

INTERVIEW OF ART SANDEEN

BY

STANLEY YATES

6/4/70

Sandeen: My name is Art Sandeen, Dean of Students at Iowa State. I was involved in almost all of the events as an observer. I felt it important for myself to be physically present at most of the events from Cambodia on, if that's the beginning, and I really do believe that it is, although we had considerable unrest on the campus over the past two or three years, of course, relevant to the war issue. I was talking with several students the night of April 30th, on the campus, when the news of the President's decision to enter Cambodia was announced and it appeared at that time that student reaction would be rather intense. There was great confusion among the seven or eight students I was meeting with.

Interviewer: Was this in the Union?

Sandeen: Yes. It was in the Union. These were not the kind of students that normally participated in anti-war protest kinds of things, but they were terribly alarmed at that point. On Friday, May 1st, we talked a great deal about this as a staff in our office and tried to speculate a bit on what might happen and as a result-

Interviewer: Had you established any kind of guidelines for how you'd react to what might occur?

Sandeen: Well, yes, many times in the past we've discussed this. We don't have any written guidelines as such. We do have adequate University policies in terms of reacting to disruption. We feel that it's very important for us as a staff to be close to where the students are, not necessarily in support of what they're doing, but to be there to provide whatever assistance we might, especially to serve as a buffer, an interpreter, as a person who might be able to keep things a little more rational. I did myself participate

in the Saturday, May 2nd, people's rally downtown.

Interviewer: Had the students who organized it contacted you about it?

Sandeen: Well, it wasn't so much that they contacted me, it was just that I feel that it's one of my roles to be around for such things and I talked with them and I knew that they were going to be there and I felt that I should be there and I was, from the beginning, and simply talked with several of the persons. It wasn't entirely a student rally at all. People's rally is accurate--a lot of townspeople, faculty, and staff there.

Interviewer: When they talked to you this time and perhaps throughout all these events, was there any hesitancy about talking to you? Did you feel that they were withholding perhaps information from you?

Sandeen: Well, not at the time, no. The students--I restrict my comments to the students because, of course, they're the people I was interested in primarily. I didn't see my own role as trying to manipulate their actions in any way and they didn't seem to see my role as that either, and I tried to be there as a friend and as a person who cared about the students. The event at Kent State, where the students were shot, obviously was the one which triggered tremendous emotional reaction. In my experience of three years on this campus and several years at Michigan State in student affairs, I have never witnessed any more intense emotions on the part of the students than on Monday and then on the following days.

Interviewer: What did you do at the people's rally? Did you act only as an observer?

Sandeen: Well, I would call myself a participant-observer. I felt rather deeply about many of these issues myself and I did march in the

parade and then went to the draft board as well and sat down and listened to some of the persons speak.

Interviewer: Did you have any apprehension that your actions might be identified as an official function by the University since you are an administrator?

Sandeen: Not at that time, no. I felt I was acting as a citizen of Ames. It was a Saturday. It was a planned march. It was supported by the City officials; that is, a parade permit was granted and so forth, so I was, I guess, as much a participant as an observer.

Interviewer: And then you continued with the march until they got to the draft board?

Sandeen: That's right.

Interviewer: And then you stayed there for how long?

Sandeen: Oh, I think 2:00 if I remember. On Tuesday, May 5th, several students, I really wouldn't estimate, I don't think it was as high as fifty, staged a protest against the ROTC program. They met in the Union in the morning and then proceeded to enter the Navy ROTC building and there were some signs that some of the students were carrying and then I think on pretty much of a--

Interviewer: Now, did they inform you? How did you find out about that?

Sandeen: My office is in the Union and I knew that they were meeting downstairs in the 1939 room and about 11:30 I simply walked down and talked to a few of the students and a couple just told me. You know, they said, "Yes, we're going over to the Navy ROTC building and we're just going to picket", and that's all they did.

Interviewer: Did they object to your coming along?

Sandeen: Not that I know of. I didn't feel like I was spying on them.

This is the kind of thing I do quite a bit and I was over there with them by the Navy ROTC building and then, as you know, they moved from there to the Armory.

Interviewer: Now, was there any kind of drills taking place when they moved over to the Armory?

Sandeen: Not to my knowledge, no. They got to the Armory approximately at 1:00 and at that time as I remember, and I was there all day and all night on, let's see, that's Tuesday and I would say there were thirty-five of them at the most and they simply sat down on the middle of the Armory floor and it was completely empty and, of course, it looked like a very sparse crowd on the large cement floor. I sat down with the students and simply talked with them for fifteen or twenty minutes and at that point they didn't seem to have any particular goals in mind other than sitting there. I didn't view it as a sit-in at all and as a matter of fact, never did. I think the word "sit-in" is a definite misstatement. I suggested at that time to the students, and there were some non students there as well, that we contact Col. Brumbaugh and Col. Barnett to see if we could get some kind of conversation going and I had already talked to them to see if there were any classes or drills scheduled and they said there were not, at least on the Armory floor there was nothing happening that was disruptive. Three students then did talk with Col. Brumbaugh and Col. Barnett, but that was unproductive in terms of appeasing anybody, of course. The students did stay in the Armory--

Interviewer: Did more and more students show up? Did it spread throughout the campus?

