

2017-02-06

Karl Scheibe Oral History Interview, Feb. 6 & 13, 2017

Christine Foster

Follow this and additional works at: <http://wescholar.wesleyan.edu/oralhistory>

Recommended Citation

Foster, Christine, "Karl Scheibe Oral History Interview, Feb. 6 & 13, 2017" (2017). *Wesleyan University Oral History Project*. 28.
<http://wescholar.wesleyan.edu/oralhistory/28>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Special Collections & Archives at WesScholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wesleyan University Oral History Project by an authorized administrator of WesScholar. For more information, please contact ljohnson@wesleyan.edu.

Interview with Karl Scheibe by Christine Foster

Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, February 2017

Christine Foster: I am here with Karl Scheibe at Wesleyan in the Wasch Center. It is February 6, 2017. Can you tell me about your early life before you came here?

Karl Scheibe: Yes, I will sketch my early life, briefly, before Wesleyan. I intend to start the major narrative after 1963 which was the year I came here. I was born in Illinois, lived there basically all my life. My parents moved to St. Louis when I went to college. I went to high school in downstate Hillsboro, Illinois. I went to Trinity College in 1955 after graduating from high school. I graduated from Trinity College in 1959, went to the University of California at Berkeley in 1959 on a fellowship from The Woodrow Wilson foundation for my first year of graduate school. I was in graduate school at Berkeley from 1959 to 1963, got married halfway through graduate school in 1961 to Wendy. We're still married. You know my wife.

Christine Foster: Yes.

Karl Scheibe: Wendy and I lived in Berkeley together for the first two years of our marriage, and then moved to Middletown and Wesleyan in the late summer of 1963. My dad was a minister in Hillsboro, Illinois, and then when he actually retired from the ministry--a long, complicated family story which I shall not try to retell-- he ended up going to Brazil and became a missionary, at about age 62. My two older brothers also became missionaries in Brazil for a time. That actually comes to be an important feature later in the course of my career and life. But I should focus on 1963 because that was a critical year.

Christine Foster: Absolutely.

Karl Scheibe: Okay. In the spring of 1963, I was finishing up my Ph.D. under the tutelage of a psychologist whose photograph you'll see right there. Theodore Sarbin, about whom I've just completed a book, *The Life and Work of Theodore R. Sarbin. The storied nature of human life*. I began to work with Sarbin in 1959 and worked with him all the way through graduate school, did my dissertation with him, and he

ended up being a lifelong mentor and friend. He's an important influence throughout my life. He died 12 years ago, in 2005.

In 1963, as I was completing my PhD, I began to look for jobs--in a desultory way because at that time, jobs were plentiful, and new Ph.D.'s were relatively rare. My Ph.D. from Berkeley was still pending through the spring and summer. It took me until September to finish the dissertation and get it signed. It was four years and three months from the time of the beginning of my PhD program until my completion of it. I was the second person out of a class of 50 to have completed the program – and the other fellow came in with a master's degree. I moved along well.

In April of 1963, a Wesleyan Psychology Professor, Robert Thompson, came to Berkeley to visit friends of his and also to interview potential candidates for a job at Wesleyan. He put a sign-up sheet on the bulletin board in the psychology department and all graduate students were invited to sign up if they wished to be considered for a position at Wesleyan. I knew of Wesleyan because I'd been an undergraduate at Trinity College in Hartford, so I signed up for an interview with Bob Thompson in Berkeley. I remember the meeting. It took about a half an hour, and it was perfectly friendly and routine. I wasn't offered a job, but it was a cordial meeting.

It turns out that a colleague of mine was offered a job at Wesleyan from the same list of people who signed up because he was a physiological psychologist -- a biological psychologist -- and that's the position they were looking to fill. They selected him to come to Wesleyan for an interview and he was offered the job. Dick DeBold was his name. He accepted his job offer at Wesleyan with pleasure. It was a great place for him.

Later--it couldn't have been more than three weeks later – he asked me if I'd be interested in a job at Wesleyan also because he said he received a phone call from Wesleyan saying that they now had an opening in social psychology as well as the opening in physiological psychology. So they might be interested in my candidacy. I said sure, and he relayed that information back to Wesleyan. The next thing I knew I got a phone call from Bob Knapp, the chair of the psychology department at the time, offering me a job at Wesleyan over the telephone. All I'd done was to take part in that half an hour interview with Bob Thompson, and also

gave him a vita, a resume, an early version of the document that I just gave to you.

That's what he had, and on the basis of what he saw, and on the basis of Thompson's interview, I was offered a job. I remember the initial salary was \$7,250 a year. I bristled a bit because Dick DeBold had told me his starting salary was \$7,350 a year, \$100 more than my offer. I called that to Knapp's attention, and he said, well you need to understand that Dick Debold is 10 years older than you are. He's 36. You're 26. We've got to give him an extra 10 bucks a year. I said that sounded fair to me, so let's go. I accepted the job offer and came to Wesleyan.

I arrived here in August of that year, having driven across country with my wife and her little brother. We had a wonderful trip. She lived in Boston. It was a great job opportunity for us because I'd gone to Trinity College. I was familiar with Wesleyan. My wife was from Boston. It's two hours away from her home. She was delighted with the opportunity. I had been considering job offers as well in Florida, Minnesota, Ohio, and New Jersey. She said she didn't want to go to any of those places, but Connecticut sounded fine to her. The Wesleyan job was perfect as a first job and as it turned out it was a long first job.

I came to Wesleyan and met my colleagues in the psychology department. At that time, there were six people in the psychology department. Today there are 15. It was a small group. Of the six people in the psychology department, three of us were new that year. There was Dick DeBold and me from Berkeley and another new person, Jim Ciarlo, who had just received his Ph.D. from Harvard. He joined the faculty at the same time. Half of the department was new when I came, and the other three people had been here for a while.

When I talked to my former colleagues at Trinity College about Wesleyan, they said that I ought to take the job, but their impression was that the major feature of Wesleyan was that it had more money than it knew how to spend. That seemed to me not a disabling problem.

Wesleyan had acquired in the 1950's the American Education Publication organization that published *My Weekly Reader*, so they

had a big surplus of cash lying around, and they were in a development and expansion phase. Little did I know that the faculty had essentially made a decision to move away from being a standard potted ivy college into something more ambitious--a genuine university, to have graduate programs, to grow in size and stature, and to stand out.

The president at the time was Victor Butterfield. Vic was extraordinarily innovative. I came to understand this later, I didn't hear it at the time, but he was widely regarded nationally as perhaps the most impressive, successful and prestigious college president in the United States. He was highly regarded. He had excellent relationships with foundations, such as the Ford Foundation. He thought of himself as having a lot of access to foundation money, which he in some sense did, at least for a time, but that turned out to be something of an illusion.

