to the most recent unhappy-making thing that he'd done. So that this… I can picture where he stood and Frank used a phrase that made so much sense and was a sort of Dickeyism in that

it said so much in so few words. Frank said, "You know, I think he's one of those people who does not have an inner gyroscope. There is not a center around that keeps him in one place, keeps him grounded, as it were."

I think it's reasonable to say that just as Walter Burke… It never occurred to Walter Burke that this was anything but the right choice. I think, my hunch is, my take is, and at various points along the way I was in Dave McLaughlin's presence a fair amount, I don't think it would have occurred at all to Dave McLaughlin that anyone would care about his firing Rod Morgan [Rodney A. "Rod" Morgan '44], other than Rod and his friends.

But it did. And it showed that in a very fundamental way Dave McLaughlin, in spite of all those associations with the institution, had never cottoned on to one of the most important things about the institution, which is how close-knit it is. And people who didn't even know who Rod Morgan was, quite apart from the people who did know him, and I suspect that most of them who had any idea of who he was or what he did had no reason to think he deserved to be fired even before Dave had taken up the presidency. But the fact that this was done, and the fact that it essentially demonstrated that as far as the administration was concerned, Dave would continue to be a CEO and to act like a CEO. And the stories that got around, whether they were true or not, of that kind of behavior, in effect, saying, "I want the key to your office by the end of the afternoon," it seems not to have occurred to him that anyone would see that as inappropriate in that context.

And I think it struck many people – it certainly struck me – that one aspect of the appointment of a corporate executive to the presidency, which came exactly from that set of facts, would be, and in my opinion certainly was, that from the beginning the president would know that the president as such has relatively little power when it comes to matters academic. And therefore that dealing with whatever frustration was felt in that respect, was done, the dealing with it was done by acting as an autocrat when it came to the administration. And from the word go, with Rod as the first one to disappear, that attitude and how it was manifested created a very big gulf between Dave and the faculty and, of course, the administration. Because there was no one whose job was safe. I think we all came to see that.

DONIN: Well, Rod Morgan was followed by Dennis Dinan [Dennis A. Dinan '61].

SMITH: By Seaver Peters, by Ad Winship. I mean somebody said to me recently -- in fact on the trip when I came up for that interview – in conversation about Dave, and said very straight, "Of course he killed Ad Winship." And that's not an unreasonable thing to say. If, as I guess there is, there is some relationship between stress and certain kinds of cancer, because Ad was beaten up on and undermined and…

So that attitude towards the administration, where you could either fire them or in some instances make them so completely uncomfortable that they would get out, so that you just don't have the firings.... Ralph Manuel [Ralph Manuel ‘58] wasn't fired, but he certainly knew there was no point in his being around. Mike McGean [J. Michael “Mike” McGean ‘49] may not have been fired.... I mean one could go down the list.

Dennis, of course, was. My own involvement with that, which I don't think I got onto the last tape, but I may have said this to you in conversation, but just in case it's not there it should be there, that I came back from my sabbatical to this new administration. Leonard no longer there, John Kemeny no longer there. Dave explicitly making clear – I don't remember quite how or in what context – that he was happy with the arrangement that John had made with me, and I can't remember the exact sequence. I think perhaps I'd already been talked to by Ad Winship and was going to get into the role that I eventually played for a few years.

But certainly my first meeting with Dave in his office in Parkhurst was about the alumni magazine. In effect, he called me in and in effect offered me the job of editing it. And however much I, in retrospect, want to believe, I can't absolutely say with certainty that my answer was quite as eloquent as it is when I retell the story, which is essentially to say that, “It would be an honor to follow Dennis Dinan retired; it would be impossible to follow him if he were fired.” I mean that was certainly what was conveyed unequivocally. Again, it's this question of living in different worlds. It couldn't ever have occurred to me that I would say, yes. On the other hand, I don't think it had occurred to Dave that I would say, no. I mean it was an interesting job, etc., etc.