Sandeen: I don't think so, no. At no time do I remember, and I was there all afternoon, at no time do I remember the number of students being more than forty or fifty. They just engaged in a few games, playing frisbie, talking, making plans for that night, which was a very important meeting night, at 7:00. GSB had a meeting to call for a strike and the building was to close at 5:00 and I informed the students about that then that the building was to close and that I wanted them to leave at that time.

Interviewer: And what would be the penalties if they didn't leave?

Sandeen: Well, there's a University policy against using University facilities without permission and I told them that that was the policy that I would invoke and they could be subject to possible disciplinary action in not responding favorably to that request.

Interviewer: What was their reaction to that?

Sandeen: At that time they simply said they had no intention of leaving. They didn't think they were sitting-in so they saw no reason for not being able to stay at that time. They were very anxious to have a strike called that night and then to use the Armory in a non disruptive action to talk with faculty and staff and other students all night and especially to make posters and to make plans for the next day. It was at that time between 5:00 and 6:15 that we made contacts with (I might say very frustrating ones) with law officials to see if there was any way, if we wanted to go that direction, forcibly removing the students.

Interviewer: You were contacting what, the city police and the campus police?

Sandeen: Well, the campus police were there and the campus police were not sufficiently aware of the law to be able to invoke a particular

ordinance such as trespass or disturbing the peace or what have you. The students were not disturbing anything. We went all the way to the Attorney General, who is our advisor in such matters, and despite the fact that information to the contrary was reported to the police at a later date about that incident, we received information at that time from his office that we would not be able to remove the students with any kind of legal ordinance.

Interviewer: Did you ask for an injunction?

Sandeen: No, we did not ask for an injunction at that time formally, but at least we inquired into the possibility of one. However, as I mentioned earlier today, emotions were so extremely intense at this time and the day after the Kent killings, this was coming to a head on our own campus. Even if we would have had the legal backing and the police force to remove the thirty students or so who were there at the most, by 6:00 there were probably only twenty students, they were completely non-disruptive in a building that was not used very much anyway. It was my opinion and it still is that it would have been a grave mistake to remove the students. I think we would have escalated our own campus situation.

Interviewer: So, these legal approaches that you took were simply what, precautionary or to understand what you could do if the situation-

Sandeen: That's right. Now, then, the students all left around 6:30, quarter of 7:00 because everybody, including myself since I serve as GSB advisor, went to the Great Hall, Memorial Union, for the GSB Senate meeting which was attended by four hundred people and lasted an hour and a half and by a 15 to 11 vote they called for

the student strike.

Interviewer: Did you speak at that meeting?

Sandeen: No, I didn't. I make it a point not to interfere in any way with GSB meetings and I try not to even express an opinion when asked; I feel it's not my role to do so.

Interviewer: Then after the meeting did some students come back to the Armory?

Sandeen: Yes. About 8:30 Bob Trembly made an announcement, I think it was Bob, at the meeting that everyone should go back to the Armory and use that in the manner that I had explained earlier, to talk, to make plans for the next day for the rally that was planned, to make signs, posters, and armbands and to get ready for the rally that was planned for the next day and that's what they did.

Interviewer: Was there any attempt to prevent them from returning to the Armory?

Sandeen: No, there wasn't. There wasn't a large group that went over right at that time. I would say all night long there was never more than one hundred fifty persons in the Armory and I was there all night. The students were extremely orderly, as a matter of fact at that point we, meaning the University administration, decided that this was a good opportunity--and we thought we understood the high level of emotions at that time and should seize the opportunity to be of some positive influence and we called maybe twenty to twenty-five or thirty faculty members who came over and stayed, well, maybe later than midnight many of them, simply talking with students, talking about the problems, the plans, trying to make it into a positive situation. I know it's a matter of interpretation, but the events in the Armory that day, I still feel, were not a "sit-in". I can't condone the activities of the students

in the earlier afternoon by merely moving into the Armory in the manner that they did and they did not leave when I asked them to. But, nevertheless, the situation came out very positively. The students, I would say, numbered about one hundred by about midnight and there were a large number of blankets on the floor of the Armory and people were sleeping and singing and playing catch with softballs or frisbies and generally it was a fairly positive atmosphere. There was a definite feeling among the students that they would try as hard as possible in the next few days whatever might happen to keep activities non-violent. There was quite a strong informal leadership among the students. At the mass rally on the steps of Curtiss Hall on Wednesday, May 6th, I was present and had talked a considerable time with several of the selfappointed marshalls who, I felt, did a good job that entire day and the next few days. Jerry Parkin, GSB Vice-President, was "in charge" of the rally that day and he told me later that he was disappointed and surprised when Bob Trembly took the microphone. He really didn't "take" the microphone; he simply went up and started to speak very calmly as Bob usually does everything. Bob then at about 1:00, after the rally had been going for probably forty to forty-five minutes, did announce to the crowd that there was a ROTC drill going on on the other side of the campus and suggested that they go over to the drill. At no time do I remember him saying anything like "Let's go disrupt the drill" or "Go prevent them from having a drill." On the other hand, a very large number of persons left and we had tried to make preparations before that time. I had three or four staff

members on the ROTC field and I had talked with Col. Barnett about the situation--that it might be hazardous to have such a drill and, of course, it turned out to be that way.

Interviewer: He did decide to go ahead and hold the drill anyway?

