

Oral History Interview with Sam Ray
Interviewed by Julia Stringfellow
June 18, 2010

[Start: 00:00:00]

JS: Today is June 18, 2010. We're doing an Oral History Interview for Reunion Weekend in the Lawrence Archives. Could you please state your name?

SR: Sam Ray.

JS: And what year did you graduate from Lawrence?

SR: Well, technically I graduated in 1971, but I sort of got drafted into the Class of '70 for this Reunion, because I had as many or more friends in the Class of '70 than I did in '71. So I am honored to be an interloper.

JS: Great. What was your major?

SR: Government.

JS: Why did you choose to attend Lawrence?

SR: To be perfectly honest, one of the biggest attractions to me was the faculty with whom I was most interested in studying, none of them were from the United States. It was the diversity and international scope of the faculty that attracted me. Before I got here, I spent about a third of my life outside the US. Since I graduated, I spent about half of my adult life outside of the US. So international was really important to me.

JS: I was going to ask you about Lucc and how you were involved in it and how the students in it kind of grew into this new type of government and any information you can share about that?

SR: Where would you like me to start? My involvement of the evolution of the...

JS: Your involvement.

SR: Okay. Again, to be brutally honest, I was an anomaly from the day I set foot on campus. I was a Vietnam veteran; I was a transfer student; I was older than most of the senior class; I was just kind of a weird duck. My first roommate was the late great Ken Harris, known as Ned, who was that year in charge of new student orientation and as such had been given some access to the folder of the incoming class. When he saw that I had been in military intelligence...he sort of liked the fact that I was this weird duck, he thought, I want this guy as my roommate. Ned knew everybody on campus. Just by virtue of trailing around on his coattails for the first few days, I literally probably met a third of the campus in the first twenty-four hours. Student, faculties, administrators...Ned was "Mr. Everything, Everybody, Everywhere." He was the perfect introduction for the guy who was sort of a fish out of the water. He was also a Beta, so he kind of co-opted me into the Beta house. I never formally pledged, but when

second term began, the President asked me if I made my grades and was eligible for initiation and I said, "Well, I guess so," but I never pledged. And he said, "We got to get you initiated." The Beta house for a long period of time had either the distinction or the infamy of being pretty active in most things on campus. Not the least of which was student government, and I think for most of the time I was there, they had the highest academic standards. Some of the more influential folks were people like Jeff Riester and Jack Krill, who was on the staff of *The Lawrentian*. There were a couple of others who were involved with WLFM, and I think at one point either of the Captains or Co-Captains of virtually every athletic team were Betas. And they basically said, "We're in the process of shifting over from sort of a spineless student senate to a sort of all-inclusive multi-constituency form of government that would include students, faculty, and administrators. Since you have to win the confidence of all three constituencies, we think the fact that you were older, had been in military service, might give you an edge. So we are going to propose you as our candidate of president of LUCC." Through Jack Krill who was on *The Lawrentian*, I met Peter Wittenborg who was sort of known as the "king maker." He seemed to have a finger in every pie on campus and Jack and Peter sort of made an agenda. First they handed me a copy of four years worth of zoo books and said, memorize every name and face. So within and week, I knew every name and face of everybody on campus. They mapped out an agenda and I was supposed to talk to the faculty, the Dean's office, to the President, to every dormitory, every Fraternity, every Sorority, every student organization, and it was sort of like a Fireside Chat. I was supposed to sort of go through what my main points were, ask for suggestions of issues that students thought ought to be brought before LUCC, and to build a platform from the ground up, whether then to sort of give my personal view on it. I was supposed to collect the popular view and synthesize an agenda. I ended up getting the endorsement. I got interviewed by *The Lawrentian*, by WLFM, ended up getting their formal endorsements, met with several of the trustees, and then another Beta, Bob Fellows, who was a good photographer, he decided I should have a photograph as sort of a very casual sort of young student look and one that was little more formal and maturely. So I had one in a plaid shirt, jeans, and a turtleneck on Union Hill with the wind blowing in my hair all over the place.

[00:07:48]

JS: Okay, yeah, I think I've seen that.