But of course, what made it worse was that I now knew that the chopper was going to fall, the boom was going to be lowered, or whatever, and Dennis didn't. And also I guess Dave may have told me – I certainly found out – that this decision was one that Ad Winship didn't agree with and didn't want to be the person to tell Dennis.

I imagine there were not slews. There are not all that many people who were in the administration, but there were instances of that kind of living in different worlds within the decimation of the administration that left McLaughlin isolated, in effect. And puzzled. I mean I do think that this whole business of why should the faculty care who's in charge of this or that or the other thing, which is a kind of absurd misreading of the situation.

Just so I get them in, I have to be sure that I bring in one little anecdote and one very important piece of news which, alas, I don't know why I didn't think of this ahead of time, but it involves my finding a piece of paper whose whereabouts I don't right now know. But at the point where I will find them, I will send them to you.

The little anecdote I think I told you in conversation. It was a very precious moment where after Dennis had been fired and at a point where virtually everybody was unhappy, either because somebody they liked had disappeared or because they were fearful for their own jobs, I ran into Jim Farley [James L..“Jim” Farley ‘42] who was, I guess, in some respect in Blunt. I guess he was… What was his capacity? I mean he was a newspaperman. And maybe by this time he was no longer actually on the payroll. I forget. He was a Dartmouth alumnus, a very good writer, and a very good man. And I ran into him on the day that Dave had been admitted to Hitchcock for his aneurism or whatever it was, his angioplasty. I ran into Jim, and I said, "Have you heard McLaughlin's in hospital?" And Jim said, "Nothing trivial, I hope." [Laughter] It was a lovely moment.

The much more important thing, related to this truly astonishing – what would you call it? – phenomenon, one has to call it for want of a better word, involving Dave's communicating with John Dickey. I don't remember exactly when John's stroke hit. But it may have been even… No, it wasn't before. John was certainly there and was articulate about David's appointment as president. So when Dave was inaugurated, John was still up and healthy. Somewhere deep in the back of my mind I have a very vague memory of somebody, probably Leonard, sharing with me a comment from John about Dave, which is very striking, but which is pointless for me to bring up because I've forgotten what it was. However, he then had this stroke and was confined to Dick's House, and was…

After I had been asked to write the history of the Dickey presidency, I went to see him often. He was, from time to time, able to communicate.

But for most of the time he was not. It was apparent, and I of course got this from other people who spent time with him, including Chris and Suki, his daughter, that the great horror of John's condition was that there were signs that his brain was functioning, but that very little else was. The first time I went to see him, he was able to communicate something to me, which showed that certainly he knew who I was, he knew what I did. Because in the painfully horrible way that a person who's suffered a stroke can talk but not quite, not really, but within the sounds coming out of John's mouth on that occasion, were the words "Warner Bentley." And at the time… I don't mean to say that I couldn't understand what John was saying. It was evident that he knew who I was, and knew of my relationship to Warner, and had Warner in his mind and so on. If I'd written it down as soon as I came out of his bedroom at Dick's House, there would have been a kind of sentence, too, of whatever he was trying to convey to me. But he was essentially out of it.

Then it became common knowledge around, I think, something of which Dave was proud, that he went to, the phrase he used was "to counsel" with John, virtually every day. So they had these sessions one on one, and nobody but Dave knows what they consisted of. But nobody who was aware of John's condition and there were quite a lot of people. I mean Leonard went to see him quite regularly to spend time with him.

But I don't know of anyone who knew about this practice who wasn't mystified by it. And also I certainly was, in a sense, alarmed. I mean it was unreal, it was a peculiar thing to do.

And just to say it at this juncture, because it would certainly be said at some point while I'm talking about the McLaughlin years, I became convinced – and I'm sure that Leonard did, too – that if there was anyone I knew who needed and who on behalf of everybody associated with him needed psychotherapy, it was Dave McLaughlin. And there was certainly a story floating around the campus that towards the end of the time -- I don't want to pretend that I was in an inner circle when I wasn't but I think it was something that became current that when the time came for someone to confront Dave with the harm that he was doing and the failure that his presidency was, it was Sandy McCulloch [Norman E. “Sandy” McCulloch, Jr. ‘50] who made that clear to him.