Sandeen: Yes. It was a regular class activity, of course, and when the people went over there in such a mass number, of course, there was no possible way to stop them short of having an extremely large number of police officers or professional guardsmen there which, of course, we did not have. I don't really know if the students going over there at that time, and I was running with them, had a preconceived notion of disrupting that drill at all. I don't know if there's such a thing as a "crowd mind", but they simply went in a leaderless fashion right on to the drill field. I was with them and I didn't see any kind of violence or pushing or shoving but their presence obviously made it impossible for any kind of drill to take place.

Interviewer: So, by the time they got on the drill field that activity, whatever the activity the students did, cadets were discontinuing?

Sandeen: Yes. Now, the Colonel at that time, decided simply to cancel the drill and I thought the ROTC students did a great job. They simply walked away and there were some comments made to them personally, you know, like "throw down your hat" and "quit" and all that stuff and they, I thought, handled themselves very well. They just walked away. Some of them knew some of the protesting students and some of them even went so far as to joke with them and make wisecracks to each other. They just walked out and I was quite concerned at that time, of course, and I was very happy that there

was no violence, and to my surprise at that time, again almost spontaneously all two thousand or however many students were there, then went running across the street into the Armory and then I met with Col. Barnett and Col. Brumbaugh again while the students started a rally down in the Armory, but they only stayed there for about fifteen minutes and somebody suggested they go downtown and they started chanting a football cheer "All the way to Lincoln Way" and that sort of put the crowd in good spirits and I was happy to see that!

Interviewer: When you talked to the Colonels in ROTC, what were they going to do?

Sandeen: At that time, quite frankly, we didn't know. I wish I could say more definitely at this time but I can't. There were, I would estimate, twenty-five hundred people in the Armory. They were all clapping and singing. They weren't there for more than fifteen minutes. To remove them would have been an extremely difficult task. If they wouldn't have decided themselves at that time simply to leave I suspect that after a period of time we would have had to take some kind of drastic action if we were to remove them. We didn't at that time try, in the fifteen minutes that we were there, we didn't establish any personal contact with the students other than just talking with a couple of them and we didn't make any comment public.

Interviewer: So, it might have been a very sticky situation eventually if they hadn't left?

Sandeen: I think it could have been but the fact that they had, you know, been at the steps of Curtiss at 1:00, ran probably five blocks over to the other side of campus, stayed five minutes, then went to the

Armory, stayed fifteen minutes, left there and then walked three or four miles through the campus downtown to the draft board in this huge crowd, I think is another indication of the tremendous emotional feeling that there was among all these people. There was fantastic energy, and up to this day I am just amazed at the lack of violence, knowing the intensity of the feeling. There was some very strong and positive student leadership exerted.

Interviewer: So, once they left the Armory, you accompanied them?

Sandeen: Oh, sure, yes. We were with them all the way downtown and walking with them, talking with them, and several of our staff were there.

Interviewer: Was there any indication of once they got to Lincoln Way which direction they would go?

Sandeen: Yes, there was a great deal of speculation on my part. I was quite worried, especially when they sat down on the corner of Beach and Lincoln Way and it was a very large crowd. I had stopped in a dorm along the way and had called Chief Siedelmann downtown right away and told them the students were on their way to Lincoln Way and if there was any way he could possibly block off traffic it possibly could avoid an incident and he and his men, I thought, did a tremendous job.

Interviewer: He didn't object to doing it this way, did he?

Sandeen: Well, he was quite alarmed, of course; I won't speak for him in terms of what decision he made or why he made any decision. Clearly we don't have in Ames a sufficient number of law enforcement officials to remove twenty-five hundred people or more from an intersection if they are not willing to go right away. He had all four lanes of Lincoln Way blocked off by the time the stu-

dents got to Beach so that there wasn't a traffic problem and the students sat down on Beach and several of the student leaders and myself made a few comments into the police bullhorn out of one of the cars there on the corner.

Interviewer: What did you tell them?

Sandeen: We simply urged them to be peaceful, that if they were going to go downtown, to try and stay clearly out of the way of traffic and, of course, to be non-violent. I also urged many of the students to go back on campus and to go back to their rooms and I urged them to talk with faculty and their fellow students to arrange meetings that might be beneficial to everybody. But it didn't have much affect at all. The students again, pretty much on a whole basis, sort of split two for one, I think about two-thirds of the group going downtown and about one-third staying on the intersection and in maybe another twenty minutes or half an hour, they broke up. And, so, we went with the students who went downtown and a couple staff stayed with the students who were at the street corner.

Interviewer: How was the march downtown?

Sandeen: Very peaceful. At that time I was very worried. I didn't know what was going to happen because there was such a mass of students and the emotions were so high. Perhaps they walked off some energy or something because it is a long walk and they walked all the way down Lincoln Way to Duff, turned left, and went up to Main Street, went down the middle of the street and to the draft board, again.

Interviewer: Did you get any feeling of reaction from the townspeople over there?

Sandeen: Yes, although, of course, there had been a march Saturday, two or three days before that time, and who knows what you can read from the expressions of people as they walk by. There was some negative feeling, I am sure, but then the group wasn't entirely students, probably ninety-five per cent.

Interviewer: So, you again went up to the draft board and you stayed how long?

Sandeen: Well, I don't remember at that time. Past two o'clock. The students were very tired at that time. They'd spent a great deal of time--

Interviewer: Was there any indication then what they were going to do next?

Sandeen: Not to my knowledge, no. Thursday, May 7th, was the first incident at the draft board and we knew that the students were going to be there because they told us they were. Again, it wasn't any kind of a secret kind of thing at all. They wanted to go there. They were extremely concerned. That was a highly visible kind of target.

