

PRESERVING MEMORY: NEWARK AND RUTGERS  
IN THE 1960'S AND 1970'S

An Interview with

HARRISON SNELL

Conducted by

Gilbert Cohen

OCTOBER 22, 1991

INTERVIEW: Harrison Snell

INTERVIEWER: Gilbert Cohen

DATE: October 22, 1991

GILBERT COHEN: This is Gil Cohen. It is Tuesday, October 22, 1991. And I'm meeting with Harrison Snell in the Dana Library. Mr. Snell is a practicing attorney in New Jersey and New York. He is an alumnus of Rutgers in Newark, Class of 1970, and has a law degree from Rutgers University, Class of 1973. [Break in recording] Okay, we are back with Mr. Snell. Could you provide a biographical sketch of your career, academic career, before and after coming to Rutgers University for the record.

HARRISON SNELL: I grew up in Newark, and my mother sent me to—I should say my parents sent me—to parochial school for grammar school. I think it started out as St. Peter's Grammar School; it used to be old Queen of Angels over on Belmont Avenue. That's Martin Luther King Boulevard now. Then I went over to Blessed Sacrament Grammar School which is on Clinton Avenue, and I went to high school at Essex Catholic Preparatory High School in Newark. Came to Rutgers in 1966. Got my BA from Rutgers in 1970. I went to Rutgers Law School in Newark from 1970. Got my JD in 1973. I passed the Bar in New Jersey in 1975. I was admitted to the DC Bar, I think, in 1979.

COHEN: DC did you say?

SNELL: Right.

COHEN: Oh, so you're practicing....

SNELL: Then I was admitted to the New York Bar in 1981. And I'm finishing up this year—I'll get a Master's in Science from NYU.

COHEN: When you came to Rutgers, what were your initial impressions of Rutgers in Newark? What were your initial impressions of the campus?

SNELL: Well, it's strange because I think the greatest influence for me coming to Rutgers was my guidance counselor when I was in high school. And it was a new campus. It was—we were the first class in 1966 for the new buildings that were built for the campus—that was the buildings on University Avenue and Central Avenue. So it was a very new campus. That was intriguing. I remember we had our first classes down in the old brewery. And I really just didn't know.... It was a friendly campus. There was a lot of closeness. It was small. I didn't feel a lot of conflict at all, you know. Being in the school, I almost took it as an extension, since I was staying home, as being somewhat of like high school. I thought it was a very close school. Everybody seemed to know each other. It was very easy to get to know everybody on the particular campus, both white and black students. I really—I felt comfortable with that at that particular time.

COHEN: Now what was it like being one among 60 black students on a campus of about 2500 students?

SNELL: Well, it wasn't, for me personally, it wasn't that different an experience than I had experienced during most of my educational career from grammar school to—I think it was worse in high school. In high school, my high school class was five black students maybe out of 500 students in our senior class. So during my education I had always been in a small number of blacks in a large number of basically white students. So it wasn't that different than I had experienced all along.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. When you came to Rutgers and during your time at Rutgers, was there overt discrimination that you experienced?

SNELL: I guess you always experience overt discrimination or some type of discrimination. You really don't try to—I never tried to look at everything as being always discrimination. But discrimination comes usually in more social type of orientations. I joined one of the fraternities down here at Rutgers, and they didn't have any blacks in the university social life. There weren't really things that really a black student, I think, would have been interested—more of the social things. In an academic sense I didn't find... I really didn't think of like overt discrimination occurring at that particular time. I found that the black students there, they were extremely bright. And it was interesting. The black students that they had down there at this time... I guess Rutgers was very selective in reference to black students. And most of them were like in the top 10 or top 5 percent of their classes. Even the ones who came from the Newark high schools were definitely like numbers one, two, three, or five in their high schools. So they had a really sharp—the black students that they really had on campus were very, very sharp. But that's something I had found during that particular time anyway, that even when I was in high school, the black students that they admitted to those schools were usually, you know, the top students and usually much better than the average white student that went to those types of schools.

COHEN: The schools that you went to. Uh-huh.

SNELL: Yes, I remember that. And Rutgers was just one of those types of examples because the black students were extremely bright, and they were extremely sharp.

COHEN: Well, why was BOS organized in 1967, I believe?

SNELL: Well, BOS was I think a reflection of the time period of the sixties. As I said, the students were extremely sharp, and they were very conscious of social issues. And they were also very conscious—I have to give them credit—very conscious of their role of what they had to play at that particular time. Because they really saw themselves as leaders, and they really were. As I said, they were in the top percentile, and they were strong leaders. We had some really strong personalities and some really strong intellects here on the campus. And BOS was a defining process, saying that, you know, we're bright, but where are we going to go with this? What are we going to do with this? You know what university—we're bright, but what's going to happen to us? You know we have to do something. We have to reflect the University's... The

integration movement was strong during that period, during the sixties. And, you know, the bus rides into the South. I guess that had just dissipated because that was around '64, '66. And you were having just the riot of black students like on other campuses like Columbia. And they were defining themselves from that. And organizations of black students on different campuses organizing themselves.

COHEN: Why did BOS replace the NAACP chapter on campus and replace it?

SNELL: The people that were very instrumental in that were people that were really before us. Very sharp students and very interesting.

COHEN: Who founded BOS, you're saying?

SNELL: Who really founded BOS. It wasn't really my group. It wasn't really a Joe Browne or Vickie Donaldson. We participated. But the people that really laid the seeds for the foundation of a BOS were people like Richard Roper. There was a Cheryl Green. They were about a year or two years ahead of us. There's another guy named Dave—I saw him at an alumni function—and I can't think of his name right now. Because they were very much intellectually into concepts of blackness, and they were reading Fassant [referring to Frantz Fanon] at that particular time about black people dealing with a white world and the types of schizophrenia that went on in that time. And they were the people that were really.... They were part of the old NAACP: Richard Bartell, really great people. And they transformed. They didn't like the image of the NAACP. They looked at it as a reflection of being—I don't know what you can really say—a concept of not being an Uncle Tom, but a concept of not reflecting assertive philosophy or doing anything or really accomplishing anything within the society for black people. Because, see, the emphasis was that we saw ourselves, even though we were, you know, we saw ourselves as being part of the black community and being leaders in our black community and somewhat leading that community on.

COHEN: How did work in the community affect—and ties with the community—affect work on the campus?

