

Seaver Peters '54
Dartmouth College
Athletic Director, 1967-1983

An Interview Conducted by
Dan Daily

Hanover, NH
May 23, 2001

DOH-44

Rauner Special Collections Library
Dartmouth College
Hanover, New Hampshire

INTERVIEW: Seaver Peters

INTERVIEWED BY: Daniel Daily

PLACE: Hanover, New Hampshire

DATE: May 23, 2001

DAILY: I'm speaking with Seaver Peters today, Class of 1954 and Athletic Director from 1967 to 1983. Mr. Peters, I wanted to start off . . .

PETERS: "Seaver" or "Pete" is fine, by the way.

DAILY: All right, Seaver. I'd like to start the interview today by hearing how you decided to come to Dartmouth.

PETERS: OK. From Melrose, Mass.—I played hockey at Melrose—Dartmouth was always known as a very, very good hockey school (they dominated intercollegiate hockey for a period of time). My father went to Dartmouth, my brother went here as a part of the Navy V-6 or V-12 program. So I always liked Dartmouth because of family involvement and because of hockey. We had a very good high school hockey program; a lot of people from Melrose, Mass. came to Dartmouth and played hockey. And I applied here, [to] Clarkson—nope, nope—Colgate and St. Lawrence. [Edward J.] "Eddie", "Jerry" Jeremiah ['30], the then hockey coach, late, was in touch a couple of times, and the good fortune was I was accepted. It was that simple, and as a matter of fact a teammate of mine at Melrose High [John Titus]—we won the New England in high school in Melrose, and a teammate from Melrose and I came here, obviously the Class of '51—that was a pretty good class, as a matter of fact. So a combination of hockey, higher education—(I think hockey was probably the primary stimulus)—and I had a great four years here, a wonderful four years. I don't know whether you want me to go on or not, but . . .

DAILY: Well, yes, that sounds good. Just to back up . . . so Coach Jeremiah recruited you.

PETERS: Yeah, and that's . . .

DAILY: What was recruitment like in that time period?

PETERS: Writing a couple of letters, really, maybe a phone call. It was that casual, relaxed, and he didn't have to do much with me. I could have gone to—I think I was accepted at St. Lawrence, I really can't remember. But—because Dartmouth was always number one, and Jerry was in touch a number of times, and our senior year at Melrose High we came up, our team came up, and played KUA [Kimball Union Academy] and the Dartmouth freshmen, and that was an important weekend for us. We happened to beat KUA and then—by a goal—three guys from that KUA team ended up at Dartmouth in the same class as I was—and then we beat the Dartmouth freshmen. They weren't a particularly good hockey team, didn't have a lot of talent. We beat them fairly easily, and I was fortunate enough to get a couple of goals, and that solidified my interest, and, I guess, Jerry's interest in my classmate, teammate, fraternity brother as it turns out, and myself, John Titus and myself. And so we were all set. We were lucky to get in, I think as I look back, but who knows? We didn't—how well I did in the Boards, I can't remember any of that, but it was just good fortune. I had decent—good grades in high school, but [it's] not nearly as competitive as it is now, by any means. My rationalization is that I would have been that much better educated today, but who knows?

DAILY: Right. Yeah, I'd like to hear about your time here at Dartmouth, both playing hockey and as a student, kind of . . .

PETERS: I played freshman hockey; freshmen were not eligible. It was a good freshman hockey team; [I remember] that we were undefeated. The varsity was good, and we thought we were better than they were, which we weren't by a long shot. If we ever had freshman eligibility, which they now have, I don't know as I ever would have been good enough to play. The transition year as a freshman hockey player was very, very important. We had a great group of guys and we thought we were going to tear up the college ranks in the years ahead, but we had a wonderful, wonderful freshman year.

Davis Rink was the facility at that point; it was indoor natural ice, before the artificial ice came. So you had some days that you couldn't play. But it was a great year, and frankly, after the season

I remember going down to the rink because still the ice remained in there, and practiced quite a bit myself because I was worried whether I could make the varsity. Also freshman year I got very involved in intramural athletics, which was a lot of fun for me. So that was my chief involvement in athletics as a freshman, indeed as an upperclassman. I played three years of hockey, varsity hockey; we were terrible our first year (I think we won four games); then we won ten games, then we were 16 and 14 my senior year. Never quite as good as we thought we were going to be, but it was a wonderful experience.

Jerry had—Jeremiah, Eddie Jeremiah, had a tough time at that point. His wife was ill and dying, and he became ill, but I guess—well, his wife was ill and it was a tough period for Jerry. He was a wonderful hockey coach and a wonderful person, but a tough period for him. I think I'm wrong when I say he was ill. He was ill when I came back here to work, not while I was an undergraduate. But it was a wonderful four years.

Again, intramurals: I went and joined the then hockey fraternity. Phi Gam [Phi Gamma Delta] had the hockey captain for God knows how many years in a row, and we were all in that house, and never much feeling or allegiance to the national. More a feeling of allegiance to a great bunch of guys. I regret what's—[. . . an aside . . .] what's now happening to fraternities, but I think they brought it on themselves. We used to hire a guy full time to make our beds, be a janitor, clean up, all that kind of thing, and they don't do that. I mean, Fraternity Row is a pigpen. You walk, drive up there—they've brought it on themselves, they've really an awful mess. But we had a lot of fun there. But back to our undergraduate days, it was—I remember we won the College foot—touch—two-hand touch football championship, played softball, and intramurals were as much fun as intercollegiate athletics. A great program, and we thoroughly enjoyed it. And senior year I was fortunate enough to be elected captain, and that was a rewarding experience as well.

Also an undergraduate, what, Sphinx Senior Society—not a great student, but frankly we had comprehensive examinations then, on the academic side.

I was an economics major, and I found comprehensive examinations a challenge and a really wonderful culmination; it brought everything together—I don't know how many courses; we took ten courses in economics or something, but people—I studied

for them, did reasonably well at them but not well enough to get honors or what have you. But it was great. And after the—oh, I also ought to—this is more personal than anything else—as a sophomore we all panicked and joined the R.O.T.C. That was the time of the—what, Korean War?

DAILY: Yeah.

PETERS: Well, as a matter of fact [David "Dave"] McLaughlin '54, we were all—most of us were in Air Force R.O.T.C. So when we graduated I went in the service as a budget and accounting officer in the Air Force, two years overseas. And I say "overseas," it was in Cape Cod. Otis Air Force Base, over the canal, so that was about it. And obviously we got commission, I could pay back all my college loans and it was a wonderful two years.

DAILY: I was wondering how you ended up in the Air Force.

PETERS: Right. Oh, a ton of us joined. And a couple of my classmates—maybe me, but I don't think so—but a couple of my classmates owe their degree to the Air Science courses we could take, because they were guts. Oh, yeah. I mean, captains and majors in the Air Force were assigned up here to teach them, and . . .

DAILY: They weren't tough?

PETERS: No, not by a long shot! Not by a long shot.

DAILY: Do any professors stand out as favorites?

PETERS: Yeah. Let's see. One—one was a correspondent for the Boston Globe here. Last name was Kelly, I can't think of his first name [Eric]. The very best professor I had was in Russian history, Professor [John] Adams—I can't think of any more than that, but he was terrific, absolutely great. Economics, I'd say there were—just there like Clyde Dankert. And I loved the G.I. course, the Great Issues course. I mean, it was fabulous as a senior. I don't know whether you know anything about it, but John Dickey brought that in. And it was fabulous, I thought. We'd go Monday night to hear a lecture and then Tuesday morning, as I recall, we had questions and answers—I think that's the right timetable. And some speakers—but very prominent speakers, and it was a wonderful—I thought it was a—because I loved John Dickey anyway. And it was a wonderful, wonderful course. That stands out.

DAILY: How close were you to President Dickey during your undergraduate years?

PETERS: Not particularly. I got closer, obviously, when I came back here to work. But he clearly had an interest, a remarkable leader, I thought, and a wonderful, wonderful speaker. And of course I always to this day remember his lines at both Convocation and Commencement: You know, "You are the stuff of the institution; what you are it will be," and all that kind of thing, and he was great.

DAILY: To circle back to the fraternities: an alum from the forties had told me about the janitors working in fraternities. And he was saying that, at least in his particular frat, that the janitor did a little more than cleaning: kind of helped keep the guys in line . . .

PETERS: Oh yeah, all of the above. He was more than just a custodian.

DAILY: A little chaperone?

PETERS: Sure. No, they were great. And we obviously paid them. Our guy's name was Leon LaBombard, and he'd give us hell if we misbehaved and left a mess around there in the fraternity basement. He made us come down and help him. It wasn't as if he was just going to be the clean-up guy for whatever the occasion. But he kept the place—you know, we paid for it, I repeat, but he kept it in good shape. And that was the—I presume kids' fraternities gave that up for the expense of it, I don't know. But that's a shame, it really is. Sure, we had our Wednesday night meetings, we'd all go into the goat room or the chapter room or something, but we couldn't really care less about it until the guy from the national came around, and then we pretended we did; and sure, we misbehaved some nights. But I think that's part of your education.

DAILY: What was the general role of frats on campus at that time?

PETERS: Well, I moved into it [Phi Gamma Delta house] my junior year, several of us did, and lived there for two years. So it was our dormitory, it was our social outlet. Of course there were no women here, we'd go down to Colby Junior [College] and all that kind of thing. But it was a focal point of [College]—I do want to say that the fraternity, everything was secondary to the institution. We didn't eat there, ob[viously]. A couple of guys would cook stuff there, but we

didn't eat there. I kept eating at the—was it Thayer Hall then? Whatever it was. So it was a, more a social club than anything else, I'd say. After hockey games they always had a keg or two of beer, and that was a gathering place for people after a hockey game. So it was just that, a club. (I mean, I'll go to Rotary this noon. I [will go to that as] a fun luncheon group.) And the fraternity not because it was Phi Gam, but because it was a good bunch of guys and we had a lot in common, and did a lot of things together socially and athletically. It's too bad. But things change, institutions change, dramatically. We used to have to move out of the fraternity [for] house parties, Carnival, Green Key, so women could move in.

DAILY: No, I didn't know that.

PETERS: Didn't you? That was just what you did. And your dates would all go up—my bed up there, that was a ritual and it—we would team up with somebody and go somewhere, sometimes upstairs in Davis Varsity House or with friends in the dormitory, that kind of thing. And that was kind of fun, and inexpensive housing, obviously, for your dates. Something else I was going to say about that, and I've lost it, but that doesn't make any difference.

DAILY: Maybe it will come back.

PETERS: Probably.

DAILY: Did you know [Robert "Red"] Rolfe ['31] at all while you were . . . ?