Interviewer: Did you know they were going to try to keep it from being opened?

Sandeen: No, and I am not quite terribly sure that they did either. I think they responded pretty much to the situation as they found it at that time and I think it was, in my opinion, it was individual decisions on the part of the persons who went down in the well, as I recall it, down the stairs there, and sat-in. I talked to Mr. Bishop, the City Attorney, I talked to--

Interviewer: What time did you get there?

Sandeen: Gosh!

Interviewer: Were any arrests made before you got there?

Sandeen: I would say I was there before 8:30. No arrests were made before I got there, that I know of.

Interviewer: And when you got there, police were there and city officials?

Sandeen: That's correct.

Interviewer: What city officials were there when you got there?

Sandeen: As I remember it, Mr. Bishop, City Attorney, was there. Well, I guess that's about it as I remember it. Mr. Lyttle, the Assistant Chief of Police was there, of course.

Interviewer: Did you talk to Mr. Bishop?

Sandeen: Yes, I did but, of course, other people did, too. I didn't see my role as particularly advocating anything. I did request of Mr. Lyttle an opportunity to go downstairs and talk with the students who were sitting, which I did and I knew most of the students who were down there.

Interviewer: What did you tell them when you talked to them?

Sandeen: Well, I didn't tell them so much, I just asked them, I said, "Are you sure this is what you want to do? You know the consequences." They were very aware of what they were doing. I said, "Are you sure that this is what you want to do?" I requested specifically, I said, "Come on, why don't you get out of here, I don't want to see you get arrested. I think you're going to come out worse in the long run." And I was down there maybe five minutes. The students knew me quite well and said, "Come on, Art, make a commitment yourself and join us." I decided at that point not to. I walked up the steps and at that time Mr. Bishop decided, "O.K., get them out of there."

Interviewer: Had you talked to Mr. Pyle at all?

Sandeen: I had not. I knew that Mr. Pyle was there, yes, but I was very uninvolved in anything like that. I suggested that it might be dangerous to have gas thrown in that area, although I have never had any experience with gas before in my life and I am anything but an expert on that. There were, I think, ten or twelve students down in that very small well and my main worry was there were girls down there and that they had their arms interlocked and there might be panic and somebody might be badly hurt. On the other hand, if the decision was going to be made that the students should be removed from that area, it would be extremely difficult because of space reasons to carry them out. They were all interlocking arms and feet and so forth and you just couldn't have carried them out.

Interviewer: When you said not use gas, to whom were you talking?

Sandeen: Well, I was simply saying "isn't there a danger if we use gas of somebody being hurt" and I was talking to Mr. Lyttle, Assistant Chief of Police. So, luckily, no one was hurt to my knowledge although Jim Hannah, who had his wrist burned by one of the cannisters itself when the gas was thrown down. It was really a bad scene in my view because most of us had never experienced that before and had never seen it before and it was sort of like "boomI"--all of a sudden the realization that the "movement" as such had come to Ames and was here.

Interviewer: Now before the gas was thrown, they had removed some students from the staircase?

Sandeen: Yes, I am not so sure if it was from the staircase, I don't remember if it was from the staircase, the bottom of the staircase or if it was from the doorway itself, although there were many things going on and I wouldn't attest to the fact that that's very accurate.

Interviewer: Did you see how the police were removing the students?

Sandeen: Only in a couple of instances. I saw Clyde Brown removed, I remember that and he went limp and he was dragged out but as far as I could tell the treatment of Clyde was very fair. Well, as soon as the cannister was thrown downstairs, well, instantly the students ran out, coughing, crying, sneezing, what have you, falling on the ground. It was a pretty bad scene and at that time the police arrested them and put them in cars. Most of the students went peacefully; however, there was some struggling on the part of three or four of the students and Jim Hannah came out and I was quite worried about Jim Hannah because he had evidently been down there quite awhile and he slumped to the ground. I thought he might have passed out or something but he turned out to be O.K. Two or three of the students fought rather vigorously, not slugging or anything, but just trying to resist being picked up by the police and placed in a car and there eventually were a couple of students I remember being maced by the police but very briefly and not in an obvious manner and didn't seem to have negative results. Bob Trembly had his arms and legs wrapped around, I think, Mr. Freiburger and Mr. Freiburger in turn had his arms and legs wrapped around Mr. Trembly.

Interviewer: This was outside of the building?

Sandeen: Yes, they were lying on the outside of the building in the parking lot area and two or three policemen were trying to unwrap, pull them apart so that they could individually put them in cars. They seemed to take three-four-five minutes and they finally achieved that.

Interviewer: Was there some kind of reaction from Freiburger and Trembly to this?

Sandeen: Oh, yes. They were struggling rather vigorously to resist the attempts to untangle them. But there was no slugging of such or anything like that I could see. It was very difficult for the police to achieve.

Interviewer: Did you then go to the police station as the students were being transferred there?