Wesleyan was in an expansive phase. When I came here in 1963, my class of newly recruited faculty members numbered 50 people, and that constituted a substantial portion of the Wesleyan faculty, about a sixth. And of those 50 people, 49 were men. There was one woman who was a young assistant professor of physics. She stayed for a year or two. Then she left and went to the University of Connecticut. It was a totally male faculty. It was a totally male student body. The student body was about 1,100 people. It was dominated by fraternities socially. That was the atmosphere I stepped into in 1963.

I immediately started teaching. I had done some teaching as a graduate student at Berkeley as a teaching assistant, but now I was responsible for an introductory course and courses in social psychology and human motivation and research methods and techniques and statistics. The course load was two courses each semester, which is not bad. This was 1963, and that was the course load – certainly reasonable, much less than my Trinity professors were teaching.

The expectation was stated clearly that Wesleyan professors were meant to be not just teachers. You're meant to be a scholar, and you're meant to publish. There was a great amount of the seeds of tenure anxiety that were floating about. The story we were told as new faculty members is that you may think you're hot stuff, but you're probably not going to get tenure at Wesleyan because the

place is growing. The idea was that Wesleyan was only going to accept the best people nationally for full-time positions at the university – that it could afford to be highly selective.

I was told that at the outset. It was kind of daunting, but it wasn't defeating. If anything, it provided some incentive to get busy and do things.

Christine Foster: Right.

Karl Scheibe: Okay. One feature early on in my career has a lot to say about Wesleyan at the time, and I'll say a little bit about the atmosphere of the place. In career terms, important things happened to me in my first year as a faculty member. I came in 1963, taught two courses in the fall, was teaching the two courses in the spring term. Just before spring break, I had a visit from Jules Holzberg, at the time an Adjunct Professor. (He was the father of Robert Holzberg who is now a former judge and a prominent lawyer. You may know of him.) Jules was in the psychology department at Connecticut Valley Hospital and was affiliated with the psychology department at Wesleyan as well.

He came to me with an invitation. He said he wanted me to think of applying for a federal grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, NIMH. (It was known at NIMH at the time. It changed its name later as part of the National Institute of Health and then later to Health and Human Services.) Holzberg wanted me to apply for a grant to evaluate an experimental program called the Connecticut Service Corps. The Connecticut Service Corps was a summer program involving the recruitment of college students to work on the chronic closed wards of the four state mental hospitals in the state of Connecticut at the time. They recruited 100 students nationwide to work in the hospital settings as an entering wedge to break up the paralysis of closed wards in mental hospitals.

Not knowing much about the program, but regarding this as an assignment I might have received in graduate school, I said okay. I spent two weeks in my first spring break in 1964 writing a grant application to the National Institute of Mental Health. I was informed six weeks or two months later that it was successful.

I was all of a sudden a co-principal investigator, with Connecticut's Commissioner of Mental Health, on a fairly substantial grant that

enabled me to hire a staff of people. I hired several research assistants, including one fellow whom I'd been a graduate student with at Berkeley who was a statistical whiz, and who I knew was looking for a job. So I got him to come the following year and work with me. I also hired a former colleague from Trinity College who had just received his PhD at University of Connecticut.

I had a staff of psychologists and other students who were working out in the field. So all of a sudden I had this large research grant. I had a couple of rooms in the department to house my staff.

It was not the kind of research I had imagined myself doing, frankly. You could say I just took the opportunity. I was not, and never really had been that kind of opportunistic person, but I couldn't turn down the chance to direct this grant. It was money, and it was success, and it was access to a lot of good things. I took the grant. It's a good thing I did--because it was a very important career step for me. I hit the ground running at Wesleyan.

I'd like to say a word about Victor Butterfield. I didn't know this when I came in '63, but his Wesleyan career was winding down. Vic Butterfield actually retired from Wesleyan in 1967 just four years after I came.

Because of the curious history of my being recruited at Wesleyan, I'd never met him in person prior to joining the faculty. Vic made a point of almost hand selecting his faculty. A lot of faculty members who were on the faculty at that time were people whom Vic had gone to meet and picked out and hired with or without the consent of the departments. He was really that aggressive and ambitious in forming a faculty. He formed a splendid faculty in that fashion. Since I had been hired so abruptly, he wanted to get to know me.

This resulted in the following occurrence. It was in my first semester. I was sitting up in my office at 8:30, 9 o'clock one evening. We lived just a couple blocks from campus, so I walked to my office because I was preparing for my class the following day, and there was a knock at my door. I asked the person to come in, and it turned out to be Vic Butterfield. He said that he saw my light on and just thought he would stop around and say hello because he'd never met me. He sat down and interviewed me and talked with me for a good half hour. I thought, "Whoa, this is amazing!" What college president is slumming around at night and comes to

meet a young, wet-behind-the-ears assistant professor. I was really impressed with that display of interest.

In the beginning, I was scared to death of the responsibility of teaching. I never really had full responsibility for a course before. I over prepared and probably brought in sheaves of notes that I never got through. Later, because Wesleyan students are good and understanding, they would forgive my compulsiveness and got me to be more relaxed about preparation. My teaching began to go better. It was never terrible, but I surely had a tendency to over prepare when I first began and not to give enough time for engagement and discussion and involvement of students. The students turned out to be wonderful. I quickly recruited people from among the students I was teaching to help out in research projects. That turned out to be just delightful.

I have a note to say something about the College of Quantitative Studies. There is currently no College of Quantitative Studies, but there was at that time. The first two colleges formed at Wesleyan were the College of Letters and College of Social Studies. The College of Quantitative Studies was formed principally by Bob Rosenbaum, Professor of Mathematics, and later Provost, who was one of the people we interviewed in this oral history project about seven years ago. He's now 101 years old.

Christine Foster: Wow.

Karl Scheibe: Rosenbaum lives in Colorado, is still alive and well. It was he who was the director and founding father of the College of Quantitative Studies. Rosenbaum passed the leadership of CQS on to Bob Singleton. Singleton stopped by my office one day and asked me if I wanted to join the staff of CQS, and he described the program to me. It was an interdisciplinary program emphasizing quantitative studies, and the students work on a tutorial basis mostly with faculty members from a variety of fields. They were looking to have somebody in the behavioral sciences join CQS, and I knew a lot about statistics. So when I was invited to join CQS I accepted the invitation.