SNELL: For me it was like...I could say for some students it was a good experience because it directly led us into a lot of public policy issues, even issues that 20 years later we're still dealing with. Led us to what was going on in Newark in regards to a lot of things. I think like Douglas Morgan became, some years later, the city's director of health, was dealing with community issues such as health and what they saw they were doing wrong and analyzing the system. I remember they used to have during those days an office in Newark Studies, and I interned on it. And I think it was back even then we were looking at a Newark cable TV franchise, which had been given up by a franchiser. Started looking at the city's tax structure and started looking at the Port Authority contract with the City of Newark. A lot of analysis. It was a good time for us because we got into going to the board of governors meetings, the board of trustees meetings for the university, and what was their policy in regard to minority students? The question came, well, why were we the ones admitted and why did you only have like 60 black students at that time? So we started a link with the high school students across the street at Central and other high schools to find out what's going on with these kids. What's happening to their world? I

think all the students who were on that campus at that time knew that they were going to achieve. They had the ability to go on in society. But it's such a different attitude than you find now. Their question was, well, if we achieve, why can't they achieve? Why are we so different? You know. Why can't... I guess we had an emphasis or a belief that we could really change society. That we could really make a change, especially... I grew up in Newark in the Central Ward and Clinton Hill section, and you had seen a lot of things. I had seen a lot of destruction—destructive lifestyles. I saw people who were bright who never went anywhere in their life. And it was a question of we are going to change this. And there was that feeling that we are going to change this whole process that was going on. We were going to be the group that started something to happen.

COHEN: What gave you and your colleagues, fellow students, the faith in their ability to change society?

SNELL: Where did it come from?

COHEN: Yes, where did it come from?

SNELL: I don't know from the students. I can just talk for myself.

COHEN: Okay.

SNELL: It came from my father. My father—he still does it today. He's like 80. We used to sit down in the morning at the kitchen table, and we'd start talking politics. Politics I grew up, that type of thing. About politics. And my father would talk about his grandfather, my great-grandfather. And he talked about slavery and the destructive system of slavery and how far black people had come who had come out of slavery because it had just been a hundred years—it was about 1865. And he was talking about he had wanted to go to college. And how it was so difficult, the hurdles that were put in his way. It was a lot of things that made me think that way. A lot of it was him, I think. It was a lot of his ideals, a lot of his concepts about what could be changed and would be different. It was also the era of Kennedy. I think the New Frontier, an attitude that people had a chance to change their destinies, to make a change in the rest of the world. I think it was a lot of those type of thought patterns. You also had some terrific leaders at that time, or speakers, who were motivating, like Malcolm X and Martin Luther King. He had a lot of inspiration. It was, I think, the spirit of the time, kind of a thought pattern of what could be accomplished. You could do anything, you know. At that time man had not landed on the moon. That was around 1969. But it was the point of achievement: You can try, you could achieve anything. You could make changes out of the impossible.

COHEN: You mentioned Martin Luther King and Malcolm X. Martin Luther King advocating a nonviolent approach, Malcolm X a militant approach to social change. How did those two apparently conflicting approaches influence—

SNELL: Most of those had a much greater effect upon me later on on that because I listened to Martin Luther King's aspect of nonviolence, and I had a deep respect for that. I couldn't understand where his strength lay at that particular time. Probably being young, you would say

probably Malcolm X had a more galvanizing effect on youth in regards to we're not going to turn the cheek. And that black people had to struggle. I look at him and, you know, it's funny. Later on in life I encountered their families. Later on—it was in the seventies—I started hanging out with Attila [sp]; I think that's his daughter. And his wife Betty Shabbaz I met a couple of times. And then I really came in very close contact with Yolanda King and Coretta King. And they were all pretty much friendly, you know. We'd get along quite well. And I've listened to discussions that they've had on that whole subject, about the difference between their fathers and their father's viewpoint. And there really wasn't that much difference. I think it might have been an approach the media picked up what they were saying. But I get the impression now that they were basically, from talking to Mrs. King and talking to Mrs. Chavez, that they were pretty much on the same wavelength. They had different styles. But their goals were really to motivate black people to, as I see it, to really stand up. Malcolm X was more aggressive. I think the media portrayed him a little bit more sinister. He didn't have the education or the eloquence of Martin Luther King or the background that Martin Luther King had. He was a Black Muslim, and he came out of the Muslim religion. He was a great speaker. He was a great thinker. And I think the media kind of portrayed him a little different. But as I look at it now, I really don't see that much difference between the two of them. I think they were pretty much on the same wavelength.

COHEN: At the time, which of the two, which one do you think, had the greater impact on the students?

SNELL: Probably for me....

COHEN: On the students, let's say, your perception of that?

SNELL: I don't know. It could have been either one of them. It could have been either one of them. I think there were a lot of them who said that they were followers of Malcolm X, and a lot of them their hearts were more aligned with the concepts of Martin Luther King, Jr.

COHEN: Did that— Well, my question is: What was going on at the time on the campus to force their confrontation and militant action or even thinking about it at the time, before it actually happened?

SNELL: That was more of an afterthought. I don't think it was more of an afterthought. I don't think it was anything that was really planned.

COHEN: Mm-hmm.

SNELL: It was planned. But it wasn't anything that, to my knowledge, it didn't really galvanize. Joe Browne is a very instrumental person.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Yes.

SNELL: As I said before, like Richard Roper and Cheryl Green, they had a concept in regards to minority education. Because I think they started working with the chancellor. Duncan was the chancellor of education for the State of New Jersey. He got a job there working after he

graduated from Rutgers undergraduate. So they were involved with higher education and looking into attracting minorities into higher education in New Jersey. And they would come back to campus, and we were still students. And that's when I think I was chairman of BOS. You had a lot of other people around there: Bessie Nelms Hill, who was on the board of governors. And we used to meet over in her apartment and talk about minority education. And there was never a concept of militancy or any type of action. I think a catalyst for a lot of the activity that came, came upon the death of Martin Luther King, Jr. Because at that time there became almost a feeling of—I don't know if you could despair. But look what happens. If you don't move fast, you'll be killed. You'll be destroyed. And I think it just evolved from there. I just can't—I don't see it coming out of one thing. Joe Browne was the first person that really articulated the whole concept of the Minority Higher Education Program; I remember that. When the students decided to take over a building to force their demands on the university, they were trying to clearly enunciate why they were doing it and to increase minority enrollment in the university. And as I remember, there were a lot of very bright people around. Joe Browne extremely bright. Vickie Donaldson was very bright and articulate. Vivian Sanks King was a very bright and articulate woman. Sue Perry, Ivy Davis, a guy who teaches here I think sometimes, Peter Jackson.

COHEN: Oh, yes! I interviewed Peter.