PETERS: Oh, sure. Well, not as an undergraduate, he wasn't here. Who was the Director of Athletics? [William] "Bill" McCarter ['19] was Director of Athletics, [DeOrmand "Tuss"] McLaughry the football coach, and we went downhill in football badly. It was pretty good my freshman and sophomore years, and then didn't win very much my junior and senior years, and I think a year later McLaughry was put in the Phys. Ed./Intramural job. I think late my senior year Red was hired. I don't know the dates of his tenure, maybe you do.

DAILY: No.

PETERS: I want to say—whether he came in the fall of '54 or '55 I'm not sure. I'm getting him mixed up with [Robert] "Bob" Blackman. I think Red came in first. I want to say he was hired in '54 and came to work in the fall of '54. And then he, I believe he, the "Athletic Council," in quotes, terminated McLaughry and moved him to

Phys.Ed./Intramurals, and they hired Bob Blackman as football coach. I think Blackman's first year was the fall of '55, and I didn't know Red, no, but of course when I came back here I got to know him well. As a matter of fact, he hired me, after the service and two years in my father's business.

DAILY: Yes, how did he—how did you come to Red Rolfe's attention? How did that all work out that you came up here to Dartmouth . . . ?

PETERS: I used to come through here—after the service, two years I went to work in my father's food business, more a salesman than anything else (he was a broker). I would come through about every six weeks. I had to come from Boston up through Peterborough, Keene, go up to Burlington and then swing back down, I always came through here. And the fellow's job—the fellow had a job I'd always envied, named Snuffy [Irving] Smith ['41]. He was Assistant Director of Athletics. And I said to him a couple of times, "You know, Snuff, if anything turns up, give me a holler," never thinking much would happen. And one day, I guess in the spring of '56, he called my father's office, "How come Pete (me) Seaver hasn't applied for my job? I'm going down to the Eastern College Athletic Conference to be Associate Commissioner, it's a one-year leave of absence, I will have the right, privilege, whatever, to come back." So I came up here and interviewed. And it finally worked out.

Red—that was my first realization about how Red operated: a wonderful, wonderful old Yankee in every way, but very, very indecisive. And he was really a wonderful old Yankee, not only baseball Yankee, but thrifty Yankee, and you know, he was from way—Penacook, one of those places. And God, it took him forever to make a decision. It turned out it was between me and a fellow named Phil [Philip Duncan] McInnis, who turned out to end up being a wonderful friend here, he ended up in the Treasurer's complex. But I came here as Assistant Director of Athletics for one year. I did feel—I wouldn't have come if I didn't think that Snuffy Smith, the job to which he went as Associate Commissioner was going to be so good that he wouldn't come back. I thought clearly he was in line to be the Commissioner. I remember a former Dartmouth writer, columnist, Bill [William] Cunningham ['39], wrote that "Snuffy Smith, heir apparent to [Commissioner] Asa Bushnell. But to make it short, I had a wonderful year, loved it. Loved it. Did the College budget, all sorts of things. But it was a great year, and along about spring kept pushing Snuffy ("pushing's" too strong a word, but) "Hey, you know, what do you think?" And he . . . "I'll let

you know." I wasn't like—then had a family, and finally he said he was going to come back. So I was out, period.

It turned out that John Meck ['32], then Vice President and Treasurer of the school, offered me a job in the Comptroller's Office with [Robert "Bob"] Funkhauser ['27], and I was—my title was Assistant Comptroller, I handled the College budget. And I was very sorry to leave Athletics, but in retrospect it was probably the—let's see, that would have been '59, '60—well, I did that for at least—I don't know how many years. I came back here in '59 on my birthday, '60—three years. Does that sound right?

DAILY: Yeah, so it was about '60 to '63 that you were in the Treasurer's office?

PETERS: Yes. And it was a marvelous experience, it really was. Present the budget to the Board of Trustees and got to know a lot of very smart, very good, very capable people. And I liked it. But the background experience was just second to none. I had to know everything that was going on in the College, period. And then in '63 or 4—'63 I guess it was—[Gilbert] Gil Tanis ['58] then—and I don't mean to make this my history, I mean if I'm getting off on a tangent . . .

DAILY: No, no, this is—certainly your life story here is important.

PETERS: Ah—Gil Tanis, Assistant to John Dickey, whom I'd gotten to know pretty well by then, came down to see me in my office (I was in the basement of Parkhurst), and said, "Pete, Tuss McLaughry's going to get through." I think I mentioned, Tuss McLaughry was moved from football into Phys.Ed./Intramurals. And, "Who do you think in the Athletic Department might be a good choice?" And I said, "It's very clear it ought to be [Alden] Whitey Burnham ['46]," who was then coach of soccer and lacrosse, and he'd come within a year of when I came back, early '60 I think he came here. I thought no more of it.

A few weeks later Gil came down and said, "Whitey isn't interested. He doesn't want to get out of coaching yet. Who else do you think might make sense?" And I said, "Well, let me think about it. I might be interested." And so it all developed that I got the job. I wouldn't take it unless, one, I was on a par with Snuffy Smith as an Assistant Director of Athletics, and two, if I didn't have some responsibility in the intercollegiate side, with Phys.Ed./Intramurals, which I thought were important, still do, but also had the intercollegiate recruiting

responsibility, and was on a par with Snuffy. And that was important for my psyche, I don't know why, but it just seemed to be important. And I thought it was an important statement by the institution, by the department, to have Phys.Ed./Intramurals still recognized. Because Tuss was really a wonderful gentleman, but it was more a title for him, an excuse to pay him, I think. So I got that job, and then—when did I get that, '60?

DAILY: About '63, I believe.

PETERS: '63 or 4, yeah. Now, fall of '66—yeah, '63 it would have been. I decided I was ready to be a Director of Athletics, you know, swell head. Interviewed around, went to Bowdoin, was invited back to Bowdoin, John Meck said to me, "Well, if they offer you a job, Seaver, put them off for the weekend." So they did offer me the job. I went back up to Maine, they offered me the job, came back down, October of '63—whoop, '66—and saw John Meck and John Dickey, and they said, "Red Rolfe is going to retire next June," June of '67, "you've got the job, you've got to shut up about it until January." So obviously that wasn't easy. I withdrew from Bowdoin, with the offer of that job which I took over in July of '67, the Director of Athletics. I would have gone to Bowdoin in a heartbeat. And you know, great school, obviously, and it wasn't—nothing against Red. He was very, very indecisive. Wonderful person, as I said, old Yankee, but very indecisive, and of course you always think you can do better than your boss does, and all that kind of thing. So I moved in as Director of Athletics in '67.

DAILY: OK. Was it typical, or typically were coaches moved into A.D. positions?

PETERS: Yeah, I think so.

DAILY: You kind of came from the business side of it.

PETERS: Red succeeded [William H.] Bill McCarter ['19], who—he was an English prof, writer—wrote the Alumni Magazine, I think—think—I'm pretty sure. He was an alcoholic, had a lot of problems. And then they went to Red, primarily I guess because of his name. He had been with Detroit after playing; had been with the Detroit Tigers, and Yale as basketball/baseball coach. And that was an important hire for Dartmouth, I think, to have a name, nationally known person and alumnus. But I think at that point it was fairly typical, nationally, to move coaches in. And I wasn't much of a coach. I was more

administrative, pure administrative, than a coach, no question about it. I did help out coaching a little bit when Eddie Jeremiah coached the Olympics and [Abner "Ab"] Oakes coached both freshman and varsity hockey, and he—obviously there were conflicts occasionally, but I didn't do much of it. But it was a great run, it was a wonderful job.

Ivy League athletics were much, much, much more competitive then than they are now. We're not competitive outside the League, with a few exceptions, more women than men, frankly—maybe soccer, maybe lacrosse a little bit, but most sports were not—I mean, Ivy football, the caliber of it has deteriorated very, very much. We're pretty good in hockey now; basketball the Ivies—no. But it was a great job. And got involved very much nationally with the NCAA, chaired the NCAA Television Committee, was on the Executive Committee, and that involvement was important to me. Worked with John Dickey, who was wonderfully supportive of athletics, would come down to the Chase Field, practice fields, with his dog, and watch more afternoons than not. And I reported directly to him, which I felt was important at the time. Terrific guy.

DAILY: OK. Now, as you took over in that position, were there specific challenges that you could see on the immediate horizon?

PETERS: Yeah, I think hockey became a challenge. That's when Jeremiah got sick. Football: [Robert "Bob"] Blackman, as I suggested, came—I repeat, I think he started in the fall of '55—very difficult person. Charismatic, pleasant, but always in the—Red was, as I mentioned, very indecisive. And that frustrated Blackman, and Blackman would just go to John Meck. And when I came in that became very awkward and we had to terminate that, and John Meck and I talked. So that was—but Blackman was smart. But he was always in the gray area. You'd find him—you couldn't practice out of season at Dartmouth in football. No spring practice, which they happen to now have. But he would be in the double squash court with his backs, or he'd be out on the—we built him a house on the Lyme Road, he'd be out there. Always something to think he could get an edge. Now let me be clear to say, or repeat, he was very smart, almost brilliant; he showed the League how to recruit—Dartmouth made a commitment, and no two ways about it, a very strong commitment. I always wanted to be strong in Ivy football, so made a commitment of resources, and he recruited nationally and did a masterful job, masterful job.

DAILY: I read where he was almost an innovator in recruiting.

PETERS: No question.

DAILY: How so?

PETERS: Well, the Ivies generally recruited much like I was recruited. You know, maybe a letter or two, maybe a visit. But he came here, he sent out letters nationally—I'd say 10,000 letters a year—and outlined what it took, generally speaking, what it took to get into Dartmouth, why Dartmouth is a natural place to go, etc., etc., and what the criteria generally would be. And then a reply card, "You got anyone you think might fit the bill, let us know and we'll be sure to . . ." So they did. And so we literally recruited nationally, and put a lot of pressure on Admissions. Admissions was receptive; I think they were told to be. But I remember, Blackman had more fights with Admissions, and sometimes we'd lose to Harvard, and he'd say, "I'm sick of losing to Harvard with kids that were turned down by Dartmouth," all this kind of thing. But he was masterful.

I did catch him once, went over innocently to Davis Varsity House to see him about something, and the secretary, Sally Estes, I said, "Where is he?" She said, "Well . . ." "Sally, where is he?" "Upstairs." He was in a team meeting, which was illegal. So I went up and embarrassed him in front of the team, and then he squared himself away. But I think the coaches would tell you that I was a stickler for staying within everything. Whether they liked it or not they understood that, and he had to do that.

But we dominated Ivy football. We were—didn't know how to lose. And we only had three tough games a year, Harvard, Yale, Princeton. Most of the others were W's, wins. And football, whether people—I've said this to a number of coaches—whether you like it or not, football's king. And we drew a lot of people, and we built the new east stand then. (I don't know whether it's of interest. Interrupt me if something's not of interest, please.)

DAILY: This is great.