But there was also the story that at some point before that crisis, as it were, Sandy, who had been and was very public about having been

rescued from alcoholism by McLaughlin, went to Dave to suggest that he go into psychotherapy, and was thrown out, and was made to feel very unwelcome. I assume – I certainly hope – that Sandy and all of the trustees from that time are part of this recording. And it doesn't matter whether that was true or not, coming from me. I'll say no more.

One thing I think, though, that only I know, and it is absurd that I didn't think ahead of time to… For a long time I carried around a piece of paper, a very small piece of paper with me, in my wallet. It represented the tragedy of the McLaughlin appointment to me. At some college event, well into McLaughlin's presidency, and after, as it has to have been after he asked me and I agreed to write the history of the Dickey presidency… I was at a college function, and Ed Shanahan [Edward J. "Ed" Shanahan], whom Dave had picked to be the dean of the college and saw Dave on a daily basis, I'm sure. I mean that relationship is always very, very close. Ed said, "I've heard the news that you're going to write the story. And of course I've never met Mr. Dickey. I've heard a lot about him, of course. So, you know, in a nutshell, how would you describe Mr. Dickey?" And so I came out with four or five adjectives. And Ed said, "The only way I know Mr. Dickey is through the fact that Dave goes to see him every day and counsels with him. And obviously sees himself as in the same mold. And so I had the impression that John Dickey was… " And then he came out with five adjectives that were the exact opposite of… And obviously "modest" was one, "kind" was one, I assume. One of these in terms of a synonym, "consistent." I mean we both realized that this was a remarkable thing.

And as soon as I wasn't talking to Ed, I tore a little piece of paper off something in my pocket, and I wrote down those adjectives, and I carried that around with me for a long time. I mean I think Dave, more than anyone I've known in an important position in higher education, was someone who didn't know himself. I don't know whether Leonard talks about this on his tape. But Leonard, who knew much more about Dave than I did, was of the opinion, as an amateur psychologist, that the relationship between Dave and his father was such as to have made Dave the person he was.

It was a tragedy. I mean, apart from the general sympathy that one has for any human being, especially a human being who suffers in some way or another, I had that kind of feeling towards Dave. But it is overpowered by the feeling I have with many kinds of negatives put into it. And something which again I'm the only person who knows other than a handful of persons to whom I've told it, it's a rather strange thing for me to do, and it says something about the size of my ego.

But I care and certainly before I went to Columbia, cared in a unique way about Dartmouth. And my feelings towards Dartmouth and Columbia are distinct. But whereas I know, because occasionally it's something that becomes a part of conversation with Columbia colleagues, I know that I'm a rarity in the Columbia scene as someone who loves Columbia. That is the phrase that I would use. I'm not a rarity in loving Dartmouth. And so what was going on during the McLaughlin presidency was constant and all pervasive. The influence…

I mean it showed that indeed an institution of that sort, of that size, in that location, all of which play into the almost unique quality of the Dartmouth alumni body. It's obviously a commonplace thing to say that the only place within the truly elite that comes close to it is Princeton and probably for the same reasons. I mean it is essentially an undergraduate institution. It's miles from anywhere. Only in Dartmouth's case, of course, many, many, many more miles from anywhere. And it has an ethos, has a spirit, and has for a long time. So Dartmouth is somewhere you love. And within this set of pieces I wrote for Dennis when I left the Hop and for two or three years, and which I stopped writing the day he was fired, and the last one included a reference to the fact that I was stopping only because he has been fired, in one of those I talk about what it is to love Dartmouth.

Perhaps the problem that exists is that perhaps, if there is such a phrase, Dartmouth is loved too much. The real problem is that it is truly loved by people who see the world in entirely different ways. Enough said on that.