SNELL: But Joe seemed to articulate that type of demand that there should be a program or a concept for the university to not exclude students who don't particularly meet the educational requirements that the university held at that particular time. But the university should do something, go out into the community and foster their educational levels and try to help them to attain a higher degree of education. And Joe really somewhat articulated that type of concept. And I think talking with Bessie Hill kind of refined that type of concept. And talking to a Bob Curvin somewhat refined that. And Richard, sure, working with Chancellor Dungan, the chancellor of higher education, kind of refined that type of concept. But I think Joe Browne was the first person who really articulated that as a concept or as a goal.

COHEN: Can you recollect at what point did this concept materialize in the form of demands?

SNELL: As I remember, when the students went into the building. It hadn't been articulated to make a demand upon the university. It was kind of like a vague concept in the growing stage. I remember—and I may be wrong in regards to going into the building. The demands weren't really articulated until they were in the building, and they articulated those demands in regards to setting up a program in regards to minority admissions, disadvantaged students.

COHEN: You don't have any recollection of demands having been made....

SNELL: There were some demands made upon the university. There were discussions on that.

COHEN: Before the takeover?

SNELL: Yes. But it seemed like it became more dramatized at the point of the takeover. But there were discussions with the board of governors in regards to admission of minority students.

And there were discussions going on about trying to raise the number of minority students coming to Rutgers.

COHEN: Do you have any recollection of the various versions of the demands? As I understand from talking to people, I know that there were some.... Jim Ramsey has a file of—he told me; I haven't seen it yet—of the various demands that were made at the time. Do you have any recollection of that whole process whereby the demands were made and then refined and some withdrawn and some added?

SNELL: Okay. A lot of that negotiation went on with I think it was Joe Browne, Vickie, and Peter Jackson in regards to really defining those demands down. Because they were the ones who were really in the building. And it really became almost a decision among them what they would accept to leave the building, as I remember.

COHEN: I see. Yes. Where were you at that point?

SNELL: I was over across the street, right here, over in front of the building.

COHEN: Oh, you weren't—

SNELL: I wasn't in the building. No, I was outside of the building. Because the building that was taken over was the building across the street.

COHEN: Conklin Hall. I remember it very well. I want to go back a bit. Do you have any recollection of how the movement in New Brunswick influenced the movement in Newark?

SNELL: I don't— Now, that's going to be very controversial.

COHEN: Any recollection.

SNELL: I was thinking that the way I remember it, the movement in Newark influenced the people in New Brunswick. We went down to New Brunswick, I remember, to board of governors meetings. But there was never a point where we were influenced by them. We were keeping our demands, and we were pushing them in regards to making like similar demands. But ours was pretty separated. And I think we had more influence upon them than they really had upon us in regards. The only thing about New Brunswick is that the board of governors usually met in New Brunswick, and that's where we were going.

COHEN: How often did you and your colleagues meet with the board of governors?

SNELL: I know there were several meetings. There were meetings...there were meetings with individual board of governors members, and there were meetings with the full board, of going before the board to talk about minority admissions and the number of minority students at Rutgers.

COHEN: What was the tenor of those discussions? Do you have any recollections?

SNELL: [Laughs] I guess the people that you remember on the board. The person that I had the most conversation with was really with Bessie Nelms Hill. The other people...like I think Douglas Dillon was on the board of governors at that particular time.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Oh, yes. Mm-hmm.

SNELL: Archibald—

COHEN: Alexander.

SNELL: Yes, yes.

COHEN: After whom the library is named.

SNELL: Right. Yes. He was on the board of governors at that particular time. And I remember Mason Gross particularly at that time because we had some direct conversations with him in regards to negotiating with regards to Conklin Hall.

COHEN: What are your recollections of your conversations and negotiations with Mason Gross in particular?

SNELL: Mason really dealt through Bessie Nelms Hill with these students. He kind of like.... Bessie Nelms Hill really was the pivotal person where demands and conversations would come up in regards to Bessie Nelms Hill. And she would go back to Mason Gross and the board of governors in that type of capacity, explaining to them what the students were saying and what was going on, the things I remember. And there were some conversations with Mason Gross in regards to the finalization of the negotiations to just fine-tune the question of what he meant in regards to the final demands that were put out. And then I said, Well, you know, I've got him on the phone. And they would say this is blah blah blah blah. And I can't remember exactly what we said at that particular time. But I remember, you know, after that conversation, the students had agreed to relinquish Conklin Hall.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Bessie Nelms Hill, her name comes up, and of course Hill Hall is named after her.

SNELL: Right.

COHEN: What recollections do you have of her?

SNELL: A very fascinating woman. Extremely bright and very sharp. She knew effectively how to deal with people. And she was very unusual. Because she lived right at the Colonnade at that particular time. And she was very, very strong. And of course she looked at the students as being her people. She was a teacher. She talked about—she taught in the Trenton School System, and she was one of the first black teachers down there. How she was strong and how she had to overcome so many things. So she would say, "Well, you are not going to control me." You

know. "I'm too strong to be bothered with you." You know. And she treated us like—she really was trying to control us as being like pupils, her students, more than anything else. And she was very bright and very intellectual. I remember what Marvin McGraw says about her: He'll never forget Bessie Nelms Hill saying, "Document! Document! Document! If you're going before the board of governors to make a presentation, I want the research done. Document! What do you mean by this? Where's the research? What are the figures for this? No statements are made without some type of documentation." She was that type of person. You didn't come up to her with an argument that was not well researched and documented and your I's dotted and your T's crossed. She was that kind of person because she's going to bite you back on that one day, I know.

COHEN: Was she involved in negotiations before the building was occupied?

SNELL: She was probably—not to my knowledge. She had been dealing with the board of governors on minority issues since she was the only minority member of the board of governors for quite a while. But I think with the building takeover, she became a much more active figure with the board of governors. And then she played more like a behind the roles, you know, talking to them. Because I remember she said, "I thought this day would never come when the board of governors and Mason Gross would agree to a plan with regards to a disadvantaged student program." She said, "I thought this day would never come."

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Yes. Do you have any recollection of what the original demands were? Can you summarize or....

SNELL: Because they changed, they changed.

COHEN: Yes.

SNELL: I can't remember the fine-tuning of it. But I know the original demands were in regards to minority admissions. And there were attacks made on the director of admissions. I remember that day. That was before the building was taken over, when they went down to I think the...the admissions office at that time was at 50 Washington Street. Always on Washington Street, and they held a protest. And they were asking for the replacement of the director of admissions in regards to that time.