Within a year or two I was the acting director of CQS because I had come along well in the program, got along well with people. I was asked to be the acting director to cover a leave for Bob Singleton. But then I became part of a subcommittee that was evaluating the

College of Quantitative Studies, and it was the decision of the subcommittee that CQS ought not to be continued as a college because at the time, all of the science departments were developing Ph.D. programs. The CQS in some ways competed for resources and good students with the Ph.D. programs. It was clear that was not the way to go, so the recommendation was that CQS be discontinued. In 1968, it was discontinued. I was there just three or four years, but it actually turned out to be an important part of my story. Because of CQS for example, I met a guy who was recruited to come to Wesleyan and spend a year at the Center for Advanced Studies. His name was Daniel Patrick Moynihan, who later became a United States Senator from New York.

Christine Foster: Yes.

Karl Scheibe: He came to Wesleyan to spend a year at the Center for Advanced Studies, with an affiliation to the CQS. He was actually in New York City, and then came to Wesleyan for a year, and thereafter went to Harvard, and became first an ambassador to India and then senator. This turned out to be an important contact. I got to know him quite well because of his assignment to CQS.

Anyway, a lot of good things happened as a result of CQS. I mentioned in my notes that there was a faculty ball each year – it was a party to which everyone came. You couldn't hide at Wesleyan as a new person. You were included in all kinds of things in and out of your department. There were a lot of social events. All the women who were wives of faculty members were automatically invited to join in an organization called the Monday Club. The Monday Club had existed when we got here, and Wendy was invited. She never was attracted to the Monday Club because it was perceived as a bunch of old ladies, and she didn't really think of herself as one of those gals. Nonetheless, it says something about the atmosphere of Wesleyan. It was intensely social, and there was a lot of entertaining, a lot of parties, a lot of stuff going on. It was engaging and enjoyable and exciting and electric. And you had the sense in the faculty that this wasn't a cozy little college with superannuated professors around. There were people here who had something to say, who had missions, who had visions, who had things to do, making their marks.

There's was a sense of being avant garde, on the edge of things, particularly true because of the arts, music, and theater people who

were around Wesleyan. The sciences were on the move because of their Ph.D. programs. The people in the arts were involved in the development of their new center. The social studies, government, and economics departments and so on were always strong.

I was quickly recruited to become part of a committee that was responsible for the formation of the sociology department at Wesleyan since I'm a social psychologist. Anthropology also became a new department in the late 1960's. It had been part of psychology, then split off and became a separate department.

Christine Foster: Right.

Karl Scheibe: A lot was happening. It was yeasty as an atmosphere at the time...I mentioned the grant and Jules Holzberg. I want to mention something else that happened in 1966, which is a key event.

In 1965, I was invited by my mentor Ted Sarbin to go back to Berkeley and spend a summer working with him and some fellow students on some research projects that he was doing.

I received some support from the Connecticut Service Corps grant, and went to California for the summer and did my supervision by telephone with one of my deputies here. I spent several months at UC Berkeley and then went back to Connecticut. I went to Berkeley for another visit in the following summer. In 1966, I was on my way there, when in the office of my brother who lived in San Francisco, we received a telephone call from Brazil informing us that our brother who had gone to Brazil as a missionary pilot was killed in the airplane accident. This was my eldest brother, Bob.

That was the emotionally the hardest thing I had ever encountered in my life--the loss of my brother. It was devastating to me. It changed my life because it led me to Brazil. He had a wife and children who were in Brazil and who needed to come back to the United States when he was killed. My dad had gone down to be with my brother in Brazil because my dad was a minister and retired and joined by my brother down in Brazil, in the interior of Minas Gerais, not in the city anywhere, working on a variety of odd jobs. He was wonderful mechanically. He brought to Brazil a whole machine shop. He was working merrily along in this little interior town in Brazil when my brother died. My dad decided to stay in Brazil.

So I decided and convinced my wife that we ought also to go to Brazil. In 1967 with two children, one of whom was three years old, and one of whom was six months old, we went to Brazil in the fall of 1967 because of the death of my brother. We did not go to the remote interior town where my brother had lived, but rather settled in the city of Belo Horizonte, capital of Minas Gerais. I decided to learn Portuguese, and to go to Brazil. I had a book to write that was apart from my work on the Connecticut Service Corps. But I also had all that service corps research to write up and publish as well, which I did. I wrote probably a half dozen substantial articles while I was in Brazil, but I also wrote a book called *Beliefs and Values*, which grew out of my thesis work at Berkeley under the mentorship of Ted Sarbin.

Besides writing my first book in that year, I also began to learn Portuguese. I ended up teaching a course in social psychology at the University of Brasilia, the first course in social psychology they'd ever had presented in that place because the city was only 10 years old. It was a life-changing experience for us. It really started with the death of my brother in 1966.

During the year in Brazil, I had received tenure at Wesleyan along the way in May of 1968. I got a little half-page letter from the chairman of the psychology department that said "Dear Karl, you have just been awarded tenure. Congratulations! More later." I was in my fifth year at Wesleyan. Normally the year for tenure decisions at Wesleyan is the seventh year so it was two years early. Jules Holzberg thought that I deserved tenure, so he pushed it along. I received the promotion notification by regular mail because there was no e-mail at the time and no telephone contact either.

We returned to Wesleyan in the summer of 1968. When we came back to Wesleyan it seemed that the world had changed. It was a heady time. It was the year of the police riot in Chicago, at the Democratic National Convention. It was the year that Martin Luther King was killed. It was the year that Robert Kennedy was killed. It was a year of turmoil. At Wesleyan, in 1965 -- two years before I left to go to Brazil -- they had begun to recruit black students on campus in an aggressive way. Now in 1968, diversity was a major theme on campus. In the class of 1969, the so-called vanguard class, there were not just one or two Negroes in the class, but 12 or so stalwart black students, one of whom is still a good friend of mine.

It was a great time. While the diversity movement began about that time, it soon included the initiative to admit women. By 1970, Wesleyan women were recruited as part of the regular freshman class. Some had come as transfer students and exchange students before that.

Wendy was offered a part-time position in the Admissions Office. She continued to work in that office for almost 20 years – it was a career for her, and a most successful and enjoyable one.

The time was an exciting time, nationally, and for Wesleyan, really significant. Vic Butterfield had left in 1967. He was replaced by Ted Etherington. Etherington seemed ready to change the world. He was known as Super Ted. He was recruited at Wesleyan because he was at the time the President of the American Stock Exchange. He was thought of as a financial wizard who would come in and do good things for us. What he mostly did was to spend our money in a short time and to put us in a real financial bind. He then got ambitious and decided to run for the Senate in 1970 in his third year as president. He hadn't completed three years. He became a candidate for the Republican nomination for the Senate, resigned his position as President at Wesleyan in order to run for the Senate. He wasn't nominated. But nevertheless, we were out a president. So the aforementioned Bob Rosenbaum became Acting President at Wesleyan. A national search ended up producing as a result the presidency of Colin Campbell, who had been Etherington's lieutenant at the American Stock Exchange. He began his presidency in 1970-71.