SR: And one in the three-piece suit with my neatly combed and flicked back in a leather winged chair in the library of the Beta house. They printed up a couple hundred copies of each picture on 11x17 pieces of paper and stuck one to every mirror on campus. So if anyone wanted to brush their teeth, comb their hair, crimp, they had to look at my face the day before elections. So when the results were tabulated, I think I had ninety some percent of the votes, which was very sort of a land slide. I was running against a guy who was sort of "Mr. Everything." He was up for honors in his major, had done the Slavic linguistic thing in the Eastern-European tour. He was men's honor council, in a Fraternity council...really a pillar of the community. And a model student. This sort of had wiped him out. He was as flabbergasted as I was. I had actually never met him. After the election came in, I went over to his room and I said, "You know what, you need to understand that I did not beat you. A machine beat you. I have been on campus for eleven weeks. I am nobody. You have been here for three and a half years, you know everybody, you understand the climate of the campus, you understand what's important. I can't do this job without you.

And if your ego will allow it and if you were willing to run for Vice-President, I will put the same machine to work that just beat you and you will win." And so he agreed to do it and so Phil York became the Vice-President. We worked hand in glove, very closely and very productively.

After a couple of weeks, he said, "You know, I'm a counselor over in Brokaw and my co-counselor is not back this term. Why don't you come over? We'll be co-counselors, we'll be president and vice-president of LUCC, and we'll work on stuff together." And that worked actually very productively. We continued to go to those same constituencies and find out what the issues were. Every meeting was very carefully orchestrated. Like in real government, we did a lot of behind the scenes chat with people. If we knew somebody was strongly opposed to something, we tried to have a meal with them, chat through it, find out what their objections were, tried to persuade them. So we did a lot of lobbying. I am not sure why they opened the door to us, but even the trustees... Art Remley, John Strange, John Reeve...were willing to have coffee with us, to come over to the Viking Room for a beer after we managed to have that passed through, to take us out to their club, or whatever. But we made sure that we had a consensus built before we ever tabled a new motion. In that first year, we went from visiting hours from 2 to 4 on Sundays with three feet on the floor and a book keeping the door open, to co-ed dorms. We went from being liable to be expelled for being drunk and no beer or alcohol of any kind at any time on campus, to the Viking Room. We went from expulsion, reporting to your parents and reporting to the police of any use of drugs, to a counseling non-punitive drug policy, which was largely attributable to the fact that Art Remley's son, and Art was opposed to that, his son went to Beloit, got busted and expelled. And he said, "it would have been much better if they had given me a call and I could have come picked him up, rather than giving him a police record when he wanted to go to law school and kicking him out of a school where he was doing otherwise very well." So he finally came on board and we got a non-punitive drug policy. We had all of the major issues of the day. We discussed the students, faculty, administrators, and trustees and sort of orchestrated how will we approach these things together. My campaign slogan, I thought I had originated, which was "Progress through Participation." Two years later, as I was driving down to southern Wisconsin, I passed through Beaver Dam. On the water tower in Beaver Dam, it says "Beaver Dam Wisconsin: Home of 10,000 Busy Little Beavers- Progress through Participation." And I thought, I bet half the campus has seen that sign and was laughing at me when I put that as my slogan. But we did have a lot of progress in a very short time and it was totally due to collaborative discussions among all of the constituents.

[00:14:04]

JS: Now was Knight the President when you started...

SR: No, Curtis Tarr was President. I have to tell you a funny story, if only for posterity. One of the items on our agenda was that the leaders of student organizations would have the opportunity to present their point of view before faculty committees when a faculty action would impact their organization. So it would basically be giving the students a voice even with the faculty. That was going to be a toughie, I knew that. So we very carefully orchestrated our argument, just like doing a legal brief. And I went armed for bear and had an appointment with Curtis Tarr and went in and I started my very meticulous argument. I got three seconds into it and he said, "Sam, just stop. I agree with you 100%. This institution

exists for your benefit. This is your education and everything that this faculty has any business discussing in any meeting is a vital concern to you, but I caution you. If students could see how the faculty behaves behind closed doors, it would destroy the entire academic process." So we dropped it and to my knowledge, there has never been a student willingly admitted to a faculty meeting. And so that remains sacred. We were never able to cross that divide.