COHEN: What was there in the university response to the demands, that you can recall, that precipitated the action? At what point did the students feel that something had to be done beyond talking?

SNELL: Well, the students were meeting. I remember we were having these meetings in regards to drawing up demands with regards to the university and in regards to open admissions. And I remember it went to a vote because it was a big—oh, there was a big debate. Oh, that's right. There was a big fight going on.

COHEN: Among the students in BOS?

SNELL: Mm-hmm.

COHEN: About how many students were at this meeting, do you recollect?

SNELL: Boy, when you got to an issue like that, you're talking about a majority of the black students on campus. Everybody that was probably here. Maybe like five or ten people, you know, didn't participate in regards to minority admissions. Because I think it was very secretive in regards to the building takeover, the plans of it. And only the group of students who had agreed to do that, nobody else really knew what the plans or executions for secrecy purposes. And the question number one in regards to what was going to be done about minority admissions. And in the building the students who did that at the building, it became—oh, it was a bitter battle, bitter, bitter battles in regards to...because the students who went into that building, some of them were jeopardizing their educational career and the rest of their future and possibly criminal charges being held against them, dismissed from the university. So it was a very serious consideration for those students who decided to go into that particular building.

COHEN: Do you have any specific recollections of what was actually said at those meetings? Either difference of... one or two...?

SNELL: [Laughs] There were accusations. It was boisterous, vigorous, and very emotional. People would almost come to blows over the emotion of it. And with that decision—a lot of students had to make a personal decision in regards to what the rest of their life was when they made that decision.

COHEN: Are you saying that there was a proposal put forth at the meeting to take over the building, to liberate the building?

SNELL: There were some proposals like that. And it came to [Break in recording]

COHEN: Okay. We're back. And we were talking about the meetings....

SNELL: I remember there was a meeting, and Malcolm Talbott always liked. And Malcolm was always a very erudite man. He and Bessie Hill I think were very good friends also. And I think maybe they had put—there was some type of threat put into Malcolm that if the university didn't do something in regards to minority admissions, the students would do something. And he said, "I doubt that would occur because you will not get the support." And I think this was off the cuff. "You will not get the support of all the black students in regards to any type of militant action," I think he said. Or the faculty.

COHEN: Malcolm said that.

SNELL: Yes. And that was off the cuff. His remarks, I think, on a threat or some type of threat had been placed to Malcolm.

COHEN: Were you president of BOS at that time? You were president.

SNELL: I was in a precarious position. I was president of BOS, and I was vice president of the student council.

COHEN: Oh! Okay. How did you deal with that one?

SNELL: [Laughter] It was rough. I walked into one meeting, and the student council members are jumping up and down and saying, “What are you planning?” And I said, “Well, I’m president of BOS so I really can’t discuss that. I’ll discuss what’s going on over at the student council.” ...You know, as president of BOS. I was like back and forth between the two groups.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Yes. And when you were then—finally you relinquished your....

SNELL: Yes. At that particular time, especially with Joe Browne—I think he was vice chairman of BOS at that particular time—and we had almost gotten to the point that we had to become full-time activists. People were working in the community, and we really didn’t have any chance to really even get to the classes that semester. It really had become that difficult. And I thought for continuity with the concepts, Joe’s ideas or foresight were like really tremendous. He was a tremendous asset of leadership for the group.

COHEN: Well, how would you characterize Joe Browne’s ideas and his effect?

SNELL: His ideas, I think, and concepts were far advanced at that particular time. Joe was basically a very unselfish person. He was very committed to the concept of helping minorities. And he reflected that later on by the things he did. A lot of us—and I include myself in this more than anything else—were weak. I grew up in a poor family, a poor environment. And I was not willing to just totally sacrifice my educational career or my future life for a cause or an ideal totally. Joe unselfishly was. He would be willing to give up his school career, not graduate from campus, work in a movement or run down to Louisiana to do that type of activity. That was more important to him than education or advancement.

COHEN: If you go back to that time, what is your recollection or guess about the split, if you will, among the students in BOS about whether to take the building or not. Were they more with Joe Browne’s approach or more—

SNELL: Some of them were, and some of them weren’t. Some of them were diametrically opposed to taking the building. And the end, I mean, really had come, you know. Because the people who decided to go into the building were the people who basically had voted on that and supported that. The people who basically stayed out of the building did not so much support that type of move.

COHEN: Well, of the students who were at this one meeting—is that where the decision was made?

SNELL: I think it was a couple of meetings. But I think the vote came down at the last meeting.

COHEN: What do you recollect as the—how did the vote come out, that you can recall?

SNELL: Well, there was a group of students who had voted to go into the building.

COHEN: Were they in the majority or minority or—

SNELL: I can't even remember how that vote turned out because it was such a raucous type of scene at that particular time. I can't even remember exactly how it turned out. See, the whole thing about it, there was a split on that. But after those students went in the building, there wasn't any split in regard to support for the activity at that particular time. But the initial concept of going and taking over a building, there was a lot of dissension.

COHEN: Yes. What alternatives were considered to achieve the goals?

SNELL: Same old negotiations like they had been continuing, you know, rather than vague threats to the university and things like that.

COHEN: What arguments were presented against the alternatives?

SNELL: Of going into the building?

COHEN: Yes. The alternatives were presented, you know, negotiations and so on. Obviously the students who decided to take the action must have persuaded certainly a goodly number of students that the negotiations and the alternatives to taking over the building would not be effective.

SNELL: Malcolm X maybe.

COHEN: Malcolm X. For what did Malcolm X—

SNELL: Maybe the philosophy that peaceful negotiations cannot totally achieve your goals or achieve your goals at all ends. That type of philosophy weighed in. So you did have that conflict going on between really the Martin Luther King philosophy a about peaceful, nonviolent type of protest and a more radical type of protest.

COHEN: Now were these two certainly different or somewhat different approaches to effecting change, were they openly discussed among the students during the negotiations?

SNELL: Oh, yes.

COHEN: Were there any discussions in the ....?

SNELL: Oh, yes. People really got into philosophies.

COHEN: So they did get into philosophies.

SNELL: Oh, yes. It was very.... I tell you we had some very bright students, and it was a very philosophical discussion of black students, the way they thought, the concepts as presented by Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, H. Rapp Brown, the Black Panthers. You had philosophies reflected in regards to Fassant [referring to Frantz Fanon]. You had philosophies—there was a guy out in California, I can't think of his name right now. You had different philosophies, you know. There were people who were attuned to the philosophy of Amamu Amiri Baraka. So you had—oh, this was great! It was very philosophical! Oh, very much so!