Sandeen: Yes, we did. Although I was a little slow getting to the police station because I hung around the draft board talking with many of the students and other observers and so forth and then I did go down to the police station. On Thursday, May 7th, after the students were down to the police station and were put in jail, there was a rally on the steps of Curtiss Hall and fund raising efforts began for the students and they were, by most persons estimates, quite successful and more successful than anybody anticipated. Some \$3,500, I believe, or at least this potential amount of money was raised and the students were released and when they came back, almost one by one to the campus, it was almost like the "return of the victors." As one walked up to the steps of Curtiss, took the microphone and rather dramatically with more emotion than anything, just described his experiences. Many of the students looked very unkept because there had been several of

them in the same jail cell. They were hot and sweaty, and they still had sore skin from the tear gas. It was a tremendous outpouring of emotion, you know, lots of song singing. In other words, they were very much "together" at that point.

Interviewer: This includes the audience, the people who had stayed?

Sandeen: Yes, although up on the steps of Curtiss, where everybody was sitting together very closely, I would say that that was the group of people who was most closely identified with one another and there was lots of hugging and affection being openly displayed and genuine happiness. They felt that they had done something half decent. It should be pointed out, at least from my perception, that the persons who were arrested were not part of any overall grand scheme or well organized plan. The persons who were arrested were acting on their own individual feelings and when they were together later they did in fact learn more about each other as individuals. Some persons have claimed that they had a very well organized hard core group of people who planned to get arrested. My experience would suggest that that was not the case. Friday, May 8th, after the students discovered early in the morning that the draft board would not be opened due to the leftover gas smell, most of them returned to the campus and the day was relatively quiet, although--

Interviewer: You had been down at the draft board before it opened?

Sandeen: That's right, yes, we were down there talking with the students and it was a much different kind of atmosphere and I really couldn't speculate as to what the students might have done if the draft board would have been opened that

real hostility at the time. The Veishea operation by that time was in full swing with all sorts of high school students on the campus. It was a beautiful day out and there was a fairly relaxed atmosphere on the campus. There were a couple of rallies held around the Campanile but they were mostly singing songs and personal discussions. Our staff spent most of our time trying to figure out what we might do to try to help make the parade on Saturday morning non-violent and non-disruptive although we had received no indications from the students who had participated in any of the demonstrations that there was going to be any trouble. But we did have staff stationed around the parade route and we were very careful about trying to talk with and work with several students both from the left and the right. I might add in terms of problems that might take place at the parade that with such a huge crowd there, we were quite concerned and, of course, as we all know, the parade came off without incident. I think it was quite successful and then there was the rally afterwards at which President Parks spoke briefly.

Interviewer: Where were you during the parade itself?

Sandeen: Myself, I was right in front of the Union building near the TV cameras. It was my feeling that if there was going to be some kind of disruption of the parade, that it was most likely to be in front of the TV cameras and we had a few staff there but we had staff at other places around the route as well. On the other hand, we knew realistically, that if fifteen hundred or so wanted to stop a parade they could very easily do it and we didn't have sufficient police powers to go in and "bat heads." I suspect that

if fifteen hundred people or so would have wanted to stop the parade that's what would have happened. They would have stopped the parade and eventually it would have been cancelled if they wouldn't have left because we decided it would be a mistake to invite in a large number of police at a parade that is primarily for the public, especially children. It just doesn't work.

Interviewer: Did you get any feeling from the crowd when the Prairie Primer went by and later when the March of Concern finished up the parade?

Sandeen: Well, with the first group that went by I think there was some hostility on the faces, or the expressions of the faces of the crowd, there were some motorcycles with some persons riding on the motorcycles that sort of fit the stereo-type description of some of the people that the public is scared of, I think, but there was no problem. The March of Concern which concluded the parade I think was viewed rather positively by most of the crowd. It was a huge group by the time I saw it anyway.

Interviewer: Were there any comments provided that there were faculty members and even mothers marching?

Sandeen: Not that I heard, no. On Sunday, May 10th, a graduate student by the name of Ralph Gross, on his own, called several of the GSB senators and requested that they have a meeting. The meeting was called for 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon or, no, for 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon in the Memorial Union. After about half an hour of very open-ended discussion, there were only perhaps thirty people there and only sixteen or seventeen GSB senators, there was great confusion. The President of GSB was not there and Vice-President, who was still rather new to the position, was

too uncertain as to whether he should even proceed with any kind of a meeting and they had to go look up in the Constitution to actually see if they could get a meeting called legally. They found out that a certain number of senators had to request the meeting so Ralph Gross got together that number of senators. They formally requested a meeting and they discovered that they didn't have a quorum. After waiting about ten minutes they found one more senator and they had seventeen, which is the minimum for a quorum, there being twenty-six or twenty-seven total senators. They discussed the matter at some length and then decided by a 17 to 0 vote to pass the resolution. I think it is interesting to note, as I am the advisor to GSB and some of the senators confided in me afterwards, that they felt that they were somewhat "coerced" into that proposal. I was surprised at that expression of theirs. They felt somewhat coerced by what they called the activist crowd, which was there, but it was a very calm meeting and again there were probably no more than thirty people in the entire room. It was in the Pioneer Room.

Interviewer: Did they fear perhaps that they would meet with opposition if they openly opposed?

Sandeen: I think that was it. Yes. Although there's no question that the majority of the Senate, those persons at the Senate meeting at least were in favor of the proposal.

Interviewer: Were there any expressions of opposition to the proposal?