But I think it was my 15th reunion, I was actually trying to develop some business with AAL for the company I worked for, and so I arrived on something like the Wednesday for Thursday meetings with AAL. They finished sometime during the afternoon on Wednesday and I decided to come over to the campus before the reunion actually started. I went down to the Viking Room, which not only did I feel like I had a stake in it, because we had gotten that legislation passed, but also even after that, we had a battle with the fire inspector, because there wasn't a sufficient emergency exit on the far end of the room by the fireplace. So we were standing there and I took out a sheet of notebook paper and I said, "You know, if we take out this window and that booth, and put in a staircase and put in an emergency door, would that satisfy the Fire Department?" And he said, "Oh, that would work fine." I said, "Get out the hammer and saw." So we solved that problem and I wanted to see how that was looking. And whoever was the student on duty was just opening up for the afternoon and we started chatting. There were only two of us in the room. It turns out he was the current President of LUCC and he said after a few minutes, "Want to come upstairs and see the new LUCC office?" And I said, "Office? My closet was my office." So he took me upstairs, showed me the office, and pulled open a file drawer and said, "How did you guys ever think of anything to do in LUCC meetings?" I said, "Think of stuff? We couldn't get through the agenda in a year!" And so he pulled it open. And I don't remember the exact numbers, but it was something like, he pulled out a file and said, "The last LUCC meeting, I signed LUCC number 116." This is fifteen years later. He said, "You signed LUCC 92." I said, "You've done 18 pieces of legislation in 15 years? And we did four times that much in one year?" But it was a time of significant need for change, and by having this sort of collaborative forum to discuss things, we were able to make change fairly dramatically and fairly quickly and still be orderly and prudent.

[00:18:59]

JS: Did you have any problems getting faculty to serve as your representatives for LUCC?

SR: No. The faculty were actually marvelous. The faculty gets a lot of commendation for what they do as sort of stepping outside their field, like teaching Freshman Studies. I've got to say, the faculty on LUCC were like life coaches. They were helping us figure out for ourselves how the real world really works. The political process, basic decision making, how to formulate and win an argument, how to debate, how to have an orderly discussion with lots of people who wanted to chime in, we had a parliamentarian that kept us in line with Robert's Rules of Order. So it was a constant learning experience for the students and I think that it was an almost teaching experience for the faculty. We also had some extraordinary administrators, Dorothy Draheim who was Registrar, Marvin Wrolstad who was Chief Financial Officer and Vice President for Finance and Administration or something. You would think, and I think a lot of people had thought of Mar Wrolstad as basically an accountant. He wasn't. He was the administrator for sure, but he was also sort of a coach and he was very good facilitator and discussion leader. Dorothy

Draheim was thoughtful and yet pretty compelling in her arguments. I think a lot of people underestimated the role of Registrar. But she was almost like a research librarian. She helped, if you opened the door and encouraged her to help you, she would help you understand how to plan a course of study in a major, how to blend the courses you took in any given term so you weren't overwhelmed or bored, how many hours you could expect to spend for each course each day. Really quite a helpful coach. And I have to honor her with a little sidebar story, too. The year after I graduated, I stayed to work for the Admission Office. I learned a couple of things. I learned first that every member of the Admission Committee is allowed one memorial candidate each year, which is basically a student in whom that person, that one member of the committee has faith in and believes that they would benefit from the Lawrence experience and be a good student, even if everybody else votes against them. So you get one a year. A little later that year, I learned that I was Dorothy Draheim's memorial candidate, because I had been in the army in Vietnam, I had been away from school for three years, and most of the Admission Committee thought that I was going to be too old, too rusty at academic things, and who knows, maybe post-traumatic stress or whatever, but that I was just a bad risk. But Dorothy Draheim thought that the fact that I got 800 on my English writing example was enough to trump any negatives. So she voted to admit, and that's the reason why I ever got here. She was also the person on the stage at graduation that handed my diploma and as she handed it to me, she said, "You know Sam, we all knew you could write long before you got here. We just had to wait and see whether you had anything to say." Which I thought was one of the best one-liners I had ever heard.

[00:23:24]

JS: Now was Marvin Wrolstad a part of LUCC?

SR: Yes, he sat on LUCC and took an active role in planning things both before, during, and after if they had a financial implication. So he brought a note of realism to everything that involved a commitment of any sort, so that we didn't overreach ourselves. Chuck Lauter was on for awhile, Mary Morton was on...they may have been the only true administrators and the rest were faculty. During that first year, faculty votes were twice as valuable as student votes and then later I think that got normalized, so it was one to one. But people like Elizabeth Forter, Bill Chaney, were just incredibly valuable, they would allow students to have their say. If it needed to be challenged, they would challenge it gracefully, but forcefully. And there was never, I don't remember in the whole year, ever having an acrimonious discussion. There may have been difference of opinion, but they were discussed with civility and nobody was ever throwing stones.

JS: Was the introduction of the Lawrence Student Handbook Constitution, was that always right at the beginning of the meeting as it is today?