When we came back from Brazil, all these things were happening, and Wesleyan was utterly transformed. We had a substantial minority presence and had become co-educational. Within a year or two, all of the curricular requirements had changed, and the structure of the curriculum had changed. The Ph.D. programs that were incipient when I first came now were big and strong and powerful. We had half a dozen Ph.D. programs in the sciences which were commanding the innovative attention of much of the faculty. Some of us, of course, who weren't on the boat for Ph.D. programs were trying to get on the boat but it was too late, because of the financial crisis. There wasn't funding available for new programs. They were far too expensive.

It's a good thing, in my opinion, that more PhD programs were not founded at that time. The Psychology Department had a full-blown proposal that Jules Holzberg had developed, but it was never funded. It was approved by the requisite committees, but never funded.

Jules Holzberg was the person responsible for my promotion to tenure in 1968. He also was responsible for my promotion to full professor in 1973, during my second sabbatical year in Brazil. Then he died in February of 1973. When I came back from my sabbatical in 1973 having once again been in Brazil, I found myself a brand new full professor. I was soon the only full professor in the department remaining because Bob Knapp, died in early 1974.

In 1973, I was a full professor and chair of the Psychology Department. I was 36 years old, and had a lot of career life ahead of me.

Christine Foster: Yeah.

Karl Scheibe: I had a lot of visibility, a lot of prominent positions. Things were going well. I was married with two kids. As I have mentioned, when I came back from my first sabbatical, Wendy had obtained a job in the admissions office, working as an Assistant Dean of Admissions. She later became an Associate Dean of Admissions for Wesleyan, and she carried on for almost 20 years in that capacity. Her tenure as a Wesleyan employee began after our first sabbatical year.

We were getting really engaged and involved with Wesleyan and our careers with Wesleyan. -- A Fulbright led us back to Brazil in 1972, In 1972-73, my second sabbatical, some support came from Wesleyan for a sabbatical to be sure, but I was on a Fulbright teaching fellowship in São Paulo, Brazil at the Catholic University. I taught there, in Portuguese, for that entire academic year in 1972-73. In 1973, I became chair of the psychology department, as I mentioned before. I had been promoted to full professor, and I started getting elected to major university committees like the academic Advisory Committee.

I started serving almost every year for about 8 or 10 years on the Advisory Committee at Wesleyan, and served as Vice-Chair of the Committee twice. This was significant because that meant I met

every week with the President who always met with the Advisory Committee. That is no longer the case, but it was at the time.

The Campbell years began at Wesleyan in 1970. Colin was president here for 18 years. He and I became good friends. Our children became good friends. They played hockey together. There was a sense of family and of acceptance and friendship within the community and the administration.

In some ways, I have to say, that at that time, approaching now mid-career, I had a sense that I was getting ambitious to do something else. I wanted some new challenges, not just to be a professor all my life, reading from yellowed notes, but to do something else.

The first book I ever published was written in Brazil, as I mentioned previously. But I published a lot of stuff in journals, kept an active research career. Then in 1979, I published a second book called *Mirrors, Masks, Lies, and Secrets*, of which I was quite proud. It was an unusual book. That is to say there were some experiments, and there were data that were driving the arguments in the book, but it was largely a conceptual and theoretical exploration of the whole question of human predictability and the extent to which human beings can be predicted by other human beings. This has been a major aspiration of psychology ever since the discipline was formed – and my book was a straight-on examination of that topic.

I really enjoyed writing that book and still think of it as having been a rather substantial accomplishment for me. It didn't set any records for sales or add it to my stature as a world scholar in any substantial way, but it was certainly a worthwhile piece of work, and it was recognized as such within my domain.

All during this period I continued my collaboration with Ted Sarbin. I mention my work with him back in 1965, when I was at Berkeley for that summer. We continued to collaborate on projects, publishing things together occasionally, visiting often. Our families became close. He became like a grandfather to my children. They thought of him as almost a family member and important person for us. We went out to California frequently, particularly because my two brothers, not the brother that was killed, but my two other brothers ended up living on the West coast in California, so there

was a lot of reason to continue the California trips, more or less annually. This continues to this day because both brothers still live in California.

Sarbin came to Wesleyan on two occasions, as a scholar first in the Center for Advanced Studies in 1968-'69, right after my first sabbatical. He also came back to Wesleyan for another stint at the Center for the Humanities in 1974 and spent another semester here. We tried hard to recruit him as a professor at Wesleyan and just about did. He and his wife had too much of an attachment to California culture and California ways of living, and despite several overtures, he declined the invitation to join the Wesleyan faculty.

I have mentioned to you this itch or ambition I had to become something other than just the psychologist who stayed at Wesleyan for an entire career. It took me some time, but I did fashion a career change.

An opportunity moved into view in about 1983 because of a student (Michael Angelides) I had taught in the Master's program in the psychology department who later went on to become a co-owner of the Stonington Institute, which is a drug and alcohol rehabilitation hospital in North Stonington, Connecticut. He invited me to come out to the Stonington Institute and start consulting with them doing evaluations of patients. They had a problem with a clinical director who departed from them suddenly, so I was made acting clinical director for summer in 1984.

I got involved in clinical work. In order to represent yourself as a psychologist in the state of Connecticut, you have to be licensed, and licensure is not easy. It used to be easy. When I first came to Wesleyan in 1963, the chair of the department at the time, Bob Knapp, said that for 50 bucks he could get me certified as a psychologist, which meant that one can practice professionally. I said that I didn't intend to practice professionally, so I did not spend the 50 bucks. What a stupid thing to have declined--because by the time, now 1984, I wanted to get licensed as a psychologist, it had become a major, major issue. It wasn't just paying \$50. You had to pass examinations. There are state-run exams. You have to qualify. You have to have taken a prescribed range of courses. You had to do an internship. You had to do all kinds of stuff in order to

qualify to take the examinations, pass them, and call yourself a psychologist.

When I was working at Stonington Institute in the summers or one day a week during academic year, it wasn't entirely legitimate. I couldn't call myself a psychologist because I was not licensed. So I studied for the examinations and got documentation of my graduate program and affidavits from former professors and managed to qualify to sit for the examination in 1986, 23 years after receiving my Ph.D. I then sat for the examination to get licensed as a psychologist in Connecticut, passed the exam, and thereafter was able to practice psychology as a psychologist and not just a teacher and researcher.