Sandeen: Yes, there were. There was considerable discussion but I felt that the Senate didn't do a very good job at that meeting of considering several alternatives. They didn't call the meeting

themselves; in other words, they weren't providing the real leadership. In many ways I think they were being used, not necessarily in a negative sense at all. It was a nice warm Sunday afternoon, several of the students came to the meeting barefooted, which is very much against the typical Senate tradition, and it was a very casual kind of thing. They were much affected by what had just happened at Iowa City. There was some jumping on the band wagon affect there that didn't quite understand how they should proceed from that point onward. It was a very awkward meeting in many respects but the meeting that night in the Council Chambers of the Union, where Dr. Christensen was there and he and Jerry Schnoor, the GSB President, chaired the meeting was packed. A very interesting meeting for a couple of hours where there was just general discussions about the whole matter.

Interviewer: This included then the Faculty Council members, GSB members, plus interested faculty and students?

Sandeen: That's right.

Interviewer: Was most of the discussion dealing with proposals or to knowledge including the area of concern?

Sandeen: Primarily the proposal, how the faculty might respond or how the faculty might make arrangements with the students. The Faculty Council President, Roger Lawrence, was present along with other key members of the faculty and he responded, I thought, very well, by saying that he thought it would be quite important to call me and the faculty council as soon as feasible and if we all know, that was done the next day at noon.

Interviewer: The proposal, what kind of changes did they generally indicate they

wanted?

Sandeen: The students?

Interviewer: Well, anyone. Was it accepted as GSB had proposed it?

Sandeen: There was a great range of expression of points of view expressed both from students and the faculty all the way from accepting flatly the GSB proposal, to rejecting it completely, to several points in-between there. I think it was on behalf of students and faculty. Some student stood up and said, "I think it's a cop-out, you know, if we have a problem, we can't just run out from it and say, you know, give us credit anyway." Others said, "Look, if we're going to be really a relevant University we have to be able to adjust and here's a good way. Now give us an option and show us that you trust us." They put it in that context. At the Faculty Council meeting on Monday, May 11th, at noon in the Pioneer Room, there was a very large crowd and people were standing out in the hall and, of course, the students were very anxious to see what the faculty response was going to be. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council had provided a rather lengthy statement which Roger Lawrence read. And, of course, as we all know, was passed unanimously by the Faculty Council. I thought the wording of the document was outstanding and I thought the faculty did an excellent job. Quite frankly what I was surprised with since the document didn't make any change in our normal working procedure, I was quite surprised that the students accepted the situation as well as they did. When he finished reading it, I fully expected to hear very negative hoots and hollers and whistles from the students saying, "No, that's not good enough, you really aren't

trusting us, you're leaving everything up to the instructor and not giving enough to the students." There were several students with whom I talked who were keenly disappointed but the majority of students, I think, felt that it was a rational and fair kind of response to make and luckily the students and the faculty for the most part were able to work together to meet everybody's goals. But that was the situation where I felt, I was sort of out of touch, I guess, because I was expecting a different response. I had, of course, checked with the draft board officials and city officials well in advance to see what kind of activities, if any, in the next couple of weeks were being planned. And I learned several days ahead of time that at 6:00 a.m., on Tuesday, May 12th, that a bus was going to go to take persons to Des Moines for physical exams.

Interviewer: How often does the bus go down, do you remember?

Sandeen: I really don't know. I don't have any idea.

Interviewer: There was no indication from the draft board officials that they would postpone this?

Sandeen: Not to my knowledge, no. The students who demonstrated against the bus did indicate that they would be there. I simply had talked with them and I fully expected them to be there but I didn't expect to see as many of them there at that time because the bus left promptly at 6:00. And some of the activist crowd by their own admission are not prone to get up very early in the morning. I was down there at 5:45 a.m. and at that time there were probably thirty-five people.

Interviewer: There were police there?

Sandeen: There were police there at that time and the City Attorney was there as well as I know of and I suspect there were other persons but I didn't pay that much attention. It was almost dark out at that time. Again there didn't seem to be a terribly organized planned group activity. As it became evident that the bus was getting ready to pull out and away--

Interviewer: Did you notice any activity before the bus left? That is, were there students trying to talk to the draftees?

Sandeen: A little bit, but mostly the draftees just walked into the bus and sat down and the protesters were not allowed in the bus and some of the draftees, of course, or persons going to their physicals, were students who were known by some of the protesters and so forth. There was a pretty good relationship going on but I wasn't able to predict at that time what was going to happen. Even two or three minutes before, several persons just stood in front of the bus and then sat down in front of the bus.

Interviewer: As it was attempting to go forward?

Sandeen: Yes, as it was attempting to go forward. Then, very mildly, some police officers moved in and tried to escort the person standing in front of them, in front of the bus, to leave.

Interviewer: Were they making arrests at this point?

Sandeen: No, not to my knowledge. They weren't and a few of them were pushed out of the way, some were just escorted out of the way, but most of the persons after being moved out of the way just went back and stood in front of the bus or laid in front of the bus. I don't remember anybody lying down, but sitting down there and then it became evident that several persons were

going to try and stop the bus. It just "sort of happened." They got first in front of the bus and then, I believe, some arrests were made at that time and people started running around and then the bus tried to back up, so several persons went and sat in the back, behind the bus. It got pretty tense. As a matter of fact, I was quite surprised and really disillusioned at that point, maybe it was the hour of the day but some of the protesters got, in my opinion, downright violent. I saw two or three protesters kick policemen and hit them on the head.

Interviewer: Now, was this in response to what the policemen were doing as far as you can determine or was it just for doing it?