PETERS: Red was—I guess when I was still Assistant Director—Phys.Ed./Intramurals. For some reason I had to go to the Ivy meeting. And they were proposing a football schedule change. We always played Princeton last, at Princeton. And Princeton didn't usually like that because the week before they played at Yale, and

they felt—and that was their big game, if you will—they felt they let down against Dartmouth. They wanted to change Dartmouth to an earlier Saturday. Third game of the season, I think it was. We were opposed to that. We made very, very good money in football. I mean, Harvard, Yale and Princeton, they drew a ton of people a weekend—I mean, big, big, six or \$500,000. And—but at any rate, they wanted to change for that reason. Red couldn't go, I went, and I remember one of the Ivies saying, Well, they're—I voted against any of the changes. "Oh, goddammit, Dartmouth doesn't want any—"; "Well, we don't want any change. Whether you like it or not, that's our position." And then John Dickey had instructed me to say, "If this change goes through, then Princeton had better be ready to play in Hanover every other year. It will be the third Saturday or on Columbus Day weekend (that's a pretty damned good time to be coming to northern New England, to say the least), and be prepared to do that." And the schedule change went through and we built a new stand.

We had a little puny [stand]—the east stand was the size of the end zone stands. And we built this big stand and had Princeton up here from then on out, every other year. One year it was the third game and the next year the last game, and also it tends to begin to decline around the Ivies too, that was certainly a part of it. But Yale Bowl, you know, we'd get 60, 70,000 people at Yale Bowl. But it was interesting that that was—and he said—some other of Dickey's words were, "We're not going to be the Notre Dame of Ivy football; we're not going to be known as a standard, 'Always count on Dartmouth to be a home game,' kind of thing." And he stood on the principle, I think he was right. And that was the origin of the change. It was interesting.

DAILY: Now, did attendance stay pretty high with Dartmouth in comparison to . . .

PETERS: Yeah, we—maybe it was the novelty of it, but we filled the place, tremendous demand. But we were able to seat 20,000 people in there, so . . . And the caliber of football was still pretty good, and we were very good, very good. (It must be half an hour by now, isn't it? . . . fair enough.)

DAILY: I'll let you keep time; I don't have a watch on.

PETERS: Do you want me to get a timer?

DAILY: That's fine, use your watch.

PETERS: Then the whole thing began: we always, as I say, went to Harvard and Yale, then changed our whole thinking and played all of them home and home, or at the very least we wanted to have one of them in Hanover every year, Harvard, Yale or Princeton every year. And that's evolved—that's the way it evolved.

DAILY: One thing I've wondered about. By the late '60s the students are becoming more involved in like the anti-war movement, and kind of just anti-authority movements. What were the athletes like, in terms of how coaches responded to that, and how the athletes . . .

PETERS: Football didn't change much. I do remember a couple of coaches couldn't adapt to, I think minorities, although that never came out. Facial hair was a very serious, very great concern with a couple of our coaches. Facial hair on minorities, and that was pretty standard. And we just couldn't tolerate the coaches' demanding that [they shave]. And of course at that point John Kemeny was President, and he had facial hair. And he said, "You know, Pete," he said, "I have a certain sensitivity about facial hair." And we just couldn't have that, you know.

And that became a serious problem with one coach, [Ulysses J.] Tony Lupien, who was a great baseball coach, no two ways about it. But very, very inflexible. He was a Harvard guy who played football and baseball at Harvard, and had a problem in, I think, one year he decided not to play football, played baseball. Football put pressure on him, he had some bitter feelings about football, which he carried up here. He and Blackman didn't get along at all. I'll never forget—Penn had a long losing streak in football, and finally beat us to break their losing streak. Tony had fall baseball, roughly where baseball now is, but football in the fall would practice out where Leverone now is. And someone on the baseball team lined one to right center and it went through the gap into football practice. And Blackman yelled at Tony, "Hey Tony, the baseball season is over. Tony yelled back, "So is the Penn losing streak." Penn had lost 40 plus games in a row but had beaten Dartmouth the previous Saturday."

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

PETERS: OK. Lupien felt that football was a favorite, football was number one, got all the resources, etc., etc. So it was a jealousy and envy.

In my opinion, Lupien was shortsighted, because a lot of his baseball players were football recruits, a lot of them. When we went to the NCAAs in Omaha three or four of them were football players. One was a swimmer, several football players. But Tony, since his Harvard days, had a thing against football anyway. And didn't believe in recruiting; he'd be goddamned if he'd go out and recruit and proselytize—prostitute himself in recruiting, and they gotta want to come here, I'm not going to—he just plain didn't want to go out. Didn't make any difference the reason, but he just . . . so it was a real thing, and it turned out that he ended up—I repeat, a great baseball coach. But it got so—oh, also he had a legion of people who would come up to his office in Davis Varsity House, where the football offices were, and have drinks after every practice and game. And he was a—he'd take a goblet, coffee cup, and fill it with straight booze. I mean, tough. And the guys worshipped Tony, the old school, an old pro in every way, but he became intolerable. He was very upset about R.O.T.C., talk about women coming to Dartmouth, facial hair, minorities, all of the above. And we finally had to terminate him. And I know—I'm told he walked out of my office in Alumni Gym and said, "I'll never set foot in this goddamned place as long as I live." And he didn't for a long, long time, but we paid him for a full year; that was the coaches' contracts at that point, that I would have to let them know by June 30 of a year our intentions for the year beginning the following July 1. So in essence they had an appointment that ran down to about a year but then went up to two. So we owed him that year, and paid him that year, but it's too bad, because he was, I repeat, a very, very good baseball coach, but just a sign of the changing times, that's all, and he couldn't adapt. Blackman adapted, and—you know, that's just dumb on his part, but that's just the way he is. I still respect him to this day. He doesn't care particularly for me, but that's, you know, that goes with the territory, I guess.

DAILY: Now, with John Kemeny taking office as President, was there any perceptible immediate change in . . .

PETERS: Well, he wasn't as personable a guy. Brilliant guy, obviously. Silly to even—I don't feel I have to say it, very obvious. Loved football. I mean, he and the Math Department faculty always had season tickets to football, sat together at football, and "graded" Blackman, they had a good relationship. I think—I think—the other sports he found—he tolerated. He clearly didn't feel the Director of Athletics had to report to him. I think I had a good relationship with him, but just structurally he thought I should report to Frank [Franklin]

Smallwood ['51], Dean of Student Services? Smallwood, [Donald "Don"] Kreider . . .

DAILY: Smallwood was Vice President . . .

PETERS: Student Affairs, or . . . that's to whom I reported. And I liked Frank a lot too, and it was, I thought, image-wise, important for the Director of Athletics to report to the president just because it reflected the institution's commitment, etc., etc., but I guess if I were president I would do it the way Kemeny wanted it. Smallwood, Kreider, there was someone other, but it ended up being with the Dean of the College. It was OK. I had an Athletic Council—"I," I shouldn't say it that way. There was an Athletic Council in place, nine-person Athletic Council, three students, three alumni, three faculty. That ultimately was changed to add three administrators. But when they fired Blackman it was nine that was involved—before me it was, nine people, and they are the ones that fired him. But I always felt I had to go to [them]. It was my responsibility to go to the Athletic Council if I wanted to terminate somebody, review budget with them, salaries with them, salary increases with them, reappointments with them. They're a very powerful group. And Ralph Manuel, when he came in to be Dean of—Dean of the College I guess was his title—Ralph said, "I don't think we ought to reappoint so-and-so," and I said, "I've got to go through the Athletic Council." "[you do what you like]." "Ralph, that's the way it is." So he got it changed very quick, they became advisory only. But the Athletic Council was a very powerful group, and they were my boss, much like (not on the level, obviously), but much like the Board of Trustees is to the President.

DAILY: Now you said Bob Blackman was fired?

PETERS: No, I must have misspoke. . . . I said Blackman; I meant McLaughry.

DAILY: Oh, OK.

PETERS: If I did say Blackman, excuse me. They—I think the vote was five to four in the Athletic Council. A hockey teammate of mine, who's class of '55, he's very involved with Dartmouth now, [Gordon W.] Gordie Russell ['55], he's involved in a million-dollar gift to Native American something, I'm not sure, and he's been on the Medical School Board of Overseers. But the vote was five to four, but the Athletic Council made the decision to fire McLaughry.

I ought to say about Blackman—oh, we played [a] game—I'm sure every year is an exaggeration, but it seems like every year. He put a feeler out for a job in Maryland or wherever it might be, and make that known upstreet and get a nice raise to keep him here, kind of thing. That's just the way he did things. I know Iowa was involved, Maryland was involved, and ultimately Illinois. But he always got something more for himself and/or the programs—always. We built a house for him on the Lyme Road—are you familiar with that? [Robert E. “Bob”] Field ['43 TU '47] is there now, a former Trustee and Vice President and Treasurer—and the deal was—John Meck worked it out—“will build up equity in the house annually, \$5,000 a year I think it was, and ultimately it will be yours, unless you quit, and you forfeit it then if you quit.” So that's how strongly many at Dartmouth wanted to keep Bob Blackman. And then, I give him a lot of credit for the courage in deciding he was going to go to Illinois, and he did quit, and came to see me, and thought he should get some of the equity. And I said, “Bob, I'm sorry. That was—we wanted you to stay, and you knew that, and . . .” It turned out John Meck gave him some, but that's ancient history. He felt we had an obligation to him, and I was opposed to it, but Meck was the boss so that's fair enough. But for Bob to quit Dartmouth, where he had it made, really, to go to Illinois and accept a new challenge, shows some courage.

DAILY: Was it—I've read that he pretty much made the decision to go to Illinois on just the opportunity to coach . . .

PETERS: Yeah, he wanted to bring a team to the Rose Bowl; he'd played in Pasadena in the Junior Rose Bowl—yeah, that was it, to be in the big time. And you have to admire that.

DAILY: He wasn't unhappy with Dartmouth?

PETERS: I don't think so, no. He was not. I'm sure he'd tell you that. Well, would have—he's just passed away. But that was a great era for Dartmouth football, and therefore Dartmouth athletics. And money wasn't a serious problem for us then. It was becoming a problem, and it did become a very serious problem, but it wasn't—when did Blackman leave, '71 or two?

DAILY: Right about '70, I want to say.

PETERS: Could be, yeah. And attendance at football went down, was going down dramatically, and that hurt us badly. Yeah. We built, Elle [Elliot B.] Noyes ['32] who was the former track coach, told me that we built the squash court wing at Dartmouth, the original squash courts, with football proceeds. We had money to burn. Kind of interesting. And then of course it became that institutional support was essential, and I used to say on the alumni circuit, "No, athletics are an integral facet of higher education at Dartmouth, much like an academic department, and have full support from College budget, etc., etc."

DAILY: I guess John Kemeny immediately had to face a lot of financial pressure.

PETERS: No question.

DAILY: And he was asking the Athletic Department to do cutbacks.

PETERS: Sure. Yup.

DAILY: Do you want to talk about that?