SR: I don't recall that we did it every meeting. What we did do, we had parliamentarian Betsy Baumann, who was very, very bright and really understood parliamentary procedures. She wasn't just a figurehead. We would have discussions before the meeting about how Robert's Rules of Order should apply, what we should go over in advance so there was no ambiguity about what existing rules were about. So we laid the foundation for things pretty carefully. Though once or twice, particularly if things

weren't going the way a particular faculty member wanted, he would object and cite some parliamentary procedure, but most of the time, we got it right.

[00:26:18]

JS: And were the meetings held in Riverview Lounge?

SR: They were held in Riverview Lounge. We had a big sort of U-shaped conference table with a single table up front for the president, vice president, secretary, and parliamentarian. And unlike what I have heard of late, we had a standing room only audience for virtually every meeting and on a couple of contentious issues, we actually recognized speakers from the floor. If somebody, sometimes they would send us a note, sometimes they would raise their hand and have to speak. But we had a lot of stuff that was emotionally important to people and they wanted to be heard and we gave them a forum to be heard. I don't think anybody ever came to any of us after a meeting or after a decision that was heard and said, "I wish I had a chance to say something." They did.

JS: That's great. Did President Tarr ever attend any of the meetings?

SR: Yeah. I think there were a couple of meetings where he actually asked to introduce a topic, so he sort of got his two cents in as a take off and we began a discussion. There were one or two times I saw him sort of pass by or come in and stand for a few minutes and sometimes he was just a fly on the wall and sometimes he would wave me off, like don't stop what you're doing, I'm just sticking my head in. He was very supportive and because he was so supportive, it was very easy to go to him with ideas in advance and say, "Do you think this will fly? Or how would you advise us to approach this, or is there anybody we ought to talk to before we introduce this idea? Or do you know of any objections that we need to take into consideration before we start?" He was very helpful and very positive.

JS: What do you think was the most contentious issue? Was it the open dorms policy? Or there's always been an issue with vehicles on campus.

SR: Believe it or not, vehicles were not a big issue. Even people who had cars that they had to pay for parking downtown or something, they knew what the lay of the land was before they got here, and it was no surprise and they sort of accepted it. And I think also the administration was fairly understanding, like if somebody was practice teaching or something and needed the car, they would make arrangements. But I think a lot of people, at least back then, understood the benefits of having a pedestrian campus and the fact that most of us didn't drift off to Neenah, Menasha, and get drunk and have an accident on the way back, precisely because we didn't have the means to do that. Part of the logic, in fact, of the Viking Room was directly from a lot of parents and administrators who said, "With my own kids I say, 'if you're gonna drink, I would rather you drink at home. And at least I know you're not going to injure yourself on the way there and back.'" Also, I think it was the fact that if you had to go five or ten miles to have a beer, that you were likely to have more than one, whereas if you were right here, you could finish your work at the library, drop off, have a quickie, and go to bed. So part of the logic was not to make it a big thing. It was like, I don't know if you have ever heard of the play "The Fantastics?" The song that the two fathers sing, "they did it 'cause we said no." The last line of the song

was, “so never, ever say no.” Making alcohol less than totally taboo made it less appealing to overindulge.

[00:31:22]

JS: How was that location chosen for the Viking Room in the basement of the Union?

SR: Part of it was that the Union was the gathering place, like after the library closed, it was open a little later. There were pinball games and pool tables in the basement already. It was a casual, laid-back, easy to go to central location, and the Viking Room was there. There was a room with booths in it with a fireplace already there and it was just like, how do you decide to put the rec room in the basement? It was there, it was appropriate, it was convenient. In terms of cost of transition, it was a minimal transformation. So to take it as it is, put in a couple of taps in and a fire escape and you’re good.

JS: Now was it the idea from the beginning that it was going to be run by student managers?

SR: That was the initial idea that the whole thing would be student-run and staffed. You know, with supervision as needed and in some cases as required by law. We had to comply with all of the health regulations and inspections and whatever. People had to be of legal age, of course, to serve. But the idea was that it would be less expensive than town, more convenient than town, less likely to have any negative influence from people who were already drunk and rowdy, basically to keep it at home, and that you could walk to your dorm or fraternity house afterwards and not have to drive. Plus, the idea that if you didn’t have to go so far and if it wasn’t such a major effort, you might not try to stay all night to make it worthwhile.

JS: You had mentioned Freshman Studies and I was wondering: who did you have for Freshman Studies, and was there a work that you really loved studying in the course, and was there a work that you really loathed in the course?