That was a major accomplishment as it turned out. That made me at the time the only licensed psychologist on the faculty -- actually one of the few licensed psychologists in Middletown. Steve Bank was here. There were a few other people, but not many at all. When I was speaking of a second career, it turned out that clinical work filled the bill. Within a few years, I formed a partnership with a fellow whom I had come to know at Stonington Institute, Duff Chambers. We founded the Saybrook Counseling Center in Old Saybrook in 1990. We bought a house and converted the house into a counseling center. Part of the house became a waiting room, and part of the house became counseling rooms. We hired clinical associates to come and see people as well. We had as many as five or six other psychologists in the place, seeing 30, 40 people a week, 50 people a week. It was a growing business.

In 1996, I bought out Duff Chambers and kept the business. I bought him out because he felt more comfortable seeing patients in Niantic where he lived rather than coming to Old Saybrook for all of his appointments. I owned the house now and kept the practice entirely, with a staff of psychologists, from '96 until 2008. I ran the practice as the director of the Saybrook Counseling Center.

During that period I began cutting back on my involvement at Wesleyan, no longer being candidate for chair of the department and no longer serving on major university committees. I had a clinical practice and that was taking a lot of time. This was facilitated by my taking early partial retirement from the Wesleyan faculty, starting in 1998. This allowed me to teach half-time for the remainder of my active faculty career, until 2005.

Before the early partial retirement, I was teaching a full load at Wesleyan and seeing about 20 clients a week in Old Saybrook. Wendy was not happy with this arrangement. She did not like it that she didn't see much of me. I just wasn't home. I was so involved with things, and even involved with things at the church (First Church of Christ, Congregational) at the same time. It was just overwhelming. I had to cut back at Wesleyan or else die in the process. I continued my practice at Old Saybrook until 2006, sold the practice in 2008, and then came to Middletown to see a few residual clients. I began to see a few people a week here in an office that was used by Steve Bank on William Street. I continue to do that to this day. One half-day each week I see clinical clients.

My turn to clinical work began in the early eighties. It meant diminishing my role at Wesleyan. I was chair of the psychology department for a year or two in the mid-80s, but that was it. I wasn't going to do that anymore. I began to be less involved with the psychology department.

But I should mention as well an important change in my focus in teaching. Starting in 1979, I taught for the first time an experimental course called "The dramaturgical approach to psychology". It was a course meant to combine psychology and theater. My mentor, Ted Sarbin had been Mr. Role Theory in social psychology, introducing the perspectives of social role theory into the major domains of psychology. I thought to take this approach seriously in teaching--not just a seminar or a lecture course, but a participatory course where the students would provide much of the energy for the enterprise through role-playing improvisation, and study of dramatic texts.

I taught this course for the first time in 1979, and continued to teach it until after I retired – about twenty five times, including a couple of years when I doubled up and taught two sections. I retired in 2005, but I continued to teach the course as a post-retirement experiment for three years after retirement. It's an important item for me because it turned out to be something that had its own life.

You can see open on my desk in front of me now, an edition of the book *Hamilton*, which is based on the play *Hamilton*, currently playing in New York. The fellow whose picture is on that open page is Lin-Manuel Miranda who was a student of mine who came to Wesleyan in the fall of 1998, was assigned to me by chance as an

advisee. I came to know him well. He was interested in theater and interested in psychology and took my course. We became good friends, and he went on to become who he is--one of the most famous people--not just that Wesleyan has ever produced, but one of the most famous celebrities now in the United States.

It is worth pausing to provide a summary of my record of publishing books. The first book was the one I wrote on my first sabbatical in Brazil, *Beliefs and Values*, which helped me win tenure. I then published a general treatment of the problem of human predictability, *Mirrors, Masks, Lies and Secrets* in 1979. This was followed by an edited volume with Vernon Allen which was a collection of Sarbin's early research papers, *The Social Context of Conduct* in 1982. Sarbin and I published collection of papers in 1985 called *Studies in Social Identity*. My third individually authored book was *Self Studies*, in 1995. The course I taught on psychology and theater provided the context for the next book to be published, called *The Drama of Everyday Life*, which was published by Harvard University Press in 2000. This book also was a claim to fame for me as someone who occupied the territory that combined psychology and theater. I have a book in press currently that includes original chapters on the life and work of Ted Sarbin, together with reprints of ten of the last publications he produced in his life (*The Storied Nature of Human Life: The Life and Work of Theodore R. Sarbin*, to be released later this year.)

The current book I'm working on finishing is called *Deep Drama: Explorations in Psychology and Theater*. I continue to exploit the territory that joins psychology and theater. The final chapter I'm writing now is called "Wisdom from *Hamilton*", which has to do with articulating psychological insights that are reflected in the play *Hamilton* as it's performed. It is rich!

I've been talking for about an hour – and perhaps the time has come to take a break and then to begin to organize some thoughts for our next conversation.

Christine Foster: You've done beautifully. One thing I realize you haven't said is how you got involved with the Wasch Center.

Karl Scheibe: No, I haven't said anything about that. It really comes in the next phase of our interview.

Christine Foster: So we'll stop now, and we'll schedule another time to do that last 15, 17 years.

Karl Scheibe: Does that work?

Christine Foster: Sounds great. That sounds perfect.

Christine Foster: Okay, we are back. This is Christine Foster with Karl Scheibe in the Wasch Center at Wesleyan University on February 13th, 2017. This is part two of our oral history interview.

Karl Scheibe: Okay.

Christine Foster: Tell me where to go from here.

Karl Scheibe: First of all, we started off more or less chronologically with my description of the Karl Scheibe who prepared to come to Wesleyan, who came to Wesleyan, and who got his first exposure to teaching and research here. Went to Brazil--we talked about that, and came back, and Wesleyan life resumed. I think we more or less rounded off our first discussion with somewhere around 2000, in that decade. By that time, I think my Wesleyan career had entered a phase of what I think of as a transformation away from direct and central involvement with committees and administrative responsibilities, and more toward my own individual activities, including the development of a private practice. And later, I was involved in the development of the Wasch Center, of course.

I'd like to mention the development in 1979 of a course called. *The Dramaturgical Approach to Psychology*, because it was a pivotal event for much that came later. My mentor, Ted Sarbin, was a social psychologist and a clinical psychologist, and a strong advocate of role theory in social psychology. That meant taking social roles seriously, and conceptualizing a lot of issues in psychology in terms of social roles. He included things such as the traditional problem of mental illness. He thought of mental illness as a bad metaphor, because it located the problem in the person: You're sick. You're ill. But for him, something like a disordered person has to be considered in context, the social context primarily. He was a strong advocate of taking the social role theory approach to a lot of issues and problems in psychology. This had a huge effect on me.