PETERS: Sure. I pretty much always felt that we'd be nickel-and-dimed for a while, a couple of years. You know, five percent off each budget, something like that. And then I favored a different approach. "Look, it's time . . ." Well, John Dickey used to say, when we wanted to add a sport, he said, "Hey, that's fine, but tell me what you're going to give up to add this sport." Not a bad approach, and I've used it to this day. Then it became pretty clear that rather than—we couldn't continue to nickel-and-dime, five or ten percent each—I thought we had to reduce program. The only meaningful way to save money is, frankly, with people. I mean, that's a major percentage of any sport's budget. So we ended up cutting, and it was pure hell. I want to say gymnastics and wrestling. Oh, God, I went to so many meetings, and there were protests—you know, understandable, because as I've said so many times, that—I guess more with women's athletics, but I said at the time with men's athletics, that wrestling is just as important to a wrestler as football is to a football player or hockey is to a hockey player. So—the son of a classmate of mine was on the wrestling team and all, and a good friend to this day, but that was tough, I mean very, very tough. Feelings ran very high and it was very, very difficult. But it had to be done, and I think the institution was fair, campus-wide, on it, generally speaking. I still was not required to go out and raise

money to support athletics; the Friends were getting going, the sponsors program was getting going, but that was not a facet or an integral part of the Director of Athletics' job at that point. Now it began to grow and become more and more important, and it is very important now.

DAILY: OK. So how—by 1980 or so, how much time were you spending doing development work?

PETERS: Very little.

DAILY: OK. So that was really kind of post—

PETERS: Yes. We did—we had a sponsors program, which was organized by the late former Vice President [Orton] Ort Hicks ['21]. People give money to this program to fly prospects in. Blackman and Hicks got this going. And Friends groups were just beginning to get going, though it was more for extras, not for—the purpose now is to do things that were always an integral part of the budget, but no longer an integral part of the budget. So I did begin to have to raise money for facilities, Thompson Arena—I remember going to [Stanley]Stan Smoyer ['34] to get the chair backs and the seats in Thompson Arena. I went to [Vincent C.]Vin Turecamo ['37], a good friend of Blackman's, to [lay astroturf on] Leverone.

We had a dirt floor originally in Leverone Fieldhouse. And it would go through an awful cycle: dirt floor, dusty, very dusty. We'd put oil down and it would smell like hell, it was just awful. So, given an OK to raise money, I went to Vin Turecamo to get money for a synthetic floor in there. He said he would do it, he pledged it in writing, and to this day he's given nothing. The College had to write it off finally, but that's how we got it. It was no game on my part. It turned out he remarried a much younger woman, I don't think she wanted him to give the dough. But that was really the only—I did quite a few things for Thompson, but again more in the facilities side than the programmatic side.

But the budgets were tough. I remember sitting down monthly and going through the expenditure reports and—budgets, accounting, finance were easy for me, just because of my background. So I did handle quite a lot of that myself, and then we ended up with a business manager. But I had to pay attention to it.

We did have some funds; we had a Harden Fund in baseball, of \$300,000, we could use that income for things. And we had [television revenues], to John Dickey's credit (I think this is pertinent)—John Dickey—we generally dominated Ivy football, to be repetitive. But that also meant we'd get more TV appearances than most other Ivies. Those are very, very nice checks. We had a TV reserve. So we had some reserves which—obviously I had to go to the Athletic Council, had to go upstreet to get it. I just couldn't take it. But that was very, very lucrative. And then when I was on the NCAA TV Committee they almost felt they had to give Dartmouth a [telecast]—whether they wanted to or not. We used to have Monday conference calls, and what part of the country will this game go, and that game go, and that's when the NCAA completely controlled college football television. Now it's run rampant on every network. But John Dickey, to his credit, proposed—I repeat, it's important for the emphasis—that we have more TV appearances than anyone else because we had the better program, even though Harvard and Yale was always on. You're never going to eliminate that.

But John Dickey proposed to the League that TV monies be shared. A very important step in Ivy athletics, and I think that he wanted to make a statement that finances aren't going to dictate Ivy policy, etc., etc., much like the scheduling decision he made. But it ended up, to edit it, TV monies would be [shared]—If it was an Ivy versus a non-Ivy, Dartmouth versus Holy Cross, we'd divide it by nine. Dartmouth would get two-ninths, Dartmouth a participant, the other seven Ivies would get one-ninth. Does that add up? Yeah. If it was two Ivies, it would be divided in ten: two shares for each of the two participants, and one share for the other six. Does that come out right? Two shares for each of the participants, that's four—yeah. With me?

DAILY: Yeah, I'm following.

PETERS: OK. That was a hell of a move on his part. I'm not sure I completely—philosophically of course you agree with it, but selfishly it was nice to have that TV reserve, which was always for extras you might want to undertake. But that was a very dramatic move, and I think we were the first to do that nationally, I believe.

DAILY: OK.

PETERS: Now everyone does it, be it Bowl money, or of course, TV appearances are . . .

DAILY: You were active in a larger Ivy League circle, from what I can gather. Do you mind talking a little bit about the Ivy League philosophy and how it kind of changed in the '70s and early '80s?

PETERS: No, I don't mind at all. It's easy to be active in the Ivies. I mean, you rotate chairmanship and all this kind of thing. I've benefited because of the NCAA structure. NCAA at that point had eight, nine, ten regions. One region was New England. And the New England—and generally speaking, important NCAA committees had a rep from each region. And I remember when I became Director of Athletics, Bill Flynn of Boston College was generally the Division I rep to major committees. And then when his term expired, Bill Flynn—there weren't many [others] to choose from, frankly. It wasn't as if I was brilliant, and—there weren't many. And so Bill Flynn recommended me to replace him on the TV Committee. [I think] that [it] controlled college football completely. You weren't on unless it was an NCAA, part of the television package. We sat down and negotiated with networks, and it was a wonderful, wonderful experience.

So I became a member, and then I became Chair—I think, again, it's not because of [my] brilliance, I think they generally wanted the chair fairly close to New York, which is the hub of the networks. So [it was] almost automatic, not quite, but—maybe I don't give myself quite enough [credit], but that was certainly a part of it, let me be very clear to say. And that was fabulous, I mean just fabulous. And I repeat, if it was a regional weekend when there might be four or five games on, every Monday we'd have maps in front of us and get on a conference call and say, OK, the Ivy game's going to go here, and the Michigan-Michigan State game's going to go here, and the Southern—you know. And we made all those decisions. I repeat, we'd sit down with the networks and negotiate. And I got, I guess—where's my plaque? —oh, I guess in Florida, from Rooney Arledge, who was head of ABC, ABC Sports and then he went up to be ABC News; it was out of this world. And I think that it's important only because I think—I'm not sure Dave McLaughlin thought, but I think—that my involvement with that and then ultimately the NCAA Executive Committee helped the rest of the sporting world, at the very least, understand Ivy philosophy and Ivy athletics. I think they felt, and probably with some justification, the Ivies were somewhat snooty Ivies. And we are—we were, we are.

We think our philosophy is right and I still do to this day. But I think I helped [by saying] "Hey, we're not a bunch of phonies. This is the way we award financial aid, and this is the way the admissions process works. The coaches don't go out and guarantee admissions, all this kind of thing. So again, it may be a rationalization, but I think it helped. I got to be fairly friendly with the people in the NCAA, Walter Byers, the then head of the NCAA.

I was put on the Financial Aid Committee to study financial aid for athletics, would the country go "need"? And of course they never did and I don't think ever will. But I think they began to believe we weren't just snooty Ivies sitting on a pedestal and that kind of thing. I'm pretty sure that's right. So that was wonderful, really, and I thoroughly enjoyed it. Everyone gets to be president of the ECAC, that isn't much of a deal if you have got half intelligence, you know, you're going to end up getting that in your tenure if you last long enough.

But—I don't think Dave McLaughlin liked me doing all of that when he came in. I'm jumping ahead, but to be honest with you, as I say, I think—he said that it took too much time away. I felt it was worth the price; I felt I stayed on top of things. If I had to come in weekends I came in weekends, and my wife would tell you probably I'm a workaholic. I always got it done, but he said he didn't like that. But I think it was a benefit to Dartmouth. Obviously he's the boss, though.

DAILY: Right. We won't jump ahead to the McLaughlin years yet, but I wanted to ask just in general, how many hours a week did you put in on the job, do you think?

PETERS: Well, I was always at work at 8:00 and people would always say, always ragging, "What are you going to do all summer long?", that kind of thing. At my desk, I'd say eight to nine hours a day, in the gym if you will. I always felt it essential to go to all events at home. Football, I went home and away. Winter's a bitch, and it's doubly worse now, with women's athletics. But you know, you go to every hockey game and every basketball game and it gets pretty tedious, particularly if you're not winning in basketball. And you've got swimming—so the winter is very, very long, in a lot of ways. But I felt that was important, and that's semi-work. Sometimes it was work, when you have a crappy team and there aren't many there. And then you had—I was on the [Athletic] Council—a lot of College committees, too. Geez, I don't miss that. Council on Budget and

Priorities, Facilities Committee and all this kind of thing—holy Christ, just unreal. I worked hard. But I loved it—I mean, that's not a complaint. When you work—obviously you need to work hard when you enjoy it, so I did. And I really did.

DAILY: Back up to the early part of John Kemeny's administration: coeducation is the big thing at that point. What . . .

PETERS: Sure. Indian symbol, coeducation, all that kind of thing, holy Christ!

DAILY: We'll stick with coeducation for now, at least. What were your views on it before?

PETERS: I was opposed to coeducation, you know: the old Dartmouth guy, opposed. Pretty clear what Kemeny's direction—convocation address, I think it was. He had a commitment to coeducation, had a very innovative plan, and as I look back it was clearly the right step to take. I think once we—Dartmouth made that commitment, I worked hard to achieve it. I think we did a hell of a job achieving it, thanks to [Agnes] Aggie Kurtz. Thanks also to the experience we gained from the experience Princeton and Yale had. They'd gone just a year or two or three before us. That was a very great benefit to us. They'd made some mistakes from which we profited. And the institution made a commitment.

So it's very clear to me it was the right step now, and Dartmouth's a better place for it. I think we did it very, very well, and look today—I don't think we did, I know we did. And I'll go back to a statement I made about gymnastics and wrestling. You know, women's squash is just as important to a woman as football is to football players, and so on. And we made a very—we made a very strong commitment and we did it very, very well. Aggie was very, very good. And we'll take a lot of the credit for it too. But Aggie was great. We hired the right person, and I think we had the right approach. We learned a lot from the other schools; we had the right commitment of resources in the broadest sense.

DAILY: What were the qualities in Aggie Kurtz that made her person to be the first woman coach and the first Assistant Athletic Director?

PETERS: Let's see, we hired her away from Smith? Does that sound right?