But it was agony, I think, for anyone who… I shouldn't say it that way. It was agony for me to be there during the McLaughlin years because, for me, it involved my love for the institution and my gratitude to it, and my lifelong belief in the importance of higher education as an overwhelmingly important element in any society.

So I did this weird thing. Somewhere in this time, in those six years, as part of my ordinary reading, I'd picked up a book called Killings, which consisted of a number of essays, six or seven or eight, I think, that Calvin Trillin had written for the New Yorker. And it was very powerful. It reminded one just how brilliant a writer he is, but also what an extraordinary mind he has. And so that was there. It didn't attach itself to Dartmouth at that point, but it was there. Also there – and I guess this happened during the Kemeny years – Trillin had, I think without

any kind of fanfare, without, perhaps, anybody really knowing that he was there, had decided that what he wanted to write a big essay about was the Indian symbol. And so in the New Yorker, in that time--

DONIN: Oh, yes, I remember.

SMITH: There it is. It's a first-rate essay. So at some point I put those two things together, and I went – I wrote to Calvin Trillin at the New Yorker, and went – and got an answer. All I was asking for was could I come and see him without ahead of time explaining why I wanted to see him. But I had a thought that I suspected would interest him. So I went there, and I had the privilege of talking with him in his office. And what I went to tell him was that I thought there was a very important and very valuable and very interesting book to be written about how a president could bring a major institution of higher education in this country almost to its knees. That it was, in fact, a kind of tragedy. That it was an important story. And that from my political point of view, it was also important as a representation of a particularly prominent and (blatant isn't the right word, but it's the right sense) a particularly blatant example of how the corporate world, how the capitalist system, by virtue of its supplying at every level of education, of higher education....

End Tape 15, Side B
Begin Tape 16, Side A

SMITH: ...supplied the majority of the members of the boards of trustees of every institution of higher education in the country, public and private, that any such board will have a majority on it of people who make their living in the corporate financial world. And that what had happened at Dartmouth, what was going on at Dartmouth… And Trillin… I mean there was enough in the papers, in the Times. It wasn't there very often, but from time to time it found its way there, and he knew in rough outline what this was. And that it was a truth worth telling.

DONIN: You're not the only one that's raised that issue.

SMITH: Right, right, right. And so I think that really what I want to say and need to say can be said in the time about the place where Dave and I sort of joined up most totally, which was in his asking me to write this book about the Dickey presidency. And it is a subject on which I feel very, very strongly, and on which I feel the greatest regret for anything that I have done or not done in my life. I think had the person who was assigned to the job been the right person, I would not feel as strongly as I do.

I told you I remember and told the tape when we were talking about Mr. Dickey, that when I was given the job, Bill Andres, who was his classmate in '29, had told me this wonderful sentence. "The more you know him, the better you will love him." And that was true.

But also – and I'm sure I said this to some extent on the tape, too – what Mr. Dickey's presidency represented was setting Dartmouth unequivocally on the road that led to its being able to claim that it was a true seat of learning. And so in addition to the story of Mr. Dickey's presidency, there was a generalized state of affairs that also would be chronicled – and that as far as I know never has been – which is the way in which Dartmouth benefited from John Dickey's presidency, Williams benefited with Jack Sawyer, Wesleyan benefited with Vic Butterfield, and doubtless outside of the northeast.

Those are the ones I got to know about by going through John Dickey's papers. They were instances where in the post-World War with everything in a sense starting anew, and with the unique experience coming out of the G.I. bill in higher education, it constituted, whether anybody wanted it to or not, it constituted an opportunity, in effect, to redefine American higher education. I think in an important respect it was redefined because an institution – and there are many of them like Dartmouth, which had been to a certain extent as much at least a finishing school, not necessarily for the very wealthy, but for those aspiring to at least join the middle class if not the upper-middle class, etc., etc. – that many of those places became real universities, real institutions.