COHEN: What influence did Amamu Baraka have on the discussions and ...?

SNELL: Well, there were a lot of people who were very much...I have a great deal of respect for Amiri Baraka. I think he's a great intellect. But you had a lot of people who really somewhat respected his concepts, and he helped in regards to whatever he could do in regards to students who asked him in regards to the taking of Conklin Hall.

COHEN: And he was actually involved in—

SNELL: No, no. There was like after the building was taken over, you know, they asked to get some walkie-talkies from...this organization gave them some walkie-talkies or something like that.

COHEN: What kind of support did the students have from the community?

SNELL: That was a surprise. You know we, I guess, think of ourselves as so isolated. And I think Vickie and Marvin McGraw were talking about community support. We had people like George Hampton and I'm just trying to think of another guy. Tom Roberts. And they were talking about community support, going out into the community.

COHEN: Mm-hmm.

SNELL: And the interesting thing was that they really did a very good job of that. Because once they went into that building, the publicity got a tremendous amount of community support. Support that they had no idea existed.

COHEN: What organizations? I remember one—I came across one letter in the Archives from the Brothers—I forget the exact name of the organization. But what organizations were ...?

SNELL: I don't know if it was really structured. I think you had like individual support rather than organizations. I don't remember anything where the NAACP came directly involved. But I remember that there were people, individual members of the NAACP. I remember that Ken Gibson came down. He wasn't mayor then. He came down to bring food to us students. I remember support from a lot of individuals and groups of people working around who were supportive. And it was a lot of community support. I was really surprised at how much support there was...

COHEN: How much fear was there of police action once the building was—

SNELL: That fear was always present. That was a very great fear of the police. If the police came in and rushed the students, what would occur at that particular point?

COHEN: Were there any contingency plans to deal with that?

SNELL: If there were, it was probably made on the inside.

COHEN: On the inside.

SNELL: Yes.

COHEN: Was there concern about people from the community taking the law into their own hands and—I remember they were...the building.

SNELL: Well, you know, that was a great fear because that was just about the time of the Newark riots. So you're talking about...there was a lot of apprehension about violence occurring at that particular time. Yes, that was a very dangerous—that was a very volatile period. Because I remember George Hampton and Tom Roberts and Douglas Morgan were talking about where a group of Rutgers students had taken a log or something and were going to bust into the building. [Laughter] That was a very volatile type of situation.

COHEN: Yes. I have a vivid recollection of that because I was there at the time. The log was lying—it was a telephone pole which was in front of the building.

SNELL: A lot of volatile stuff. And, you know, it was even dangerous, I guess, even being president of BOS because we would get these telephone calls because our phone number was listed or the family's phone number was listed. So there was a lot of violence. A very volatile type of situation.

COHEN: You mentioned some of the people who were some of the leaders of the organization. Of course you mentioned Vickie Donaldson. What was her special role or contribution?

SNELL: She was the.... She's a real philosopher. She's a great intellect. Always has had a great intellect. And with her readings—she was into black writers. So she was into like Malcolm X and Fassant [referring to Frantz Fanon] black writers. She grew up in the South from Florida. And she had a great philosophical view of the role of black people and about segregation and what they had to do to be the masters of their own fate. When you're begging, you have to use force. She was very, very bright. She was one of the main philosophers at the time, if I had to describe her.

COHEN: How was she as a speaker?

SNELL: She's a very, very effective speaker because most writers, people that were writers—and she's really a writer. As I remember, I remember her being an excellent writer as a student.

You know she was just a very, very good writer. She has a great mastery of language and her thoughts. So she can be very expressive and articulate as a speaker.

COHEN: Marvin McGraw's role? I remember him very well.

SNELL: Yes. Marvin is interesting, too. We had some really bright students. Marvin was more a politician. Marvin had the intellect and the ability to sit back and work on the politics of the situation: pushing or trying to push the levers to push this way or that way. And he has that great ability to be a political mover. He's a real strategist politically.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Vivian King. What did....

SNELL: Vivian was a student who was very, very bright also. Vivian was not the most articulate person in regards to all this. She basically sat around on the sidelines. But she was like very supportive of what was going on. She wasn't one of the active persons participating. She played more of a side—as I remember—more of a sideline role in all of this. Vickie played a more articulate role in all of these activities, her and Joe and Marvin.

COHEN: Douglas Morgan?

SNELL: Douglas was—well, he was an underclassman.

COHEN: Oh.

SNELL: Douglas.... See, they were younger than us.

COHEN: I see. I see.

SNELL: Douglas was, as I remember, very intellectually into all this. He's very careful, very methodical. And he had to think about this. I don't remember [whether] Doug went into the building or not. But I remember Doug was very, very supportive of the activity and the demands. There were a lot of students who were more intellectually into the demands than the articulation of philosophy.

COHEN: Mm-hmm.

SNELL: He was one of those people, I think, who really strongly.... Even with Vivian King, she, you know, as I said, she was more supportive of the concepts and goals than articulating a leadership role in regards to this whole activity.

COHEN: George Hampton, was he an underclassman at the time?

SNELL: Yes, he was an undergraduate, too. Doug—George Hampton was more with Douglas Morgan. They played more...I guess they played a role. It's hard because I guess you do have a leverage of upperclassmen and lowerclassmen.

COHEN: Well, true.

SNELL: So they didn't play a strong leadership role so much, any major role. But they played a very strong secondary role across all these activities.

COHEN: I interviewed Peter Jackson. I know he was a....

SNELL: Now that's what I think about philosophies and concepts, you're talking about Peter. Because Peter had...was reading all this stuff.

COHEN: Yes, yes.

SNELL: He was just like...he'd come out with one philosophy. Then he had Vickie on one side, and then he'd jump into another philosophy. And those were intellectual discussions because you really...we had some serious intellectual debates and discussions on the whole concept. Because it didn't go so much on the action and demands. But they were more interested in the philosophy, the basis of why this had to occur or that. And they were more the philosophers of it more than the pragmatists involved in the day-to-day activities. Theirs was a more long-range, philosophical analysis in regards to this whole takeover and everything.

COHEN: You mentioned some of the writers and some of the thinkers who were influential: Malcolm X, Martin Luther King, Jr. I think you mentioned Stokely Carmichael.

SNELL: Let me stop now on Stokely Carmichael. You know there were just several writers out there that had a great influence because Fassant [referring to Frantz Fanon], you know, from Algeria, a great—a lot of the students were reading him in those days.

COHEN: Fasant?