DAILY: I was thinking Delaware for some reason, but that—

PETERS: Isn't that—no—Delaware was Whitey Burnham. At least, he worked there. Well. We went through the interview process—we were then getting to the days when, forgive me, you had to go through a national search. You know, it used to be when I hired somebody I'd hire him. I used to sit, I'd think, OK, if the football coach leaves, to whom are you going to turn? And it was that [simple] as you look back, it was wrong, but it was wonderful too. The hockey coach leaves, you always had, in your mind, anyway, people with whom you'd like to talk. No question about it. But then, rightly so, with Affirmative Action and all, that changed, so we did have a pool of candidates, and she clearly stood out.

First, she knows athletics; she's got a wonderful people ability; she has a nice balance, not uptight, not—some of the qualities you want in people, kind of nebulous things. But it was pretty clear that she wasn't going to be a strong, strong women's lib, you know, women or nothing. That was important. And I think she became convinced that the institution had the commitment that it had. She was wonderful. And then we hired somebody who wasn't so wonderful to succeed her, Louise O'Neal, we got taken by Yale on that.

DAILY: All right. Now, with Title IX, what did Dartmouth have to do to at least take the initial steps to comply?

PETERS: Well, the first thing we had to do was build women's facilities, locker rooms. And have a financial commitment, and we were prepared to offer sports which the undergraduates wanted. It was that simple. We didn't sit there and say, OK, we're going to offer women's soccer, women's basketball, and softball. We really let the women express what they wanted, and we said—we were lousy, we were terrible. I remember a little later on going to the first women's college ice hockey game, and I walked into it, and I said to my wife, "Good God, my son Mike's (ten years old) squirt team would beat them." And look how they've grown now. But we really let it take hold that way. And again, the women wanted swimming. Then there was budget available to hire a coach, and we had the facilities. The first thing we had to do was build a locker room, that was essential. I remember Ort Hicks going out to raise that money. I can't think of the guy's name but I can picture him. So the facilities, the personnel were never a problem. We were prepared to do it right. We, the institution. I don't mean Peters.

DAILY: The—related to coeducation was the D-Plan. How did that affect athletics for both men and women?

PETERS: Well, I was very concerned about it. First—you ought to know of why coeducation worried me to a degree, because I thought it would lower the number of men admitted, which lowered the pool of athletes, you know, so there was that—and it was true. And you worry: they're always going to take the very brilliant, they're always going to take minorities and that. So you get that pool from which maybe most of your football players are drawn was much smaller. So that was a part of it, it wasn't just that there were more women around, something like that. I've lost track. What did you ask me?

DAILY: About the D-Plan.

PETERS: Oh, yeah. And then I'm very concerned about, what about the three-sport athlete? How could he compete three terms and still follow the Dartmouth Plan? And Dartmouth was—so that did worry me. Dartmouth was—well, you didn't have an opportunity in the summer to compete because you had no one against whom to compete. But that—they were very understanding about that. If you had a—and let me also say that it wasn't just the three-sport athletes, as much as the three-term athletes, which would be, say, a hockey player-baseball player would be three terms; fall and winter with hockey, spring is obvious to you. So that was important also. Because unfortunately, with us they might not overlap in semesters, but they did with our terms, which is, you know, late November-early December and March and late May. We're about the latest school year around. But they were good about that. So we'll make an exception—if it's a genuine, you know, no pulling the wool over anybody's eyes. If it was a [Eugene F. "Buddy"] Teevens ['79] or a [Thomas F.] Fleming ['76] or whoever it might be who were *bona fide* three-sport athletes, they would make an exception. And they did, and that was important to do, very important to do. It was the only vehicle we had by which we'd go coeducational, and as I look back, that was an important step to take, and made Dartmouth a better place.

DAILY: There's kind of the hue and cry, "Dartmouth sports are going to go downhill," in the '70s. But one of the things that seems to have, in the larger frame of things, was recruiting within the Ivy League, and you know, the Ivy League philosophy, and how that worked with recruiting at Dartmouth and at the other schools. I'd be interested in hearing how you saw the changes that were going on.

PETERS: Everyone went to school on Dartmouth, on Bob Blackman, including our own coaches in other sports. And the other Ivies got sick of, particularly Harvard, Yale and Princeton, of Dartmouth and generally—maybe dominate's too [strong]—of winning a hell of a lot more than we lost, anyway. And so they began to recruit more. And so you get into this war. And obviously, whether we like it or not, or whether upstreet likes it or not, (I mean the administration), Dartmouth does not have the national reputation of Harvard, Yale and Princeton. I mean, it's just a fact of life. I think it should, but it doesn't. Also because of the location, I think we have to spend more and recruit harder than the other schools. Obviously, you throw out a net covering a radius of 50 miles from Hanover, you get very little. But you do it in Boston or you do it in New Haven or you do it in Princeton, there are a hell of a lot more and much easier to accessibility. So I think we get—I thought, anyway, we could justify spending more, and I thought we had to for those reasons. And no doubt in my mind. But the other Ivies wanted to be more competitive and they began to recruit, so it did escalate. And some—I can understand it, some curbs, restraints, were put on, and that's OK. They did at that time—this is [Dean of the College] Manuel-[President] Kemeny, and they developed a so-called "academic index." I don't know whether you—

DAILY: I think you're leading to a question, so keep going.

PETERS: OK. And I remember them coming home from a meeting and saying, "we're going to have an academic index," it had three components: rank in class, Board scores, I think Achievements were the other. And you could be—had to be—all admitted athletes had to be within a standard deviation, and it was going to be effective a year from now. Dartmouth decided to do it right away, which was a horrid mistake in my opinion, sitting where I sat. Because I thought we'd be less competitive. And some of the others got away with murder: Princeton and Penn particularly got away with murder. Probably, philosophically, a good idea. They made exceptions for Columbia to try to help them get back into football. They made some other exceptions . . .

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

PETERS: I repeat, we adhered to it in much more—like, I had graphs and all, because at that point I was also on the Ivy Policy Committee, which includes—it's the eight Deans, if you will, and also—a representative of one or two Directors of Athletics, one from

Admissions or somebody else. So I had access to these graphs, and we were just so much more faithful about living with those guidelines than anyone else. I mean, not even close. And for that reason, in my opinion, we became less and less competitive. If somebody didn't live up to the guidelines they get their wrist slapped and nothing happens. And we suffered badly, in my opinion. In principle it's right. But it's only right if the people adhere to it.

DAILY: Here at Dartmouth, who was really saying you've got to stick to the letter of the law?

PETERS: It was Kemeny and Manuel at that point, and the admissions people, [Edward "Eddie"] Chamberlain and [Alfred "Al"] Quirk. I'll never forget saying to—this is really back, referring to Blackman—I remember saying to Eddie Chamberlain once, "Goddammit, Eddie" (he was Director of Admissions), "I think Blackman is right in going public and being critical of you people, that's the only way we can get anything out of you." Something like that. Because Blackman—I gave you the one quote—"I'm sick of losing to Harvard with kids who were turned down by Dartmouth." And he'd always played that game with them. But our admissions people were very, very, in my opinion, rigid, relatively uncommunicative, they'd kind of sit there in their office, and they're omnipotent, really. And Kemeny wasn't about to get involved, probably properly so, if I were sitting in his chair. And—I'm jumping ahead, but for that reason I was euphoric when he resigned. I liked John Kemeny, you had to like John Kemeny. But he did not have a huge interest, and didn't want to get involved too much, left it up to Smallwood and Kreider and Manuel. I want to get back to that too. But I was thrilled when [David T. "Dave"] McLaughlin ['54], a known jock anyway, was named President. He's a classmate. What else I was going to say—I want to get back to that. Well, I can't think of it. Oh, yes. I think I referred to this earlier, the reappointment of coaches. Again, did you understand how that worked with head coaches?

DAILY: Yes.

PETERS: For example, I had up to this June 30, 2001 to tell coaches of our intentions with them for 2002-03. Not '01-'02, that was last year. And so I would go to the Athletic Council, this is head coaches now, to recommend our course of action. Usually it was very routine; we didn't fire people every year, obviously. And would then have to go to Manuel, fine. And then a week later I was meeting with Manuel,

and he said, "I've got some bad news for you. The President"—this is McLaughlin, now—"doesn't want to appoint the hockey coach and the basketball coach." I said, "What!?" A perfect example of Dave McLaughlin, by the way, but that's maybe jumping ahead. But I say that for a couple of reasons: one, the Athletic Council was my boss, which I emphasized earlier, and then I had to go to Manuel and Manuel took it to McLaughlin, and then he—so I had one on one of those and lost one. He kept the hockey coach, [George] Crowe and fired the basketball coach, [Tim] Cohane. But that's how Dave McLaughlin operated, in my opinion. But recruiting got more and more expensive, too, obviously we had to recruit for women. And we have a fantastic women's athletic program. And I think Dartmouth quite naturally attracts outdoor, athletically-oriented women, because of the location, a lot of reasons. But the men's program really hasn't been very good, it really hasn't.

DAILY: '70s football did pretty well with [John "Jake"] Crouthamel ['60] and . . .

PETERS: Crouthamel won three championships and [Joseph "Joe"] Yukica came in, he won two or three. But then we went downhill. There were those—see, that's a perfect example, Yukica. I just was—he was here as Assistant Coach, he went from here to UNH to be head coach, then to B.C. [Boston College] to be head coach, and I contacted him when—must be when Blackman left—and he wasn't ready. And then when Crouthamel left, he was interested. So we had—we didn't have to go through this expensive, at times unfair, very time-consuming search. That hurt us, that process hurt us because it was very time-consuming and it could cost you a recruiting year too. You know, you'd miss out on a coach because you—the idea is fine, but I marvel at how so many institutions can make an appointment so very quickly, and at least Dartmouth was not able to, because we adhered to those things so wonderfully well, but sometimes not practically so. You can see that, how you'd lose a class.

DAILY: Right, if you don't pick up a coach by February or so.

PETERS: Right. And we couldn't possibly do it in less than two months; sometimes three months. Advertising in national publications, have the Affirmative Action officer approve, then you'd whittle the pool down, it had to be a balanced pool, you'd have to get them to approve the balanced pool, you'd have to interview some who you knew goddamn right well weren't qualified for the job. Frankly,

you'd have to get a minority in there, and I'm not opposed to minorities, I'm not prejudiced. But in many cases it was using them to have them in the final pool, when they were there because of color, generally. And as I say, very time-consuming and expensive. But that's the way life is nowadays. That's why the job became much less fun.

DAILY: OK, that's one thing I was wondering about, was, between the finances, the pressures just within the Ivy League and within the College, how . . .

PETERS: Affirmative Action, Title IX, budget, lack of national involvement, lack of—less competitiveness, a lot of reasons.

DAILY: Did you look at offers elsewhere?