I thought of taking a new and radical approach to teaching based on role theory. Can we take this theatrical and dramatic way of looking at things and transport it directly into teaching? And the answer was, "Yes." The "The Dramaturgical Approach to Psychology" turned out to be remarkably rewarding for me, and it was also extraordinarily popular with students who took it. It was a source of satisfaction and pride for me, in terms of doing something distinctive and positive as a teacher.

That was significant for me, but other than being a course that was offered uniquely at Wesleyan University, it had little to do with Wesleyan per se. It was just a course that I offered here. But, having said that, one of the reasons I think Wesleyan was a great job for me to take back in 1963 when I came here, was that it offered me freedom to be idiosyncratic and not to be a conventional research psychologist, or practicing psychologist. I was allowed and even encouraged to make my own way in the field, and to be inventive and original. I think I succeeded, more with that course than any other single stroke, in doing something that really was quite original. It was a satisfaction for me to be able to do that.

Let's go back. There are some things that I want to mention that are chronological and some things which are not entirely chronological. Back in the late '70s, for example, I want to mention an episode that, for me, was important. I had been involved early on in my Wesleyan career in a lot of central committees, including the advisory committee and chair of my department several times. I was a regular attender of faculty meetings, and highly attentive to general issues that occupy the mind and attention of Wesleyan faculty members and administrators. I knew Colin Campbell well, the president during the '70s and '80s, and we were good friends. I took my responsibilities as a faculty member seriously.

In the mid-'70s, after Ted Etherington left it was plain to see that our financial welfare as an institution had deteriorated mightily in a decade. In the mid-'70s, I prepared an analysis of why Wesleyan's finances had gone to Hell in a handbasket, which they had. A seminal meeting took place in May of 1978. It took place because I and other faculty members were upset about Wesleyan's financial position and policies. As a result, we were not getting raises on the faculty and new program development was most difficult. We were not doing as well financially as we had

previously, and the institutions with which we compare ourselves seemed to be doing better than us. We were losing ground rapidly.

A group of faculty members met to consider this problem with the intention of making a contribution to its resolution. I was appointed to approach the administration with the objective of having a joint meeting between the entire faculty and the Wesleyan Board of Trustees, which had never been done before or since. That meeting was held in May of 1978. I was the person appointed to address that joint meeting. That was an occasion where the faculty could say to the Board, "This is a fine institution, but financial management has not been great. We haven't been raising enough money. Our portfolio of investments has not performed well. We have been overspending our budget, and as a faculty . . . our compensation hasn't increased much recently, and we're concerned about this whole situation."

It was a difficult meeting, but it was one that was in some ways, epochal. It marked an important moment in the development of the consideration of financial policies and procedures. Thereafter, a great deal of attention was given to finances. In the remainder of the Campbell administration we started getting budgets more in balance. Fundraising activities were increased and deficit spending was diminished. I don't want to go into a long discourse about this. In many ways, it is a story that continues to unfold. Wesleyan was an extremely rich institution for a brief period of time in the 1960's – and the aspiration to greatness that formed in those times was profoundly significant. But the readjustment to a more modest level of support has been difficult.

Because of my role in that process, I came to be identified as a person who could speak to these issues. For the last several years, during commencement and reunion weekend as returning alumni have been attending their 50th reunions, I've been part a small panel of people who have been convened to talk to returning classes about how Wesleyan went from riches to ruins, and is now regaining its financial well-being. If there was a component of my identity as a faculty member that was in some ways salient or remarkable, it would be my identification with issues of financial management positions and policies.

Karl Scheibe:

What else?

Christine Foster: Looks like you wanted to talk about Bill Chace?

Karl Scheibe: Yes, Bill Chace, for sure. I am reminded that in these oral history interviews that you are conducting, there are probably darker stories that do not get plainly told. In my own case, I think of my involvement with discussions of Wesleyan's financial position and related policy questions with some misgivings – in that I am not sure I was as enlightened 25 years ago about these matters as I thought I was. I don't regret saying what I have said or doing what I have done, but history has a way of providing new perspectives on old and familiar issues. For example, I have long been a critic of Wesleyan's development of Ph.D. programs in the sciences. I still think I was right to be critical in this way. But I think I have a more rounded and nuanced understanding of these issues now than what I was thinking 25 years ago. I'm not sure I was as self-aware as I should have been about my own place in the university and how I could best serve the common enterprise.

Looking back, I can see that I would generally say "yes" to opportunities that were offered to me. For example, Bill Chace came here in 1988-89. '89 was his first year, his inaugural year. I was asked by Bill Chace to chair his inaugural committee. I said, "Sure, I'll do that." I took a lot of time, maybe six months, to prepare the whole thing, from his appearance on campus to his inauguration in October of 1989. I did that, and became pretty close him, which is in some ways remarkable, because shortly after he hit campus, he became remarkably unpopular with just about everyone else – including close friends of mine.

In particular, he became unpopular because he didn't want to concede that Wesleyan was really a university. He himself had been an undergraduate at Haverford College in Pennsylvania, which is a place even smaller than Wesleyan. Then he'd gone on to quite a distinguished career as a Professor of English, and ended up at Stanford University in a major administrative position before he came to Wesleyan. But he considered that Wesleyan was much more like Haverford than it was like Stanford. That is simply true, but it wasn't a popular truth. He took the position that we're really a liberal arts college with a few bells and whistles, rather than a true university. That made him immensely unpopular – even as I thought he spoke the truth.

He was an enormously effective speaker, but he was not a people-pleaser. He didn't go around trying to make people happy. He would often say things that were distinctly unpopular and undiplomatic, but he would say them very well and in a very pointed way. So here I was, identified with him, because I'd agreed to be the manager of his inauguration.

And indeed, the inauguration took place on that October day, and I thought the planning for it was quite complete and good. We were going to have it outdoors, but it became clear by midday that severe rains were in the offing. By the time we assembled the inaugural parade, it was raining cats and dogs, and so we ended up having the inauguration in the old field house (which no longer is standing).

It was amazing, for a whole variety of reasons. Chace gave an inaugural address which was really an in-your-face challenge to the community. He wasn't trying to please the faculty or anybody else. He was saying, "You are a college. We are a college, and that's what we should aspire to, and not some major university," although he honored the graduate programs and said appropriate things. But the faculty was furious. A couple individuals on the faculty in particular were really burned off at Chace.

Moreover, in the course of that inaugural event, there was a student demonstration. A pair of black students came up and made a strongly threatening gesture, putting shotgun shells on the podium as Chace was delivering his inaugural address. Their presence, and the way it was presented was extraordinarily menacing. They finally left, but it was tense. The music for the inauguration, which was meant to be performed outdoors, was composed by Alvin Lucier, who is an experimental composer. He doesn't compose traditional, melodic music. He had a bunch of wooden blocks that he had people banging together, and it made a cacophony of sound. Inside the field house, there were people who could barely stand it because it was so loud.