SNELL: What's his name? Fanon.

COHEN: FANON.

SNELL: Yes, I'm sorry. I was thinking about George Fasant [sp?].

COHEN: Yea the "Wretched of the Earth." Was that the book there that you recall?

SNELL: Well, I remember there were a couple of books here he wrote about discrimination and growing up in Algeria, and that was very influential on all our people.

COHEN: About some of the demands.... Maybe if your recollection of the demands and how they changed is vague, I'll just ask a few questions and see if you can respond.

SNELL: Okay.

COHEN: And if not, you know, I mean because we're talking.... [Laughs] For instance, there was a demand, I believe, at one time for admission of all black high school graduates in Newark.

SNELL: In the City of Newark.

COHEN: Yes. That was, I believe, withdrawn from the published demands.

SNELL: As I remember, that went on, but that was not looked on very favorably. It was a very limited scope that it was limited to black students. You know—there was an emphasis, of course, on black students. But just to admit students who graduated from Newark who were black would really not really resolve anything at all.

COHEN: Uh-huh. Another demand was for enrollment.... Let me see. I even have a quote here: "Enrollment commensurate with Newark and its surrounding communities." And my question is, what were the target municipalities? That came up, I think.

SNELL: Well, as we said before, it was a very limited focus when you really talked about Newark. And then it came to...there's East Orange, there's Newark, there's Montclair. You have a large section of people who were just like in Newark. And why are you just limiting yourselves to Newark? And I almost remember the name of the person who came up with that type of term. But that was like, I think, in the building someone was working with that type of concept. And it was trying to define those things. Because as I say, it wasn't really defined very well.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. The surrounding communities, yes.

SNELL: Yes.

COHEN: Do you recall what the response of the administration was in...the negotiations, I believe, were probably involved with Malcolm Talbott as representative.

SNELL: They resisted.

COHEN: They resisted?

SNELL: No.

COHEN: For instance to the demands for the admission of high school graduates in Newark who placed in the top 50 percent of their class. That was one of the demands that was made.

SNELL: Okay. That demand, probably that demand went out. There was resistance. There was like rejection. There was rejection of them all.

COHEN: There was in the *Star-Ledger*—I have a clipping here. This is later on on March 6<sup>th</sup>. There was a question of an agreement, a document, that was supposed to have been signed.

SNELL: Right.

COHEN: Was there a signed document, agreement, between the administration and the organization?

SNELL: There was a statement, as I remember, issued by Mason Gross. And it was read to the students and signed by, I think it was him if I'm not mistaken, because it just negotiated what the final terms of that statement or final terms when they opened up the program for educationally disadvantaged students.

COHEN: That was signed by Gross.

SNELL: It was written by Gross. But that was, you know, his last proposal which, you know, which the students came as I remember.

COHEN: The question of—in fact you addressed that, I believe. You were quoted in the press as addressing the whole question of maintaining standards in admission of students in this whole period. And there were various claims, as I'm sure ...[Both speak at once] ... about lowering standards. I mean my question is considering that there was an acknowledged need for remediation....

SNELL: Well, that was the whole point that Bessie Hill brought up. Because I'm going to tell you, there was a lot of negotiations in this. And it was question that the board of governors was facing, that they were destroying the standards of Rutgers by admitting economically disadvantaged students. And we tried to clarify that. That the program was set up...there were two programs. There was a remedial program to bring up the students' proficiency level to be admitted into Rutgers. And that's the same criteria that Rutgers had always utilized in regards to graduating that was going to be utilized. So that there would be no lowering of standards. The only thing was was this subprogram which was supposed to raise the educational level of the educationally disadvantaged students, whether they could go in to be a regular matriculated Rutgers student. So, you know, it wasn't the point that they were going to lower their standards. They were just going to try to bring these students up to a level that they could be admitted into the university.

COHEN: Was there ever any understanding that students would be admitted who needed remediation, that these students would not get remediation as part of the whole idea?

SNELL: Well, the whole concept was that they would get remediation. There would be remedial education for them to bring them up to the standards to be admitted as a regular student.

COHEN: Was there any sense of just admitting students without remediation who needed remediation?

SNELL: No. No, because.... It's funny. I even talk to the admissions office sometimes about that now. Because they wouldn't survive at Rutgers. They wouldn't be able to graduate if they were just admitted in here and not have the strong educational skills to survive. They wouldn't survive! There'd be no way that they could graduate.

COHEN: Was there any support among the students, among the black students?

SNELL: I would think...there might have been some people who were naïve or just basically—there might have been some support for that. But it was never seriously considered at all.

COHEN: Yes. I guess what I'm asking, was there ever a call for open admissions in the sense of just students without....

SNELL: Okay. The call was to increase minority enrollment in Rutgers. And so there were several ways of trying to do that. And it might have been at one point discussed in regards to just open admissions. But it came into serious problems with that. Open admissions means you just open the doors and let people flunk out. So that as not a viable—that as not realistic or viable. But, you know, there had been discussions—and this had been going on before Conklin Hall—about viable alternatives: how to handle that type of enrollment.

COHEN: Yes.

SNELL: Finally it was defined that this would be probably the most viable way of trying to increase minority enrollment at Rutgers.

COHEN: Do you recall there was a crucial meeting before the faculty about the whole question of admissions of students? And there was a difference of opinion, a difference in....

SNELL: I did not attend that. I think it was a closed faculty meeting, as I remember.

COHEN: I don't recall whether it was closed. But of course it's in the minutes ...

SNELL: And who was the dean at that particular time?

COHEN: At that time Malcolm Talbott was the acting dean. So the dean, Dean Gilliland, was not the dean at that time. Malcolm Talbott was the acting dean.

SNELL: Yes, but there was somebody else I think who also played a pivotal role among the faculty.

COHEN: As a dean? Maybe Henry Blumenthal perhaps?

SNELL: There was another person also. I just can't remember his name. I think his name was Graham or something like that. I may be mistaken.

COHEN: Hmm. Graham....

SNELL: Because I remember that they were having this big debate in the faculty in regards.... Because evidently when this exploded, the students came out against—it became a very volatile issue on campus. Statewide it became a very volatile issue, what was going to happen to the state

university in regards to open enrollment or setting up an Educational Opportunity program in regards to disadvantaged students.

COHEN: The issue of that meeting was the question of whether students would be considered—students in the top 50 percent of their class. Do you recall anything about that? To accept students in the top 50 percent of their class or to consider students in the top 50 percent of their class. Have you any recollection about that?

SNELL: I don't have any recollection on that specific issue.