PETERS: Oh, yeah, I got close to going to Stanford. As I look back, too many, probably. I could have gone to Stanford, but I thought I was offered the job on the rebound when somebody else turned it down and President [Richard] Lyman called me up at the Logan Hilton when I was coming home. He called the house, and I wasn't there; my wife knew that the plane got in at 11 or 12 that night; and offered me the job. It didn't make a lot of sense. It was very poor money for the expense of living in Palo Alto, and I thought it over and decided no because of the money, if I had a marriage situation, a lot of different reasons. But he was on the rebound and didn't make a realistic offer, frankly. Whether I would have gone had it been a realistic offer, I don't know. I could have gone to U. Mass., could have gone to Washington—but yes. And maybe it was a lack of courage, I don't know. I love it here, so it could have been that. Andy Geiger, whom I hired as Assistant Rowing Coach and Phys. Ed. instructor, left here, went to Syracuse as Assistant, was at Brown, Penn; we're very close. He interviewed at Stanford, he got mad that Stanford was also interviewing me, he withdrew, and that's when they offered me the job. What they would have done I don't know, but then it turned out they came back to Geiger and he took it.

DAILY: I don't want to beat the recruiting thing to death. I came across—and you can help me out with this, because I didn't find anything more about it—this is nines and sevens. A woman would be a nine or a seven.

PETERS: Nines can't miss. Will play regularly as a soph—before freshman eligibility—will play regularly as a sophomore. Seven will probably play some as a sophomore; certainly will letter their junior and senior years; five, average prospect. That's a rating we put on young men and women for admissions. You know, Dan Daily's a nine in football, give him some background, etc., etc. And Admissions welcomed that. Blackman started that again, and it was important for them to understand how highly we thought of somebody. Sometimes it could make the difference, no question about it. It's interesting, even now, for instance, [with] [Karl] Furstenburg—I mean, [Robert] Bobby Gaudet ['81]' in men's hockey has got a wonderful relationship. I sense that—and it's only a sense—that [football coach] John Lyon doesn't have a great relationship. He hasn't got Bobby's personality, first of all. But some have it like—well, if you want to say, some have a wonderful relationship with Karl, and he works closely with them; some don't, and I don't know why.

But I must say I was interested to read the piece in The Dartmouth about accusations from minorities. Did you see that? In Admissions. Fourteen of 16 have left over the past few years, were never promoted—allegations, I'm not saying it's fact. And—I've lost her name—oh, [Provost] Susan Prager indicated that clearly there must be some internal communicative problems there, or something like that. And I sense that's the way it is with coaches, to a degree now, anyway. But that's a sense. I'm obviously on the outside looking in.

DAILY: Well, when John Kemeny moved your reporting structure around, away directly—away from being directly reporting to him, to over to the Deans—you reported to Smallwood and then Manuel, and . . .

PETERS: Don Kreider was in there at some point, at least for a year if not two. Smallwood was great.

DAILY: And Shanahan. Would you mind talking about working with each one of those deans?

PETERS: No. Smallwood was great, [he] let us do our job, and obviously it was my job to be diligent in reporting to him, telling him what's going on, keeping abreast of things and all. Kreider didn't know much about it. I think he was probably only [there] for a year. Do you know of him, Don Kreider? Ralph [Manuel], very unusual guy. Good guy, he'd write my annual review and said, "Finest athletic

director in the country," all this, but he was not candid. I mean, he was just "I, I, I, I, I." Oh, cripes! And then it turns out, after he left and went to Culver [Military Academy], I had some talks with McLaughlin, and some things I had told Ralph in confidence he had told McLaughlin, and just it would—so I had trouble with him, unpleasant with him, and he went to a Sphinx gathering the other night, but it just—"I, I, I, I, I," holy cripes. Very capable, personable guy, athletically interested. But he—what's the right word? macromanaged?—

DAILY: Micromanaged?

PETERS: What's big, did it all?

DAILY: Micro, yes.

PETERS: Micro, yeah. And so did Dave McLaughlin. I mean, as witnessed by the basketball and hockey coaches story. But Ralph generally was supportive, although as I look back, not as supportive as he indicated he was, in my opinion. I'll bet it's just the relationship I had. And he didn't fit too well with McLaughlin, I guess, he didn't feel he did; ended up going to Culver.

And then on the other side with McLaughlin at some point if you want to, but it doesn't make any difference to me. He was unique. He—classmate, and—our class, if you had, like you had in high school, voted for most likely to succeed, he would have been it, hands down. No question about it. Very capable guy. We should have known, I guess, when he was finally named President of Dartmouth, when we found out the Toro people were celebrating, that something was wrong, but that's . . . But Kemeny was good, bright, I would have done what he did even though I felt we should report directly, and a good person, no question. Smoked like a train, that's why he isn't living, I guess. So did I, by the way, at one point.

DAILY: So Manuel played a role in kind of lessening the power of the DCAC?

PETERS: I think, because I think he wanted it. I think he wanted it. He had very strong opinions, which is his privilege. He was my boss, no two ways about it. Oh, and then he—I think I gave you the story. He said, "What do you mean, you have to go to the Athletic Council?" I said, "Ralph, you've got to read this damn thing, I have

no choice!" And he got it changed, made it advisory. And that was the trend around the College, though: Hanover Inn Board of Overseers, the Medical School Board of Overseers had more responsibility than they now do. Right now they're merely advisory. But they were very powerful groups, as I said, like the Trustees to the President. And Ralph didn't like that because he wanted to be in on the fundamental decision, and didn't want any others involved. So then it became a chore to come up with an agenda for the Athletic Council meetings, they were advisory only; what the hell meaningful were you going to have on the agenda? So it was more reporting, to keep abreast of things, sort of thing.

DAILY: So when [Edward] Ed Shanahan comes in he basically inherits that changed system.

PETERS: Yeah.

DAILY: OK.

PETERS: And he was a—as I look back, a very poor choice, I think. And I think most people think [so too]. He was a kind of a—he just didn't fit in that job. Whether it was Peter's Principle, who knows? But [he] didn't know it very well, didn't understand it, wasn't with it, you know. I got along with him fine, but it was just—not the right person for that job in my opinion, and I think that was felt campus-wide pretty much. We hired him from where, Wesleyan? I think Furstenburg might have come from Wesleyan too. Well, it doesn't make any difference.

DAILY: Kind of moving up to David McLaughlin's years: When David McLaughlin was hired as President, was there a kind of feeling in the Athletic Department that there was going to be a recommitment sort of thing?

PETERS: Oh, yeah, I think I said earlier, I was euphoric. I mean, a known jock—I mean, he was a very fine football player, no two ways about it. And a good track athlete—he even played some basketball. But, known jock. I admired him greatly as an undergraduate, no two ways about it. And as a—and oh, god, I stayed in his house once when I went out to speak in [Minneapolis]—where is Toro?—Twin Cities, somewhere out there. But—and he decided—when did he become President?

DAILY: Around '81.

PETERS: Yeah. Speaking of micromanaging, I mean, wow. Really something else. We should have gotten an inkling—Toro, I mentioned. He fired [Rodney] Rod Morgan ['44], who was Vice President of Business Affairs or something like that, before he was even on the job! (Unreal!) And I'm sure they had an inkling then. Let me be clear to say he did a lot of good things too. He was a marvelous fundraiser. I think he put an emphasis on quality of undergraduate life, which needed to be done. Oh, an example—well, the coaches, I gave you. Oh, facilities priorities, for instance. Use of facilities. He felt strongly, and I think rightly so, that the priority ought to be students, faculty, employees, outsiders. But then he'd also want to go out, involved in setting the rates too! I mean, he just got involved in much too much. He was a workaholic and could accomplish—pay attention to a lot of things. But he didn't let anyone do their job, in my opinion. And then—do you want to keep going on McLaughlin?

DAILY: Yes.

PETERS: OK. Things had deteriorated, I think it's fair to say: competitiveness, facility-wise. And I got a long letter from him, you know, "We've got to work together, set long-range goals." Oh, and I think also—I think I got myself in the doghouse. He wanted me to write a report of where I thought athletics in toto ought to be at Dartmouth College. And I did that. And it included facilities, it included organization. Just to give an example, I felt that all the intercollegiate programs ought to be under the Director of Athletics. I wasn't crusading to add more to my empire, but I thought that made sense. I thought facilities such as the Skiway and the golf course ought to be under the Director of Athletics. So I wrote a lengthy report about that and everything else, where, ideally, if we could start over, what would we do? And he said, "I want you to bring that to the Board of Trustees at Minary. But please assume now that they've read this, so I don't want you to go over it"—you know. And I went over there and did it, and it was very clear to me—and I did it as he had asked. And it was very clear to me that they had not read it, and I did—I felt I did a lousy job, frankly, for that reason. I think I came across as having done a lousy job.

And from there he wrote me a letter saying—a long letter—I looked for it before you came in this morning, I can't locate it. Saying, "We're going to work together to improve this, but I must admit I start from a point of"—let me see if I can get it straight—

"considerable dissatisfaction, dissatisfaction with the organizational efficiency, the attitudes, facilities, and the result." And I said to my associate, secretary, whatever she was, "Margot,"—she's still around, Margot de l'Etoile, she's with the Dickey Endowment. I said, "What else is there?" And I guess maybe I began to think, "Hey, what the hell am I going to stay here for and get involved with the way this guy operates?" And I decided I didn't want to, whether they would have fired [me]—I don't know.

But anyway, I looked at Shanahan and said, "Hey, Ed,"—this was in January or February of '83—"I propose that I get through on June 30, and be paid full salary and benefits for a year." I was hoping for half a year. And within 24 hours he was back at me and accepted that. So that tells me something, I guess, doesn't it? So, you know—and that was—it was time for me, it was time for the department and the institution, I think, as I look back. I think changeover's healthy in a lot of ways for a lot of different reasons, for the individual involved, for the department, for the institution. And, you know, to have a year to begin to start—I didn't know what I was going to do at that point, but it turned out I wanted to get into this business, and you know, not to have to worry about commissions and all for a year was just wonderful. And whether he would have fired me, a lot of my friends—some say yeah, some say no, but he clearly was going through with a hatchet, a lot of departments, starting with Rod Morgan, of course, so who knows? But it was better for the institution and better for me, I don't think there's any question.

DAILY: Just to step down?

PETERS: We weren't as competitive, I wasn't involved nationally because Ivy athletics were no longer top division in football, for instance, therefore didn't have automatic representation, but—it was best for all, no question about it. But I loved it, don't misunderstand me. I had a great run, great run.

DAILY: You said he cited attitudes as a problem: of coaches, of your staff?

PETERS: We never—he never elaborated on that.

DAILY: OK.

PETERS: Now, he did go on to say, you know, "We're going to work together, I'm confident that you can do it," and all this kind of thing. But that

opened my eyes more than anything else: Hey, maybe it is time. It would be fun to know if he would have—who knows? It doesn't make any difference, really.

DAILY: Right. In terms of results, what was David's goal?

PETERS: I think wins and losses.

DAILY: You think it was just goals in certain sports?