SR: Well, I was really lucky. I ended up taking every course taught by my Freshman Studies teacher who was Elizabeth Kafka, who also taught Intellectual History of Europe and several specific periods of European history. I just adored her. The year after I graduated and after working in the Admission Office for a year with a couple of other students, we went to visit her. She spent summers in Austria. Rumor had it, and I think it’s probably exaggerated, that she had spent every summer from the end of June until the end of August in room number two at the Hotel Tennerhof in Kitzbuhel, since 1919, right through the war. And I don’t know whether that’s true or not, but she certainly made a pilgrimage back which Bill Chaney said was to refresh her accent. And so some of us went to visit her at the Hotel Tennerhof in Kitzbuhel, where she said that the Italian baron that owned the place and his mother, she referred to him as “Baron Spaghetti,” that they allowed her to stay at the same price every year with no inflationary increase, because the Baron loved to hear the little porter boy come through with his bell and chalkboard, shouting “Frau Doktor Professor Kafka, Frau Doktor Professor Kafka!” And that it gave the place class. But she was a marvelous old dowager and incredible teacher.

[00:36:15]

Actually, I recently had a young second or third cousin who was in school ask me at a family dinner, "Have you ever read Plato's *Republic*?" And I said, "Um, yeah, four times." Freshman Studies, Intellectual History, History of Political Thought, and of course, Philosophy. And we talked for about the next five hours about Plato's *Republic*. Maybe that was one of the most important.

The one that has helped my thinking more than any other, was Thomas Kuhn's *Structure of the Scientific Revolution*, where he talked about paradigms and paradigm shifts and about almost a Hegelian thing, except he used the terms, I think, theory, counter instance, or anomaly, and synthesis, and that for every paradigm shift in science, somebody had to first come up with a theory, which Chung Do Hah would have said was from Albert Hirschman's *Journeys Toward Progress*, where he used the term falsifiability. In order to argue with an idea, somebody has to first formulate the idea and there has to be something you can do to prove it's either true or false. So Thomas Kuhn sort of came up with that basic concept. You have to start up with a theory and then there's articulation within the theory and then as you explore what the boundaries of the theory are, you either come up with an anomaly or a counter instance. An anomaly may just be a hick up, but a counter instance is basically the falsifiability. It says, "If this is true, then that can't work." And then you have to reformulate the theory. And that's how science and knowledge grow. Somebody comes up with an idea, the discipline adopts that, it becomes sort of the dogma of the day, people start toying with it and testing it, and one day you come up with something that says, "You know, if planets move like this, then the earth just can't be the center." That's a counter instance. You basically discover a fact that falsifies the theory. So in terms in helping me think through ideas that I've encountered through life, that structure has been extremely helpful.

I understand the psychology of Franz Kafka's *The Trial*, and I understand the literary merit and the sort of psychodrama of *Crime and Punishment*, but they haven't been terribly useful. It's sort of like certain spices. It's nice to know the taste, but you would never put it in food. And so I understand why they were included, but in terms of the way my mind works, they haven't come in very handy. And I'm trying to remember what the other book was. *Crime and Punishment*, *The Trial*, *Structure...Modern Theories of the Universe*. That one I liked, although I never have gotten my arms around the difference between finite and bounded and infinite and unbounded. It's like those are contradictions in terms and how do they possibly work. Now I'm told there are new editions of it, where he doesn't use the flies on the inside and outside of the balloon as the illustration, which didn't work for me. My brain would not wrap around those concepts. But that one just didn't work. So that was one that was a non-starter. Two that were sort of nice to know. One that was mind altering. And one that helped sort of shaped my philosophy of life and understand what philosophy really is all about. And I later read more Plato, Socrates, Aristotle, and that was a good starting point.

[00:41:21]

But the idea of Freshman Studies I think is hugely important, because it is an opportunity to sort of...it's a litmus test for how well you read and comprehend and how well you write and express. And that's going to be...that's almost the whole point of being here. How does your mind grow and how do you prove it. And I love the idea that the Senior Experience is going to try to be the other bookend at the end of your academic career.

JS: Now you were here as Downer Commons started being used and there were no longer meals like in Brokaw Hall. So how was the feeling toward having this new cafeteria where all of the students could go and have meals together?