So, you had this music which was crazy. You had this demonstration which was threatening. You had Chace, who was delivering this in-your-face address, and you had the field house packed with people who were subjected to this entire ordeal. And you had then me, who was identified with having organized the entire parade. It was a difficult moment for me personally. I never

did join the hate team for Bill Chace. I always did like him. I thought he was an extraordinary man--just ill-fitted for Wesleyan at the time. But nonetheless, it's an episode that I think, at least for me, was significant.

Chace was here for five years, before leaving for the presidency of Emory University in Atlanta in 1994.

Just as he was leaving, there was a report filed that was the product of a subcommittee working within the science division, Division 3, to evaluate the Ph.D. programs at Wesleyan 25 years after their having been founded. The objective was to look at them as a group and to make a general evaluation of their success in terms of adding to the quality of Wesleyan's stature with God and Man.

I read the report of a committee which was chaired by David Beveridge in the Chemistry Department. To my mind, it was an utter whitewash. It didn't call attention to the patently obvious fact that the Ph.D. programs were financially disastrous. In the previous signal encounter that I mentioned having to do with the joint meeting of the Board of Trustees and the faculty, the unnamed villain in our decline in financial resources was the amount of money that it cost us to mount and maintain those Ph.D. programs. A lot of grant money was promised that never materialized. Initially there was some grant support, but nowhere near what was anticipated. But then the grant money dried up, or if did no dry up completely, it slowed to a trickle.

In Chace's final semester here was a presentation of this report at a faculty meeting. I was at that time the vice-chair of the faculty. I said, "I probably shouldn't speak to this directly, but I'm going to, because life is short and this document is something that I think is transparently false, so I'm going to say why I think so." I made a 20-minute speech on the floor of the faculty meeting, one of the very last meetings that Bill Chace had with the faculty, and told the entire faculty why I thought, in retrospect, that the establishment of Ph.D. programs at Wesleyan in the sciences had been a mistake.

That was a very flat-footed thing to say but I said it. Again, I earned the enmity of a lot of colleagues. But you know what? Later on you make friends with people, and the clouds pass over. The point is, I took the occasion to say something that was unpopular, but that I think was true. As a matter of fact, that issue still is unresolved, but

if anything, the truth that I was pointing to in 1994 is more pronounced now than it was then. That is to say, the graduate science programs at Wesleyan are third-rate, and our undergraduate programs are first-rate. That was the case then and it's even more the case now. I'm sorry, that's an unpopular position to take because it's not the party line within the faculty, but it is the position that I took then and still maintain, although with more acceptance of the inevitable.

It's part of the reason, in some ways, for my self-marginalization from Wesleyan, because I could see that the position I was representing and was speaking to was in general not supported by the powers that be within the faculty. I said, in effect, "I've said my piece and that's enough. I'm not going to make a career of this, I'll just do things that I find to be rewarding."

The things I found to be rewarding included establishing my private practice. I mentioned getting licensed as a clinician in '86, and then establishing the Saybrook Counseling Center in Old Saybrook in 1990. I started teaching a reduced teaching load as soon as it was possible to do so, so that I could devote more time to my clinical work. That meant less teaching in the department. But I always continued to teach that Dramaturgical Approach to Psychology course. I also continued to teach departmental service courses, including the introductory course, which I taught many times, even in those latter years.

The last decade of my teaching at Wesleyan was at a reduced load, concentrating on that Dramaturgical Approach to Psychology course, some honors theses, and teaching the introductory course. My committee service at Wesleyan then really disappeared almost entirely. If I had extra time, I would devote it to my clinical practice, and did build up a successful practice and business in Old Saybrook.

Christine Foster: Doug Bennet, Bill Wasch, and the founding of the Wasch Center. Chronologically that seems like the next logical spot.

Karl Scheibe: That's the next logical thing, for sure. I admired Doug Bennet. I was the vice chair and then the chair of the faculty the year he was appointed president. He's a Wesleyan alumnus, he is not a self-aggrandizing, self-important person. He has both an academic background and an administrative background. He came from

National Public Radio in Washington, where he had for some years been head of that operation. He used to be called "Mr. Mumbles," because his speaking style was kind of indistinct. But he was a man of considerable integrity and character, who had the right kinds of values about Wesleyan and managed to produce financial stability for us, and a good atmosphere on campus. He provided a welcome relief from the Chace years that preceded him. He was generally well-received on campus. I surely liked him.

Again, in the Chace years, one had the feeling ... I certainly had the feeling...that if you needed to talk to somebody important about something, you would talk to the President, because he was willing to listen to you. He was an open-door guy, and he was easy to approach, for me and for a lot of other people as well. In this respect, Doug Bennet was like Chace – each to approach.

Thoughts about retirement began for me in about 2002, as I could sense my own retirement approaching, I started meeting with retired faculty members about the possibility of doing something to make the entry into retirement more inviting – and I let Bennet know that I was organizing these meetings.

When I came to Wesleyan in 1963, there was a mandatory retirement rule. When you reached age 68, you had to retire. That rule was suspended in the early 1970s. You could then continue on teaching as long as you had a pulse. But I decided, even though that rule was suspended for mandatory retirement, that I would keep the original agreement. When I reached age 68, I would retire from the faculty, because I wanted to retire while I still had something left in the tank, could do something after retirement that would be significant and worthwhile. I began to cast around, and of course I'd established the clinical practice, as you know. That was satisfying.

In addition, as I approached retirement from Wesleyan, I had this sense that there was nothing being done for or with retired faculty members. And so, I got in touch with Andy Szegedy-Maszak, who is in Classics, who was at that time the Director of the Mellon Center for Faculty Career Development . As I have said, we started organizing some meetings of the faculty members who were around Middletown and campus and retired, but they had sort of disappeared. We got the list of retired people and their names and addresses, and we sent them invitations, and we started to have

meetings. "Talk to us about retirement. What's up? How are you guys doing? What's happening?" They were mostly guys, incidentally because at that time there were very few, if any, women who were retired faculty members.

The first remarkable thing that happened was that people came to the meetings. This is the first time that anybody had rung a bell that said "retired faculty members." They all came. The discussion was animated. We had three or four or five meetings, and then an accident occurred that was just remarkable. Someone gave me a notice that was published in a Yale publication about the established of the Koerner Center for Retired Faculty Members at Yale, which was established in 2002. Yale had been given \$10 million by the Koerner Family to endow a retired faculty center at Yale. And off they went. They acquired a building on Elm Street, they did a renovation, and they established a program. So, I said, if they did that, maybe we could do that.