PETERS: Oh, as Tony Lupien would have called them, the glamour sports: football, basketball, hockey. I think we all—we have a disadvantage, in my opinion, in the spring sports, although this spring baseball was successful. A secondary school baseball player, why he would consider—even if he wants to go Ivy . . . McLaughlin's son went out for hockey and was cut. No, cut to the J.V. Didn't make the Varsity, played for the J.V.'s. And that raised all sorts of problems. I mean, holy Christ! And George Crowe said to me, then our men's hockey coach, that word had come back to him from some alumni how dissatisfied Dave McLaughlin was with George Crowe. And in retro—I don't know what George should have done in retrospect; I interfered not at all, I don't think I should have, I think George makes a judgment and if it's at all close you keep him and if it isn't—well. But apparently Dave expressed that to other people, and word got to Crowe and word got to me, and then as I told you, I wanted to reappoint two coaches and Crowe was the one who was going to be fired. Now, we held on for a year, and then I got through and then Crowe was terminated the next year, I think. But that vintage—that's a little strong.

An example of how he operated. . . . I don't know whether you're Republican or Democrat, but I just can't understand Jim Jeffords, but that's neither here nor there. When you run as a certain party and then . . . best we not get involved in that, huh?

DAILY: Yeah, we'll stay away from politics. To kind of wrap things up, kind of look at the long sweep, I'm interested in hearing about coaches that you might want to bring up: coaches that you really enjoyed working with, or who made real contributions to the . . .

PETERS: Sure. First of all, we had a great group of coaches when I was here as an undergraduate and when I first came back. McLaughry was very good; I think coaches probably like you and I will, maybe I have, lose it. As I've often said to people, one of the problems of

working at an institution like Dartmouth is, your constituents always stay the same age, and you don't. Silly to say, but it's true. And you lose a lot, you lose something, anyway, I don't know whether "a lot" is fair, I don't know. So it's hard to stay abreast, I think, be patient. But we had McLaughry, we had [Alvin Fred] "Doggie" Julian, we had Eddie Jeremiah, we had Tony Lupien—it was good. As I said, we had [James Robert] Bob Shawkey in baseball—we had some good baseball coaches. And they were terrific. [Thomas J.] Tommy Dent, soccer/lacrosse, for instance, just terrific. And then McLaughry didn't stay abreast of his sport, and the times. Recruiting, for instance. He didn't—he and Lupien didn't recognize that you had to recruit. They didn't feel they should have to, that kids should really want to come to this place, "it shouldn't be up to me to convince them to come to this place." So they didn't stay abreast of that, and the times, we mentioned all those things with Lupien on R.O.T.C. and Title IX—all of it.

DAILY: With R.O.T.C., was he opposed to it being taken away?

PETERS: Yeah, that's right, being taken away. Yeah, we terminated that. Again, the faculty, much like they're on a crusade about fraternities now, were on a crusade about—you know, anti-war, you know, you can picture it all. And that was too bad. I think it was a mistake the institution made, but you know, what the hell. Nonetheless that was their decision. And then you have two choices. You can either work here and support it, or get through. So some, like Lupien, we had to terminate, but most people grow with it and understand it. And I was opposed to coeducation, but I was wrong, that's all. So you work with it. I could have quit, but I supported it. Other coaches: Oh, terrific. You know, Blackman was a great coach, there are no two ways about it. I repeat, he was always in the grey area, always pushing, strident—that was probably why he was good. Football: Crouthamel was good, Yukica was good—Yukica, some would say, lost his real incentive to work hard, go the extra mile—again, he was getting older when we hired him, not that he was an old man, but getting old. He's the same age as I am.

DAILY: Crouthamel made his complaints known around the College in terms of, you know, maybe losing the competitive edge and stuff, or—was John Kemeny or anybody else over in Parkhurst . . . ?

PETERS: I don't know—a lot of this was the—I lost my timing on that. He came right in—Oh, Jake—I think it illustrates something. Jake quit two or three times, two or three years in a row. I'd come in on a

Sunday to get caught up, or on a Monday there would be something on my desk, "I can't stand doing what I'm doing to my family, the pressure's too great," and then we'd meet, and then he finally meant it, of course. But he said to me, "You know, Pete, you made a mistake hiring me, because I was an assistant coach that wanted to be a head coach and wasn't in a position to make—well, demands, or 'yeah, I'll come if you do 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.' Whereas if you're going outside and hire somebody, well, it's obvious to you. You're in a much stronger position, yeah, because you feel strongly, but this is what I think Dartmouth has to do, and I know this is what they have to do if you want me to remain a candidate." And that was a pretty good point, a very good point. Jake wouldn't have insisted—"Yeah, but I want some guarantees from Admissions and I want some resources guaranteed," this kind of thing. And that's valid. And we'd become—I think Jake won the championship three years in a row, I'm not sure. But he said, "Oh, yeah, but that's Blackman's material." You know. And then we got a little less competitive, but we were still pretty good. And Jake did mean it one year when he quit, and we were very helpful in getting him a job at Syracuse, Director of Athletics, he's been there ever since and done a hell of a job. I mean, they've got a great intercollegiate program. So he was good, unique but good. Some coaches couldn't stand him because he was so arm's length, impersonal. You had to get to know him.

Yukica was wonderful; Burnham very good. Let me think. Hockey: my sport. We hired [Abner] Ab Oakes [III, '56], I had to fire him. That sounds more bunk to me, I obviously went through the Athletic Council, and it just wasn't working. Then we hired another assistant named Grant Stanbrook, who knows more hockey than anyone I've ever known to this day. He ended up at—he's at Maine as an assistant coach now. And I was at an NCAA convention and got a call, the team was going to quit, can't stand Stanbrook, didn't like the job he was doing. So I left the NCAA Commission and came home and said, "Look, you've got two options, but Stanbrook is going to stay here. You can quit or do as you see fit." But that didn't work, and we hired Crowe. A marvelous coach named John Kenfield, in tennis and squash, terrific. I mean, a real gentleman, classy, classy gentleman. We might have got him from the ACC too.

Basketball: we had marvelous people. We never really made it. I used to rationalize by saying basketball has become a Black urban sport and we're far from a comfortable area for Blacks. And that's

true, it isn't a criticism of anybody, we're not in an urban area, let's face it. But we had—OK, when Doggie got through I really pushed Red Rolfe hard to hire [David R.] Dave Gavitt ['59] early. And I was come here a year before as a transition and all, and Dave came and he had us on our way back, he really did. He was probably as outstanding a coach as I've seen at Dartmouth if not anywhere else. Very, very good in every way. Dartmouth graduate. What was he, '58 or '9, whatever. And unfortunately, I remember to this day, I got a call from Dave, that Joe Mullaney who was coach at Providence College was offered a job in the ABA—does that sound right? A competitive league to the NBA, anyway. And that's from where we'd gotten Dave, and Providence wanted him, and he was going to think about it hard, but it was pretty clear to me he was going to go. And you can't blame him. Much like Blackman. And he said, "You know, I miss being in the hub of basketball." And again, it's kind of like what I said about Blacks. And it was—you know, a school that had a chance to go to the Final Four, and they did. And so he left, and that hurt badly. And we had the guys like George Blainey, Gary Walters, very, very good. Tom O'Connor—we had some great people, anyway, and we just never quite made it. Part of it's Penn and Princeton, who were so goddamned tough, and they have got such a strong commitment, and they're in an urban area. I mean, you look at other schools—Cornell . . .

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

PETERS: . . . So I guess that's about all I can say about basketball, every year we read here, but I just read last week or the week before—are we OK?

DAILY: Yeah.

PETERS: We've got another great class coming in, but we're really not—I don't mean this critically, but the last four or five years we don't quite make it in men's basketball. [Christina] Chris Wielgus is a great coach, and we hired her, she was a—not quite first, because the first was kind of informal, but the second women's basketball coach here. Lived in Woodstock, we hired her—she did a great job here. And then her husband got a job as Director of Recreation at Hilton Head, and they left. She's back here, and she's as good a women's coach as I've—well, certainly as I've known, that doesn't say a hell of a lot, but she's very, very good.

DAILY: What do you think has made women's hockey and women's basketball really competitive?

PETERS: Well, I think we have the ability to attract, as I said, outdoor, athletically oriented women. And I think Dartmouth has a continuous—they have a commitment. I don't think there's any question about that. And I think Admissions has been receptive. I think they've hired good people. It takes all of that. It really does. And we have a—I mean, they've had a marvelous—well, they've had a very good program, no two ways about it. May it continue. I mean, now you—I come back up from Florida for three weekends—long weekends, I work for two or three days and then go to the men's hockey double-header weekends and all. Saw a women's hockey game, and they've improved so dramatically, it's just unbelievable. And I guess it really tells you that—it tells all of us—that when they have the opportunity as young women they really grow, and the caliber of their games, respective games, is very, very good. I still don't particularly like women's basketball, I don't know why, I just don't warm up to it, but they're good in lacrosse, they've gotten good in hockey, and in many ways their games are better games—women's games are better games than men's games, there's less physical contact and all that kind of thing. I'm trying to think—I've probably left out some coaches. Of all the coaches, Gavitt, Blackman would be the very best, we're talking all aspects of it; as a gentleman probably John Kenfield, tennis and squash. Terrific guy. Probably forgotten some, but . . .

DAILY: There was a lot of them, a lot of them.

PETERS: Yep.

DAILY: As you look back, you said you had a good run as Athletics Director. What are some of the things that stand out as successes and accomplishments?

PETERS: Well, we continued the football. I can't take credit for Blackman, but we continued that. I told you I felt football was king. We finally grew the hockey program to make the Final Four two years in a row, which was thrilling. It stands out—Thompson Arena stands out in my mind, I was involved with that and it's a marvelous facility, I think, with some prejudice. Swimming: beating Yale. That doesn't mean anything to you, but Christ, Yale won dual meet upon dual meet. I'd want to say it approached over a hundred in a row we beat them in swimming here. We built a—when we built it that

was a very nice pool, Karl Michael Pool. A number of Olympians we've had. It's kind of fun. I've probably—Where do you live?

DAILY: I'm down in Concord, actually.

PETERS: Oh, do you! Do you commute?

DAILY: Yeah.

PETERS: But to have the little things that Norwich has, sending their Olympians off. Norwich, Vermont. I mean, that really says something, doesn't it? However, I think I had a part in, with the Board of Trustees, artificial snowmaking at the Skiway, even though skiing wasn't under us. I remember saying to them—we were looking at the components of a fundraising campaign (God knows which one it was, we always seemed to be on one), but, and I did say as kind of an addendum to my presentation, "Of any sport or any sports, Dartmouth ought to be prominent in skiing." I happen to think football, skiing and hockey are the ones that Dartmouth ought to be—and I saw a reason to go with the artificial [snowmaking]—you know, whether that made any difference, who knows, but we did get some snowmaking anyway. But football's accomplishments, I loved my national involvement, hockey on the road back, swimming—baseball, going to Omaha was a great thrill, it really was. Wonderful. Probably forgetting some things.