SR: It was such a nice facility and was so much...I'm not sure what the right word is. It wasn't that much warmer or cozier than Colman, but it was more up to date. And having the big lobby where you could put your books and your clothes and your umbrella and whatever and then a choice of different lines and a choice of different dining rooms, it seemed like a step forward. The problem was that the food wasn't always terrible imaginative and it didn't vary a lot. It was sort of, it's Tuesday, so it must be mystery meat. The new facility of Warch is just light-years. I mean, I'd be happy to pay restaurant prices just for the privilege of going there. I mean, the food is really good and it's really diverse and it's really interesting. I could see being confined to the Campus Center as my only eating alternative for a long time, because I don't think you would ever get sick of it. I liked the idea, when I first started, there was no identification of who belonged to the line and who didn't. Whether you were supposed to eat in Colman or Downer, whether or not you were even a student, how much food you took, whether or not you were there for a meal, none of that was accounted for or tabulated. So I liked the idea that you are actually swiping a card and you sort of get what you pay for. Because it's not a minor expense for either a family or for the institution and you know, there are some people who have greater or lesser appetites or specific appetites for certain kinds of things. But I don't think, you know, a 600-calorie-a-day vegetarian ought to be sort of charted up as the same sort of consumer as a voracious football player. Anyway, I like the new alternatives.

[00:45:00]

JS: Now when Downer opened did the students get to go into the Teakwood Room for special occasions or anything like that?

SR: Well, you know, I'm probably not a very good test case, because I was also on the Governor's Commission for Education, which Curtis Tarr had sort of engineered. And I hosted about a third of the meeting. It was basically Lawrence, Beloit, and it may have been Ripon. But we would take turns hosting meetings, and there would usually be a little bit of a reception, a meal, and a discussion. Frequently, we would use the Teakwood Room. Also, I'm not sure whether or not I was unusual in doing this or not, but if I needed to talk to the Board of Trustees, I would host the function in the Teakwood Room and invite the Trustees.

JS: Yeah, it's a great place for that.

SR: And that gave me credibility, because it was sort of like I had the right to invite them there and to use it. Plus, that's where they had their meetings, so I was really playing on their turf. And I think we had better discussions because of it. I'm not sure there were very many student organizations that had the prerogative to do that. We did, however, had lots of meetings in the small rooms in Downer, with or without food. And then sometimes, if we were doing an LUCC committee, we might just say, "Go through the line, get your food, and come to Dining Room D." I think that when it first opened, it was regarded as a real step forward. And I have to say I've been to a lot of other kinds of meetings that the

Downer staff catered that was spectacular. So it really wasn't that they didn't have the ability to do it, I think it was primarily they didn't have the budget and support to do it. My personal feeling, I had a lot of admiration and respect for the old Downer staff and I think if they had been given the budget and the support that the catering service gets, they could have turned out some mighty fine food, too. And if they had the facility that's there at the Warch Center, who couldn't do a good job? So I'm not anti an outside catering company, but I also am very supportive of the staff who were there before. I thought they had done a good job with what they had to work with. And I had some gourmet quality meals that they prepared for meetings and other functions, so I know they had the skill and graciously served and I mean even stuff that we had done over in...

JS: Lucinda's?

SR: No, the Guest Houses, which was used for like buffet meals. They had done a splendid job. As nice as a country club. And probably as good or better quality food. Who knows, there are a lot of schools that have gone to outside catering companies and been very happy with the results. I have a friend who's on the staff of a prep school in Maine. And they have just gone over to an outside caterer and so far so good. But for whatever it's worth, the old guys did a good job, too.

JS: Now I was going to ask you if you had any involvement with The Rock? If you were a part of any of its moves?

SR: No...it was not either officially or unofficially anything that I had any direct involvement with. It's interesting, because the company I worked for went through a similar experience, where they moved a glacial boulder from a municipal park to the center of the corporate campus. But here, I was not directly involved.

[00:49:58]

JS: What were some of the main demonstrations that took place in the late 1960s and 1970?

SR: Well, the two that had the strongest impact on me...Ed Wall was the Director of Admission who radically expanded the definition of our recruiting pool, which included inner cities, second-tier performers from first-tier private schools, and geographic distribution that we never even considered before. So the classes of 1971, '72, and '73 which Ed Wall recruited, were categorically different in character from any of the classes before or after. It's interesting that he went on to be Dean of Admission at Amherst and only retired only a couple of years ago. So he was thirty-some years at Amherst and regarded as sort of the Dean of American Deans of Admission. Yeah, he was regarded as one of the best there were. I think there were some people, particularly on the faculty who felt that...

[James Snodgrass enters room]

Oh, thank you so much!

JS: Do you want to have a seat?

James Snodgrass: Are you telling her all about LUCC?

SR: Yeah.

JS: Well, we've moved on and are talking about demonstrations now.

SR: Thank you. This is James Snodgrass, who was on the formative group that made the transition from Student Senate to LUCC. You were Vice President of Student Senate?

James Snodgrass: Yeah.