COHEN: Do you have any recollection of after the students left the building and negotiations continued, and then there were charges I think from BOS. I think Joe Browne was quoted as saying that the university had reneged on agreements.

SNELL: Yes.

COHEN: Okay. That there was a call on March 13<sup>th</sup> to shut down the university on the 13<sup>th</sup> of March in 1969. Do you recall that episode?

SNELL: No. No, I don't remember that at all.

COHEN: Mm-hmm.

SNELL: Probably Vickie or Joe might have mentioned that.

COHEN: Mm-hmm.

SNELL: I don't remember that being a very serious issue at that particular time. The students weren't going back into the building or anything.

COHEN: No. Oh, no! I don't think there was any discussion about that. But there was a call for a—and the campus was shut down, if I remember. Let's see. And the campus was shut down ...

SNELL: It was shut down during the takeover, I remember. But they still had classes going on during the takeover, didn't they?

COHEN: As far as I know, yes. Some of the classes were shifted to ...

SNELL: Because I remember....

COHEN: There was a shutdown after the building had been relinquished.

SNELL: Because I don't really remember the shutdown.

COHEN: You don't recall that.

SNELL: I don't remember at all.

COHEN: How would you— Did you have dealings, direct dealings, with Malcolm Talbott yourself?

SNELL: Mm-hmm.

COHEN: How would you—how did he handle himself?

SNELL: Very, very good. Very, very well. He was a skilled negotiator. And very, very polished negotiation skills. And there were a lot of subsidiary meetings. There were a lot of like executive meetings. Meetings that went on and on, maybe like very late at night, one or two o'clock in the morning, in trying to implement this and trying to work out the details of the open admissions program.

COHEN: You attended these meetings?

SNELL: Yes. Well, they were meetings...like there were meetings and discussions over how this could be done. How the university planned to do this, and he was very, very skilled.

COHEN: Do you have any recollections of any of the conversations that went on or any of the interesting....

SNELL: I remember one meeting we went to up on...Joe and I went to Malcolm's house; he lived over on Mount Prospect. He was really upset about something, and him and Joe got into a really serious dispute at that particular point. And I remember it was really a kind of violent—volatile—discussion.

COHEN: Do you remember what the dispute was about?

SNELL: I can't remember what it was this time. But I remember it was really, really volatile, very volatile that particular night.

COHEN: How would you assess Malcolm Talbott's overall role in the negotiations and the outcome?

SNELL: Very, very crucial. Because he really was adamant about keeping it from a violent type of scene. And I think he was very, very correct. After the riots, he really did not want a severe confrontation type of situation or violence or anyone could be injured or hurt. And he was very, very serious about that, and that was one of his main concerns.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Yes. We talked a little bit before about Mason Gross and Bessie Nelms Hill. Going back a bit, do you think there was—was there ever any opportunity at any time when the students were talking about the possibilities of direct action, was there ever any opportunity to avert the action?

SNELL: No. Because then the university would have been.... You know it's so strange when I think about it now. I don't think the university would have taken that course without that building takeover, without that dramatic issue of being forced to deal with that issue.

COHEN: You don't think they would have taken....

SNELL: Not. I do think eventually they would have. They wouldn't have taken it at that particular time. They might have maybe a couple of years later or something. But I think that was very dramatic for them, and they were forced to deal with an issue.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. So you took that course in terms of really making a decision.

SNELL: Making a decision. I think there was favoritism on that ideal among the board of governors. But they really had not acted upon it. There was no strong impetus for them to act until they were confronted with a crisis problem with regards to it. They might have done it on their own, but I don't think they would have done it as soon.

COHEN: What numbers were the students thinking about in terms of what would satisfy the demand, the expectation, that the university was in fact fulfilling its obligation?

SNELL: The person that you should basically ask that question [of] would be Vickie Donaldson. Because I keep remembering that question coming up: What numbers, what are we looking for? And I think Vickie was trying to articulate that type of concept in regards to the demands. When you said that, Vickie's name came up into my mind.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. Yes, yes. What's your assessment of the historical significance of the Conklin Hall liberation, takeover, action?

SNELL: It's funny, you know. A couple of years ago we went down to New Brunswick to—the name of the program's Educational Opportunity Fund?

COHEN: Educational Opportunity Fund?

SNELL: I mean the program now, the program as it evolved. And they had a 20-year.... I think it was in 1988 that they had some type of banquet in New Brunswick. And I think they were talking about when the university created the program, you know, this is the program. And very little emphasis was put in regards to Conklin Hall and the students'.... [End of Tape #1]

COHEN: Okay, we are back. You were talking about this anniversary for the....

SNELL: An anniversary dinner. And I think the head of the program was the...I guess the speaker was the ex-pastor for Abyssinian Baptist Church—I can't think of his name right now—who resigned. And they had the program in New Brunswick. And there was hardly any mention of the activity of the black students taking over Conklin Hall. I think Joe Browne wasn't even invited...or he didn't know about it. And I think it was me and George Hampton. Maybe another

person who came down there was Jim Ramsey. They talked about it, but it was like it was never even, as I remember, acknowledged that particular evening.

COHEN: Was this meeting, was it—

SNELL: This was a banquet.

COHEN: It was a banquet. Did they talk about the original proposal for a remedial program, the Urban University Department?

SNELL: No, they really didn't. They really talked about it in more general terms about minority education and the philosophy behind it and the role that it had achieved. But they really did not talk about the struggle those students who went into Conklin Hall had made in regards to their being so instrumental in the creation of that particular program. And it really struck me funny that night. It was like...I said, "What happened?" You know it was like it was almost forgotten.

COHEN: And yet you were saying before that if it hadn't been for the action, that certainly the pressure to really start a program, a meaningful program, never would have gotten off the ground.

SNELL: Never would have gotten off the ground.

COHEN: So in terms of, I guess, the history of the university in Newark is concerned, how would you—give us some historical perspective—what was the significance, if you were telling future generations, future researchers or whatever, what was the significance for you and for your fellow students of the Conklin Hall action?

SNELL: I guess so much has gone on, I look at it as just, you know, an aspect of my undergraduate education. Looking at Rutgers at that particular time, I think it kind of—I hate to put it like this—it kind of put like Rutgers-Newark on the map. We were always like a—felt like a stepchild; we were not.... Kind of like the bastards of Rutgers [laughs] in the sense that you had Old Queens, which was founded in 1766, down in New Brunswick. And this was just...as I remember when we came here, we had this chemistry building across the street. And we played a very instrumental role, I think in Rutgers history and the creation of the Educational Opportunity program. We increased the enrollment of minority admissions. I think it also put it.... Because after that, as I say, it was like we also put demands upon the university in regards to increasing this campus, the size and scope of it and the importance of it. So for Rutgers-Newark, at least, I think the Conklin Hall incident was not only important with regards to minority students, but for students in general as an identity that they had some role or an instrumental role to play in the Rutgers system.