DAILY: If there were things you wanted to do but couldn't accomplish, what would those be?

PETERS: Probably make it in basketball. You get impatient for facilities. Another component of an earlier campaign was an outdoor synthetic-surface field, which they finally got. It's just one of those things you end up cutting, when you have to go through that process. At Thompson Arena—we had somebody to finance that well before we got [Rupert] Rupe Thompson. And it's kind of interesting, this should tell you something about John Dickey. Ort Hicks, I think I referred to him earlier, had money all set for a new ice arena. Davis Rink was an abomination, it was a relic, but we needed a new arena. Ort Hicks had the money all set from Tom Murdough. And John Dickey, after thinking about it, went to Ort Hicks and said, "Ort, in a campaign the first facility you build cannot be an athletic facility. So I want you to"—editing, obviously—"go back to Tom Murdough and see if he'd be willing to make it" what's now the Murdough Center down at Tuck there. But that tells you

something about Dickey, I think, and Ort Hicks did it, and we got Rupe Thompson. But it put it off a number of years. We weren't going to be competitive in ice hockey until we had at least a firm commitment to Thompson Arena, which I repeat I think is a marvelous facility. I mean, it stands up even today, and that was dedicated mid-'70s? '76 or '77? I don't know, in there. Gee, that's 25 years ago. That really stands the test of time, I think. East stand of football, and much scheduling. I think I've touched it. But I loved it.

And the people have been marvelous too, the coaches. We had a—Red Rolfe built Tom Dent Cabin, obviously to memorialize Tom Dent. I thought he was nuts. I mean, who the hell is going to use that? But it was used a great deal, a lot more before the rowing boathouse was built, but we used to have coaches' sessions down there, and poker and all that kind of thing, and that kind of thing you end up losing with coeducation. Again, I think coeducation was good, but it wasn't the Old Boys group gathering down at the cabin.

And the institution—of all the people, I guess John Dickey, but that shows how old-fashioned you get when you get in your late 60s, probably. I think Jim Wright's good—so far I do. Poor guy, to make him go through what he's gone through. Jere Daniell, do you know him? He was in the other day, said, the most recent faculty vote made us think of a guy in the English Department faculty, who was on the Athletic Council, one of the faculty members, [James "Jim"] Epperson, who was a wonderful guy. And Jim passed away, open heart [surgery], and then it looked like he was doing fine but then bicycling home, walking his bike up a hill in Norwich. Anyway, he was very strong, and Jere and I reminisced that he wanted fraternities abolished. And Jere said that he did some research, that he was going to speak to Heorot, which is kind of a hockey house now, if you will. Is that the right pronunciation? Heorot, whatever it is. It's out across from the gym, anyway. And he said he did a lot of research. And he said the faculty first voted to abolish fraternities in the late 1800s. He said about eight times now they've so voted, and so he didn't put much credibility [in it], but he didn't think that was a monumentous move of any kind. Kind of interesting. That would be Jere, to do that kind of research, wouldn't it? How did you know Jim Epperson, are you familiar with the—

DAILY: With the fraternities, and read through . . . interviews.

PETERS:

He's—I disagreed with him, because fraternities meant a lot to me and to us as an all-male institution. That's a part of the importance, I think. You know, you look at the—Hanover's now proposing a community center. And Dartmouth students say they don't have enough recreational opportunities, enough things to do. But holy Christ, when you look back at what there was here, and now what we have here, before Hopkins Center, which John Dickey had a commitment to do for years and years and years—you have Hopkins Center and you have Collis and you have so many things here now. But naturally the students don't know that, they haven't anything to compare to what you now have, but we sure do. And look at the community center, on the swing rope—how we need that—what the—if you haven't got enough things to do in Hanover, New Hampshire, then you're in deep trouble. I don't care whether it's athletics or the arts or the theater, being a Hopkins Center theater or a movie theater, or Storrs Pond. I mean, we've got skiing—we've got everything—skiing, golf. But I remember saying to Walter Byers once, and he put it in his book—this was during the '70s—that I felt at times institutions lost sight of the fact that one of the alternatives was to say no. And I think we did. Understandable. Tremendous pressures. I stood up on the Green and watched the sit-in in Parkhurst. Devastated for John Dickey, to see him have to go through that. But we did lose sight of it, almost never said no.

The Indian symbol was a pain in the ass in my job too, I mean awful. Right or wrong, the symbol represented our founding, our heritage, but you'd sit in the office with a Native American, saying "Mr. Peters, wait a minute. You don't know how we feel, we're Native Americans." And you have no argument to that. "And the perception is, and look up there at the cartoon on your wall, and you have a barrel of rum, and . . ." So I can understand that, but I don't think—I mean, that was pure hell to go through with them. It really was like giving up sports. And I have sympathy, I don't think I'm a prejudiced person, but a lot of us had trouble understanding their perception, you know. And not to say we were right, but . . . and most—it's kind of ironic, but most places after Dartmouth have gone through this. Professional teams on down to colleges and now even Lebanon High School's going through it. I mean, it's a—so I guess it's probably right and I can understand it, and I think their movement has been helpful, or their concern, expression of it, has been helpful to their movement, but it wasn't any fun to spend hour after hour after hour going through what seemed to us less

important than it seemed to them. That's not to say that they were wrong and we were right.

DAILY: Most of the teams, you know, the people on the actual teams, did they oppose losing the symbol?

PETERS: Sure. Yeah, hockey uniforms have the Indian on the shoulder, Native American I guess I should say. But yeah, yes they did. But hockey, for instance, Ab Oakes was a coach, he came from a long line of Dartmouth so that was probably part of the reason with him. Tony Lupien, baseball had an Indian head here. Handsome uniform. But yes, they did. But then again, most—oh, I remember Ab Oakes had a button: "Dartmouth: love it or leave it" pin, you know. And he felt very strongly. As I look back, also, it probably would have been more—it might have been helpful to have—I worked hard for and became a member of the general faculty. Not Faculty of Arts and Sciences. I think that was important, and probably, you know, it was a pain in the neck to go to some of those meetings.

But I think even more involvement would have been helpful; for me to get on the Council on Budgets and Priorities was important. Gave us a budget voice, which was important. And Dartmouth used to—I regret now that so many things—I'm still close to the ice hockey program.

And so many things, as I mentioned earlier, for which the Friends have to raise money, were an integral part of the budget years ago, that really bothers me, that the institution, for very good reasons, doesn't have the financial commitment and doesn't finance individual sports the way they used to. We go probably to extreme, but in football, and most sports, we went first class. I mean, we—even going to Harvard we'd leave here probably late Friday morning, have a big rally here, leave here late Friday morning from center of campus; probably work out at some high school or Andover Academy, stay at some very nice motel, have a fantastic meal Friday night, we'd get movies for the teams to watch, and do then, obviously, a pre-game meal before the game, come home. We really went first class and now they don't go at all first class. Box lunches and that kind of thing. So that's, again, an old—older guy regretting today and loving "the good old days." But in some cases you don't go overnight, even. Yeah, some of it was an excess, but some of it was an image of it, and Dartmouth did things first class, etc., etc. But recruiting budgets aren't nearly as

institutionally financed as they were; some of the equipment [inaudible] good it has to get. Gordie Russell, I probably mentioned earlier, I asked him to give \$10,000 a year to the Friends of Hockey. And it's important that we raise thirty, forty, \$50,000 so they can do some of the things that are so important to a successful program. But I won't bore you with my "good old days" stuff.

DAILY: Not boring at all.

PETERS: Interesting.

DAILY: Is there anything else you'd like to add today?

PETERS: Well, back to McLaughlin: I told you what I recommended, and that we met, talked about it, and he pounded, "No, goddammit, the facilities are going to stay where they are." I said, "Dave, you had me recommend, if we were beginning anew, what would I do?" And it's ironic, after I got through, the golf course is now under the DCAC, for instance. I stay involved with the Friends of Hockey, and I was instrumental in getting the golf course project going, and the people there are still giving me tickets, they're very good to me, so is [Athletic Director Richard J.] "Dick" Jaeger ['59] is—you see, I resented my successor a little bit, [Edward] Ted Leland. Probably without good reason. It just was a little jealousy. He's now Director of Stanford, a little ironic. He left here to go to his alma mater, University of the Pacific. But Dick Jaeger is very good to me, so I do have some involvement.

DAILY: Did you consider another A.D. position after you left?

PETERS: No. No, I made the move, it was time. And I studied and made a very good living. Very rewarding for the four kids. Oldest girl would say, "Dad, stop and think: you've been successful in two careers." And that's a very nice thing to hear. At least I've made money here, so I guess we're successful. My wife says, "Ah, you're too oriented on making money now." Maybe, but we can go to Florida six months a year, anyway. But no. Two great careers, and that was enough. I could have gone a number of places, and could have after I got through: NCAA, other institutions. But of course it's much harder now. It isn't as if somebody at "X" school could pick somebody, you've got to go through that. And that would be onerous. But it's been fun. If you think of anything after the fact, don't be shy. Have we covered everything here?

DAILY: Pretty much.

PETERS: Resignation; successes; McLaughlin—I think he believed in athletics. Fundraising I didn't do much of; budget cutback was a bitch. I do think our philosophy in athletics is right, and it's—geez, did you read Special Commission of the NCAA—I think it was mostly the Commission — institutional presidents, proposing an undergraduate, particularly basketball players [inaudible], could borrow \$20,000 a year to help out before they turned professional, the purpose being to try to keep the kids from committing early, and more than ever they did this year. Didn't I read—. . . well, it doesn't make any difference.

DAILY: Last couple of years.

PETERS: Yeah. I mean, Arizona's lost four of their starting five; one graduated and the other four I think at least committed. And they could give lessons and take money for giving lessons, like in tennis. Ah, it just is farcical in my opinion. First of all, is \$20,000 going to keep anybody who's got a million dollar contract from staying in the school? But I think it's too bad. I think ideally that everyone would be on need, but it just isn't going to happen. And by the way, the Ivies have fallen apart a little bit on that too. Princeton—there isn't a unanimity and solid front there used to be in the Ivies. Princeton made a move without telling everybody, there's no more self-help in financial aid, it's now a hundred percent grant. Dartmouth's trying to do it but they haven't got the resources to do it. Also it used to be important that finances not be a major part of the decision-making process, and now it's become that, which I think is too bad. We come in fourth best, at best, in that game. Maybe not even that good. Certainly behind Harvard, Yale, and Princeton. And I look back at the Athletic Department and see the growth in the number of people there, but that's again an old guy saying how much better it used to be than it is now. Well, I repeat again, holler if, as you review this, there's something we haven't covered. You got anything else?

DAILY: No, I don't. It was a good interview, and I thank you.

PETERS: Good, glad to. I enjoyed meeting you.

End of Interview