SR: And worked very closely with Steve Pondo and some others on formulating the idea of LUCC as a next step beyond Student Senate.

James Snodgrass: One of the first things we did in that year, which would have been the fall of '67. Either the fall...that academic year, is through the money that was available for student activities through the Student Senate, we rented three buses and filled them with students. We went down and we marched with someone by the name of Father James Groppi who was kind of a lead organizer for open housing. And it was nasty in Milwaukee. It was really nasty. Front line. And we did that and it was really a powerful experience. There was really nothing like this in Appleton. There really wasn't.

SR: Yeah, I think actually the faculty and administration withheld anything like a protest against student involvement and these kinds of things because they realized that it was a growth experience. And that feeling and emotional commitment to a cause was a good thing. Even if it sort of stretched the boundaries.

James Snodgrass: And I would say also that it was the current, the currents moving across the country were so powerful and so compelling that many of us needed to be in the street as much as in the classroom. Now obviously this was not easy, but it just...this wasn't light stuff. This was really shaping, relooking at some of our fundamental values.

SR: To sort of segway into your last question, almost within days of the time that I actually was formally in the saddle as the new president of the first term of LUCC, there had been a rising tide of discontent all year, largely because Ed Wall had been so successful in recruiting inner-city kids and the rest of the campus really hadn't done much preparation for their arrival. And they were justifiably saying, "You sort of sold me a bill of goods. Yes, it's an opportunity. Yes, it's a good school. Yes, I will probably get a good education. But I am not a happy camper and there is no support system here for me. You are not acknowledging the very real differences between my background and the backgrounds of everybody you have surrounded me with. And we need that to change. We are not just wanting it to change or suggesting that it change, we need this to change."

[00:55:29]

James Snodgrass: Now we had a whole raft of well-known speakers, African-American, who were speaking about Civil Rights on campus, but that wasn't the same as, "how do you live here, how do

you...?" as you were saying. But I mean, that one year, that was the focus. We had kind of a year of anti-war, and then the next year it was really about Civil Rights.

SR: And we had, I think the self-defined name of the organization was the African American Association, which we sort of unkindly referred to as Triple-A. Curtis Tarr was a good administrator in a lot of ways. He was not either open to or sympathetic to what they were talking about.

James Snodgrass: He was a former Air Force colonel...

SR: Well, no. He had been in the Air Force. He ended up being secretary of the Air Force.

James Snodgrass: Excuse me, that's right.

SR: And then went...

JS: And then he went into the Selective Service after...

SR: Yes, they closed down the Selective Service. His mandate was to end Selective Service.

James Snodgrass: So demonstrations, he really just didn't understand them at a gut level.

SR: No. And no real emotional sympathy.

James Snodgrass: Didn't really like them either [laughs].

SR: No. They were an inconvenience to him.

James Snodgrass: Yeah, absolutely.

SR: It wasn't even a matter of principal. It was just inconvenient. And so the African American Association basically took over Wilson House and they were there for the duration. Marshall Hulbert, who had been just about everything on campus and was then Dean of Students, and also subsequently taught some powerful courses on African History, and was totally emotionally and intellectually in sync with where they were coming from. This was not a marginal student protest. This was a fundamental human right to him and he really understood it. And he and I sat up in what was then the Carnegie Library, which was on the side of this building, in his office. And we worked through the night and through the following day and through the night and the following day until we had been up about sixty hours, and he never once said, "I need to take a break" or "Let's get a cup of coffee" or "I'm hungry." It was all issue focus. And I was so mesmerized and enamored of the man that I didn't care if I went to the bathroom or ate or drank ever again. We were dealing with a really important issue and he was totally, totally committed, and I don't think he had one ounce of ill will for Curtis Tarr. But he certainly understood that he was not the man to resolve this situation and that he wasn't going to get involved. So we basically had to formulate a policy and sell it to Curtis Tarr and the trustees. And at the same time recognize, acknowledge, and do something about what the African American Association was telling us and in no uncertain terms was it a priority we had to face. So that was an important one.

Another important one was the weekend after Kent State.

JS: Yes, in 1970.

SR: I think that hit the whole country like a ton of bricks. And the student body here was, I think, in certifiable medical, emotional shock.

James Snodgrass: That was in the fall, right?

SR: No, it was in the spring.

JS: Spring of 1970.

[01:00:01]

James Snodgrass: And right after that was the bombing of Cambodia, which I remember as being the last straw, basically. I think classes were cancelled for the remainder of the term.

SR: It was a big deal.

James Snodgrass: That was...yeah. That one-two punch just...I really think that there were no more classes.