COHEN: One of the, well, major developments which grew out of the period was the establishment first of the.... First there was the original Urban University Department; that didn't get State support. Then on this campus the Academic Foundations Center was established. And then eventually that became the Academic Foundations Department. What is your sense of the role this department has played on the campus in remediation?

SNELL: I really can't say. I really haven't kept up with it over the years. I talk to people that are working with the program to try to find out, and I know the numbers have tremendously increased. One thing I did a couple of years ago, I got a list of the minority Rutgers graduates, and I was really impressed, you know, with the numbers, they had become so large. I think it played a very active role in increasing the number of not only minority or black students, but disadvantaged. I think it brought Hispanics to Rutgers. I think it brought blacks to Rutgers. I think it brought a lot of people who wanted—or sought—an education. And it gave them the opportunity and the vehicle to succeed in achieving their goals and dreams.

COHEN: Now you went on to the Rutgers Law School in—

SNELL: Nineteen seventy.

COHEN: Okay. How would you assess the preparation, the quality of the preparation, that you had in the College of Arts and Sciences for your career as a law school student and as a lawyer?

SNELL: Hmm. You're asking me a dangerous question. [Laughter]

COHEN: Uh-oh.

SNELL: You're asking me a very dangerous question. For me personally, I feel that my high school education was better preparation for law school maybe than my Rutgers preparation. My high school was very, very intense in regards to the education that I had. The education here at Rutgers was good. It was a good education for political science. I think it could have been a little better in some ways, a little bit more intense, you know, in some ways. I think it was good, you know. But I don't think it was, you know, totally the best education. And of course law school—law school was a very challenging, very challenging for me. I was able to achieve in there. And I think Rutgers gave me adequate support. I just wish it was a little more intense in some directions, in some things.

COHEN: Is that the main reason why the high school education was...you said it was more intense?

SNELL: Because when I came into Rutgers, I didn't find the Rutgers courses that challenging for me. I didn't find it to be an extreme challenge for me. I remember I took physics my first year or something like that, my first semester. And I had most of that physics when I was in high school. So it wasn't really challenging. I think a lot of the courses I took in regards to—I was a political science major—political science were interesting to me. But I think even those could have been a little bit more intense, a little bit more into focus. I worked...I remember I went into Washington after I graduated from law school, and worked a year. And I got involved with the politics. And it was a good education. But, you know, it takes a little more intensity to really focus on what's going on when you're dealing with Congress or the role of Congress. And then Marvin McGraw, he did a lot of work down in Washington also. I would be interested to hear what he would say about that also.

COHEN: Well, why do you think that the quality of the teaching lacked this—the word you’re using—intensity at that time that you were....

SNELL: I don’t know. I don’t really know. I really...I think, as I’m seeing the total education, there were courses that you took that were very good. They were very intense and very challenging. Some of the courses were not that challenging from an intellectual standpoint. They weren’t challenging—I know they didn’t really challenge me. I don’t know if they challenged a lot of other people. But they weren’t as challenging as they could be.

COHEN: Which were the most challenging courses that you can recall?

SNELL: Let’s see, most challenging courses for me? Some of the English courses. I remember I had Felicia Bonparte [sp] my first year. She was a very challenging woman in regards to her English course. And that was good.

COHEN: How was it challenging?

SNELL: Well, she was very intense about our writing and analyzing our writing and what we were doing. And she was a very, very rough marker. And, you know, you had to really work hard and really fight her. And it was kind of a challenge. But I learned from that type of experience.

COHEN: Mm-hmm. What other courses do you recollect in that fashion?

SNELL: That were extremely challenging.... I can’t remember now. It just seems...I’d have to go through my records, to look up the courses. The science courses were, you know, pretty challenging. The physics course was rough, I grant you that.

COHEN: Physics, did you say?

SNELL: Yes. That was a pretty challenging course. And some of the others. But, you know, I didn’t find myself to be totally challenged, to my full capability.

COHEN: Did your fellow students share this lack of enthusiasm about the content of the courses here?

SNELL: I don’t know. I never really discussed it, you know. I know some of them went to law school with me. They all did well. All of them did well. They graduated undergraduate from Rutgers and from its law school...with the Bar and everything like that. But as I told you before, those students were always good students when they already came in here.

COHEN: Sure. Yes. Were most of the students you’re talking about from the parochial schools, that you talked to?

SNELL: No, no. They came from public schools. But they were like number one, two, and three in their graduating class. They were.... George Hampton I think was around number five or four

when he graduated from Southside, which is your Shabbaz School. They were really top-notch students. You had to really...the black students that they admitted were the cream of the crop basically.

COHEN: Okay. Is there anything we've discussed that you'd like to go back to, a footnote or expand upon?

SNELL: No.

COHEN: Anything that we haven't discussed, haven't any questions or haven't asked anything that I should have asked and didn't that you'd like to address?

SNELL: In regards to Rutgers. Rutgers has played a very pivotal role. Rutgers-Newark has played a very pivotal role in Newark, with the education and with the open admissions program. The only thing I think I regret, looking back in 20 years, was that I think the role that Rutgers can play has not totally played as of yet. I think it really has the capability of totally taking control and being the total leader of this community, and it hasn't really done that. It's taken—I may be wrong. It's taken more of a role, well, we're going to take an advisory capacity when we have the capability to really do great things in this area. But we are an educational institution and kind of limit our access. I mean Rutgers has done tremendous things. But what I can see, what it can do in this community. Because I look at even greater things than it has done at the present time.

COHEN: Well, what things are we talking about?

SNELL: Well, I see a lot of good directions. I see that in 20 years we've come up with dormitories; so we have students that are living down here at the present time. I see how the university in the community has really expanded. But I think the university should be probably the leading force. They're trying to be. They haven't really achieved it as yet. But I think they're trying to go in the direction of the leading force in the Newark business and community in total. And that it should lead every other direction of where this community is going and what's going to occur in the next 20 years. I think it's on this roll with its expansion. But I don't think it's achieved that level as it could.

COHEN: Okay. Well, thank you very much.

SNELL: Thank you very much. [End of Tape #2]

[End of Interview]

Edited by Gideon Thompson