It's a striking thing. I wish that I could realistically think that I could still write that book. There's never a day when it isn't a part of who I am. As I say, I feel an extra tinge of guilt because I was a part of the discussion – not an important part, and I don't think we ever spoke more than once – but I was part of the discussion through Ed Lathem who is, as far as I'm concerned, a figure out of fiction, is Dickensian, is very strange. (And there's another book to be written about Edward Connery Lathem.) But Ed, of course, was essentially in charge of the project from start to finish, and, as it were, my supervisor.

So I was in the conversation as to who might take on the job. And I'm quite sure that if Charlie Widmayer's [Charles E. Widmayer ‘30] name came into that conversation, I didn't object. As it turned out, it was exactly the wrong… I suppose the one thing that I could have said even ahead of time, as it were, even not knowing that Charlie was as ill

as he was, was that Mr. Dickey and Mr. Hopkins were so totally different that it didn't make sense for the person who'd written, with great enthusiasm, as a great admirer, the book about Mr. Hopkins to write the book about Mr. Dickey. So the book about what I regard as the most important presidency in Dartmouth's history, and that includes Kemeny, has yet to be written.

It was very hard for me with Dave. I was extremely pleased. I guess the word people use is "flattered." I don't think it's exactly the right word there; but of all the things that would go into that sentence, I felt. And I very much wanted to do it, and I believed I could do it. We talked about…

Two things happened. One was talking about how long I thought it would take, and I consulted other people. I went back to Dave with a phrase that I think had come from Jere Daniell [Jere R. Daniell II ‘55], which was, "if you say you need more than four years, that's indulgent; if you say you can do it in less than two, that's unrealistic." Something like that.

So I shared that with him. And two things happened: One was that I made the very big discovery that plenty of other people have made, that it's one thing to be able to write well, and another thing to be able to write a book. So I was learning a lot. I delved into the vast amount of paper there is in the archives coming out of the Dickey presidency, as well as listening to all the many, many hours of oral history. It was a great deal. I remember reading at the point where I first took in the size of the archive. I'd read a review I guess of a biography, I think, of Neville Chamberlain. It was some British political figure of some significance. And either I read it in a review or I picked this book up. And the author is quoted as – either there in print is saying or is quoted in the review as saying – that he'd been staggered when he'd discovered that he was dealing with X number of boxes. It was less than half of what Dickey's was. So, you know, it was not an easy task.

At the same time and this is not something I've said out loud before. Leonard knows, Gwenda knows it extremely well, but not many people realize that one of the years that I spent, the two years, effectively that I spent getting ready to write was the year in which I was president of the Vermont Council on the Arts, at the time of absolute crisis in getting aware of the fact that the executive director was hopeless and dishonest, etc., etc. Getting rid of him and then going through the business of finding someone else, I was far more involved, much more

time was taken up than I had any business giving to anybody outside of the college. But it slowed things down.

I did expect that I would write it in roughly four years. But I came to see that at the end of two of them, I still had a long, long way to go in terms of dealing with the paper archive, and still conversations that I would like to have, etc., etc. And Dave was getting very unhappy, and Charlie Hood [Charles H. Hood II ‘51], Harvey Hood's son, who because one of the parts of the Harvey Hood legacy had been the establishment of a fund that was kind of discretionary to the president, and he used that to pay my salary. Which I had insisted should be more than the offer that he initially made, after checking with a lot of other people. And by the time the offer from Columbia came, which was in every sense of the word irresistible, there was no possibility that I would turn that down once I was offered it. But long before that came along, I was beginning to be quite frightened of Dave, myself. That I knew what I could do and that I could do it well. But I couldn't feel that I could convince him that it was worth four years' worth of my salary and my little expense account. So in that sense it was, in a way that is sort of troubling to me, a tremendous relief when I escaped. But also, even more, a source of tremendous regret.

That's probably where we stop at this stage. There may be more to say. And maybe if I find myself in Hanover, I will write to Jim, and I will send you the piece of paper with those adjectives.

DONIN: Great. Okay. I'll turn this off.

SMITH: Okay.

End of Interview