SR: I remember, I was here. And I remember the impact that it had. I don't remember the actual consequences.

James Snodgrass: They had to take finals, but classes were cancelled. But it was just...

SR: But the real solidarity thing was that the students and faculty were on the same side of the fence and this was a unified protest. And we had a candlelight vigil that went down to...was it the cemetery or the park or where did we go?

JS: Would it had been City Park or... Peabody Park?

SR: It was down past the bridge on Oneida. What's over there? I don't even remember what our destination was. Was there a municipal cemetery or memorial or something?

JS: Well there's Riverside Cemetery, but that's on the other side of College.

SR: I can't remember what our destination was, but we had a candlelight vigil in front of the Chapel and marched a long way.

James Snodgrass: Could it have been just a silent protest? Or do you think it was a destination?

SR: Well, it was basically a vigil.

James Snodgrass: Yeah, that's what I mean.

SR: And there was no action to take place wherever it was, but it seemed like there was a symbolic destination, but I don't remember what it is.

James Snodgrass: I don't remember either. That year, incidentally, it was interesting that if '66-'67 was really the explosion of the Vietnam War, Gulf of Tonkin, and then the next year was Civil Rights, and the next year was the Women's Movement. And then the *next* year, which was this year we're talking about, the Environmental Movement, until Kent State and the bombing of Cambodia. And the Environmental Movement just got lost.

SR: There were bigger priorities.

James Snodgrass: Now we see that, we really needed to pay attention to that one [laughs].

SR: There was sort of a double whammy with the Kent State thing, because the drama department was putting together the spring production, which was, for the life of me I can't remember the playwright's name, but the name of it was, "Oh, What a Lovely War." Which was a really powerful drama anyway, and it was extremely well done, and it happened, the opening of that play was the weekend after Kent State. And, I mean, it seemed like everybody on campus knew somebody in the production, so Stansbury was a packed house for two nights running, and everybody walked out of there in shock, just dazed, it was so powerful. And coming right on the heels of Kent State and trying to emotionally grasp the fact that students had actually been killed for protesting, I don't think people could get their arms around it. And the thing that made it so emotional for me was that I had been in Vietnam the year before, and even having been there, I couldn't see the justification for what was going on. Either the bombing of Cambodia or the massacre at Kent State. I personally was sort of catalyzed into a level of involvement that I might not otherwise have had, if I had not have the personal experience. But there were a lot of people who were doing it on principle. I was doing it on emotional gut reaction. And the combination was fairly potent.

[01:04:48]

James Snodgrass: You probably have already said this, but I think that in these years, they kind of contributed just to the rawness, were the double assassinations of MLK and Bobby Kennedy. It was two months apart. April and June.

SR: And then the Chicago Convention, which blew me apart. I watched that until like four in the morning.

James Snodgrass: Those two assassinations just...I really think there was something of an end of innocence.

SR: Oh, absolutely. The paradox was that as LUCC was getting its teeth in, we were actually feeling like we were getting some control over our lives. All of this stuff was falling apart around us, and we thought, "There is no control. It is a free-fall." The world seemed very chaotic.

James Snodgrass: It did. It did.

JS: Wow. Well, those were about all of the questions I wanted to ask.

SR: Well, thank you very much for giving us the opportunity.

James Snodgrass: I'm sorry. I'm not sorry, but...

JS: No! Thank you. This was really great.

James Snodgrass: Sam had really said, "Come sit in or even say something."

SR: Well he was so formative in bringing LUCC to life. I was just there to pick up the reins and drive the horse for awhile.

James Snodgrass: I can't remember any of the details, but I know that there were gobs of meetings, trying to you know get the right balance.

SR: It was very carefully thought through. Part of the reason that it worked so well in practice was that it had been very well conceived and articulated.

James Snodgrass: And thank goodness it came when I did. You know, Mike Matheson was saying just a little earlier that when, he and I were 5 years here, and when we came here in the fall of '65, life at Lawrence was like life in college thirty years ago. How our parents described college. It was exactly the same. Exactly.

SR: Like we were freeze framed.

James Snodgrass: And one year later, there was a huge change. And as you were saying, it really moved through all parts of this community. All the different groups who made up this community. In fact, we claimed that it was a community. We claimed it got into the name. This was really quite something. This was really quite something. So...

JS: Very interesting. Alright.

SR: Great time to have been here. And I hope we left a good legacy behind.

JS: I think you did. Yeah. Great. Alright, I'm going to go ahead and turn this off then. Thank you.

[End: 1:07:47]