Sandeen: I think the former. I think they were responding to the policemen trying to pull them out of the way. I didn't see just any random "slugging of cops" and I would like to emphasize, that they were isolated, well, it certainly didn't represent everybody by any means.

Interviewer: Would you say there was more of this kind of activity this time than before?

Sandeen: Yes, it was an entirely different situation. That's why I was sort of disillusioned. I had expected, after listening to the students over the last four or five days, that if there was going to be any protesting activities that it might result in arrest and that they would go peacefully and they would either go limp or they would simply walk up to the car. Now, some of the persons that were arrested did do that but others struggled rather vehemently and in a couple of instances there were two or three persons that I saw personally that I was quite surprised that they were not

charged with assault on a police officer if there is such a charge or because they got very, very rough and I was quite disappointed with two or three, four individuals.

Interviewer: Comparing those that you had been accustomed to speaking with before this incident and those you actually saw down there, were there many that you were familiar with?

Sandeen: I am glad you brought that up because I remarked to several persons and there were only two or three other staff members there with me that morning. We asked each other, "Do you know most of these students or these persons?" and we were alarmed, we did not. Most of the persons arrested did turn out to be people associated with the University but some of them appeared to be "recruits" or persons who had not been, at least, visible participants before. And I thought, I was a little disturbed, because I thought, "Gee, I should know these people. What's wrong with me?" I wasn't staying in touch, I guess. After the Sunday, May 17th, peace rally march in Des Moines which was fairly well attended but was nothing new, it was either on a Sunday or Monday as I recall that the two students were shot and killed in the dormitory at Jackson State College, in Mississippi. Many of us were very perplexed as to what kind of reaction this might cause on our own campus. One certainly cannot ignore the racial overtones on this. The fact that at least initially students here and students around the country did not respond in the same manner that they did to Kent State I think might at least in part be interpreted as having racial overtones, you know, like, "Oh, well they were black students and that was a Southern or black school." I think there's

some of that, and I suspect there was a little bit of this involved. The students were dead tired and I am afraid to say that some of us grew a little calloused over a period of weeks, or whatever amount of time there was there between the Kent State killings, almost two weeks, I guess, and the Jackson State shooting. Maybe we weren't so surprised and horrified at it as so many of the people were at the Kent State shooting. Our own black students, of course, made the response of having, or calling a rally and a march and I thought they handled the situation very, very well.

Interviewer: Did they contact you in any way?

Sandeen: No, they didn't contact me although I talked with several black students myself. And Bill Bell, I am sure, can provide much better information on that than I can. The blacks, I think, made the expected response at the time, saying that they were skeptical, you know, "Whitey, do you really care about that?" The rally then held in their memory was on Wednesday, May 20th, on the steps of Curtiss and the march started on by the Black Cultural Center on Welch Avenue. Quite frankly to my surprise but, of course, to my considerable pleasure there were lots and lots of white students who joined the probably fifty black students, maybe that's a low figure, I don't know, seventy-five maybe, I suspect my estimate would be three hundred to four hundred persons at that rally. I am not a good estimator. I didn't know what to expect from that whole experience.

Interviewer: Did you attend that rally at Curtiss?

Sandeen: Oh, sure.

Interviewer: How would you characterize the speeches that were given?

Sandeen: Well, there was a great variety of speeches given. First of all, the Black Student Organization and Roy Snell, as their President, really chaired the session and I thought the poetry readings were well done. I think that they were appropriate. Liz Scott, I thought, read a very effective prayer. Roy Snell read a several page statement that he had evidently written. It was so lengthy and, I think, quite complex to the extent that I am not so sure the message got across quite as strongly as he might have liked to have it come across. I was quite disappointed with two or three of the other persons who spoke, not because they were white, but because I thought they were irrational. Their statements were very short. I think that they were unleashing their own emotions or meeting their own personal needs more than they were trying to comment with the crowd.

Interviewer: Did they attempt to do anything after the speeches or did they come to an end?

Sandeen: Not that I know of. The flag had been lowered to half mast. I think right at 12:00 and then after 1:00, maybe it was 1:30, I don't recall, everybody just broke up. It was a rather solemn atmosphere at that time. On looking back at that terrible month of May, it's another example of the fact that outside events really determine the kinds of things that happen on our own campus today. The cliché that "society sets our agenda" on our campus is a reality, I think, and nothing could be more plain than the Cambodia decision on the part of the President. I was very much involved, of course, in any decision and all decisions that were made in terms of not calling the police or in using a heavier hand at various times, or you know, even down to the details of

providing microphones to students for rallies to larger decisions and working with the police. So, I have a biased viewpoint, there's no doubt about that concerning whether the University as such handled the situation correctly. I think it would be more accurate to say that we really didn't "handle anything." The students exerted very effective social control themselves within the several groups, "groups" meaning conglomerations of persons, I think, as opposed to formal organization.

Interviewer: What do you mean by social control?

Sandeen: By social control just informal comments, unspoken feelings, that non-violence was the credo, that at Iowa State, anyway, we were not going, at least as groups, to burn down buildings, were not going to attack this University necessarily. When in very isolated situations, if students or a person, a non-student, might stand up and say, "Violence, let's go, let's burn something down or let's take a building", he was not treated rudely necessarily, but he didn't find a response of a receptive audience. I thought the marshalls that the students themselves provided (that wasn't any University gimmick that we came up with) the students, especially, people like Dave Schwickerath, Dave Henry, Tom Fortson, some of those people just did this on their own. They got twenty-five students to wear white armbands and they didn't perform any miracles. They didn't tell students what to do, I don't think students would have listened anyway, you know, if they would have told them but their presence there throughout the thing was important. My feelings, again I am a little biased, my feelings are that we came out of that month of May in remarkably positive fashion as

a University community. I don't deny that there were some very distasteful kinds of things that happened; however, we didn't have the kinds of violence that occurred on some campuses, although the bombing of the police station in Ames certainly left a very bad taste in everybody's mouth whether or not it is related in any possible way to the Cambodia situation or the demonstrations on the campus itself. I feel one thing very strongly. That is if at any time during the first week beginning with the so-called sit-in or demonstrations at the Armory ranging through the events at Veishea, that if we would have called in the Highway Patrol or the National Guard or if we would have moved in with a large number of police, that we would have immediately escalated our own campus situation to something that would have been very negative. That's, of course, speculation on my part.

Interviewer: Is this the general feeling of the administrators that you were in contact with that you should play it by ear and keep your presence at a minimum so to speak?

Sandeen: I think so, yes. On the other hand, I hope we're realistic about our own effectiveness, too. I would like to emphasize that myself and the many persons on our staff who physically were present through all this, probably greatly overestimate our own involvement in this situation. We were literally observers and very little more than that. We do know the students, we talked with them a great deal during this time, but I think we were there in a very different capacity than as official administrators, not in an impersonal sense with "a heavy hand."

Interviewer: Was there any hesitancy on the part of the students to talk to you at any time?

Sandeen: It didn't seem that there was, as a matter of fact in my view anyway, we continued a rather congenial relationship throughout the two, three week period. At least I felt quite able and willing to speak with any student and they seemed about the same with me. There are some, of course, who wouldn't want to have anything to do with me at that time or any other time as well, but for the most part the students were remarkably friendly, understanding the supercharged emotions at the time. That was one of the most disturbing things that the students had expressed to me throughout the, especially the first couple weeks, that is that you know, that big phrase "the public", whoever they are, didn't have any understanding or trust in what the students were doing. They just thought they were a bunch of, Nixon's famous word, "bums".

Interviewer: Was there a feeling of frustration, too?

Sandeen: Oh, definitely, very deeply. Of course, I felt a little of the frustration, too. It is tremendously difficult to be a nineteen or twenty year old person in this kind of situation and I am only about twelve years away from that myself and I have been with these students all year and I know many of them very well and I don't feel in any way that they were not sincere in their feelings. They're really going through a terribly difficult period of their lives. It's a very tragic situation.

Interviewer: As an outsider perhaps viewing what the students did would you say that the marches, the demonstrations, so forth, were done more for their own benefit as a means of releasing this tension

and frustration rather than trying to convince or express this concern to others? There have been some expressions that the marches and so on set up walls and characterize people as either on one side or the other and, instead of influencing people, it just drives them further apart.

Sandeen: I don't know. Marches may not have the effectiveness that they had back in 1957. I don't know when they might have been a little more innovative than they are now when they seem so repetitive. Students expressed to me almost a desperate need to, in their words, "do something", even if it means making posters or signs or running off mimeographed copies of various things and distributing them. The students on the other hand, I feel, are pretty realistic, too. They didn't just do things to occupy themselves. But the work itself and the participation in marches did serve the function, no doubt, of releasing some of the emotion for them. I get asked the question just about everywhere I go and have for a couple of years, especially in the last two, three weeks, you know, "Why did you at Iowa State apparently not have at least severe violence or buildings actually burned down and one or two persons killed?" I am very weary of providing an easy answer, as there are cliché kind of answers to this. I quite frankly don't support those few persons who might claim that we're doing something so well as a University that we have avoided this. I think we're as vulnerable as many other institutions are. On the other hand, we do have a strong student body--strong in regard to their own motivation for obtaining a degree. For the most part they are a "no nonsense" kind of student body and most so-called

radical groups don't find a great deal of support. We have tried to emphasize, from President Parks on down, close student, faculty, staff relationships in everything we do at this University and I think for the most part we have fairly good relationships among the student, faculty, and staff but I think with a student body of over nineteen thousand, I think it's downright impossible to talk about all of our students in the same bag. We've got tremendous diversity in the student body and there are students to support just about any cause you can think of and whether we like it or not a group of twenty-five persons, students or otherwise, could probably bring just about any University to its knees nowadays. If they were clever enough or if they wanted to be violent enough, and the fact that we're not located in an urban area certainly is a benefit in a situation where violence is a definite possibility, but some of the older arguments that, there, you know, "Well, at Iowa State that just wouldn't happen, because of the curriculum here or because of the fact that we're doing something so effective as a University." I'd like to believe this, but I am not so sure that it's true.

Interviewer: Would you say that whatever leadership there has been supplied by the students has been of non-violent matter?

Sandeen: Definitely. Whether anybody would like to admit it or not that's what saved us in this whole situation of positive student leadership and I don't mean just of the "establishment" kind of student leadership. I mean people like Clyde Brown, even though he was not a student during this. He was not registered this particular quarter. When I say "saved us" that means avoided violence.

Clyde or Bob Trembly were not the charismatic leaders that some persons would claim. I still believe that the students were essentially operating as individuals and as part of a leaderless group, at least in a visibly formal sense. The students provided the leadership. The faculty helped a great deal, but the students were the ones that made the difference.