Then it happened that I had a conversation with Bill Wasch, who like I, was fond of playing squash. We would have occasional faculty squash matches of an evening -- 5 or 6 o'clock, you'd play squash for an hour or two, and then you'd go to somebody's house and have pizza and beer. We did this one night in early 2003 at Bill Wasch's house on Coleman Road. During the evening, I told him about this article that I'd seen about the establishment of a retirement center at Yale. The next week he made an appointment, came in and saw me, and said that he and his wife Susie had been thinking about making a gift to Wesleyan. They proposed making a million dollar gift to Wesleyan to establish a retirement center for Wesleyan. Blew me away!

It took me just a few days to compose a three-page proposal that I then sent to Doug Bennet with this idea. I called attention to an opportunity to develop a retirement center for faculty members at Wesleyan. I told him of the meetings we had been having. I asserted that there clearly a lot of interest in this sort of thing. I noted the establishment of the center at Yale. I told him that Bill Wasch has recently spoken to me about the possibility of establishing such a center at Wesleyan. I asked for a meeting with him. He bought the meeting right away. I went in to see him, and by the time I walked out the door, we had a deal. It was that quick.

It's important to know the date was something like early 2003 when that happened. Why? Because a few years later, let's say 2007, 2008 after the recession, there's no way it would have happened. But our finances were looking relatively decent at that time. Doug Bennet was firmly established but wasn't going to be here forever. He was thinking of doing something original and good. And Bill Wasch was looking for the right opportunity to make a substantial gift to Wesleyan. Their initial pledge was for one million dollars. They gave a portion of it and pledged the rest of it. We established an ad hoc committee, a planning committee for the retirement center of half a dozen folks. We took a trip down to Yale and talked with them. They were excited, we were excited. With Bennet's support we did a survey of the faculty, beat the drums and fanned the flames a little bit, and before you knew it, we had a lot of interest and people participating in development of the retirement center.

We started then meeting to review properties that were available around the campus. It turned out that this house, 51 Lawn Avenue, was available. It had been a faculty residence, but was really too large for most faculty families. It had been sitting empty for three or four years when we first encountered it, and in the course of sitting empty, the electricity had gone off, the pipes had frozen, and there was a flood in the building. It was a mess. It was a terrible, terrible mess. Moreover, the third floor, which is now finished with individual offices, was not even lathe and plaster, it was just an unfinished attic.

Nonetheless, the university very kindly gave the house over to us. We then established a planning committee and hired an architect. Within six months to a year, we had an architect's drawings, we had a budget, and we began construction. The construction began in 2004. By the fall of 2005, we had our opening ceremony.

This was a significant development for Wesleyan, It came about first of all, because Doug Bennet was extraordinarily supportive of this idea. Bill Wasch was financially in a position to offer a major incentive for getting it going. We'd done all the spadework previously with respect to meetings with faculty members. We had the example of Yale, and the Yale people were generous in offering us aid and comfort for our new enterprise. And so off we went. We had our inaugural opening event in November of 2005, a little more than two years after the idea was formulated in Bill Wasch's kitchen.

The year 2005 is significant, because that was my retirement year from the psychology department at Wesleyan. Mind you, I had been half-time for six years prior to that, because I had been freeing up time to devote to clinical work. But it also left me even more time to do this planning for the Wasch Center. When 2005 rolled around, I retained my office in Judd Hall in the Psychology Department for the 2005-2006 academic year, but after that year I moved out of there completely. I became a resident of the Wasch Center.

In the first several years we were just beginning the Wasch Center and its programs. I continued an intensive clinical schedule down in Old Saybrook, so I was working a lot of time. The practice in Old Saybrook was working well, and I had a number of other psychologists and therapists who were working with me in that practice. But it became clear in about 2006 or -07 that I wanted out of the practice. The practice required going down to Old Saybrook five times a week, This took a lot of time. The money was good but I didn't really need to make more money. Fortunately, I had built up a retirement fund though TIAA-CREF at Wesleyan. I came here a poor preacher's kid without any financial resources at all to speak of. But because of the miracle of compound interest, and Wesleyan's rather generous retirement program, by the time I retired in 2005 I had a super-good investment in TIAA-CREF funds, which I rolled over entirely into Fidelity mutual funds. Financially, we were okay.

I never have had a salary here at the Wasch Center, which is in some ways a point of pride for me, but it turns out to be a point of difficulty later. It made finding a replacement difficult. It is likely that compensation for a Director or Directors will be needed in the future. Not necessarily salary, but something to take the edge off of nothing. This is one of the issues we're dealing with currently, to see if we can make that happen and try to raise money for the Wasch Center--additional funds beyond the initial gift. That's a challenge for now. The development of the Wasch Center has been my major concern over the last ten or twelve years, and I'm very concerned now to leave it in sustainable and good condition. This looks like it may be possible, but it isn't going to be simple. But with recent successes in finding Co-Directors and an expanded Advisory Board for next year, I am quite optimistic about our future. .

The development of the Wesleyan Institute for Lifelong Learning was simply something that came along about five years, after we established the Wasch Center. Somebody said, "Why don't we get retired faculty members to give non-credit courses in areas of interest to them to people in the community?" So we established the Wesleyan Institute for Lifelong Learning, modeled in part upon a similar program that has been established for almost 20 years now at Trinity College up in Hartford. I knew the people at Trinity well, because I'm a Trinity alumnus and former trustee there. So, I went there and visited them and got their brochures, and modeled our program on their Academy of Lifelong Learning. There was a lot of support for that. That's been going along swimmingly, I'm happy to say. Each year seems to be stronger than the year before, and that's still true now. I'm no longer directing that at all. Herb Arnold and Rick Friswell are the co-directors of the WILL program.

I mentioned Michael Roth, because Roth is, I would say, the first president with whom I have not been particularly close. He's a wonderfully energetic and intelligent man, and a distinct asset. He's a Wesleyan alumnus, and just works his butt off for this place. But he and I are not close. He's not somebody I would regard as a confidant, or somebody I was really close to in the sense that I could go talk to a Doug Bennet or a Colin Campbell. It's just the way it is, and I'm not making any judgment, it's probably as much my responsibility if not more than his.

Other thing that I should mention before we hang up our recording devices is that I have been able to continue what I regard as scholarship in the 13 years that I have spent here at the Wasch Center. I've actually written quite a lot since I've been out of the psychology department and in here. One book is in press now, already mentioned above. That book is in press with Palgrave Macmillan in London, and is due out in a few months. That book I prepared jointly with a colleague, Frank Barrett, from California who's a psychologist, who is a good friend and student of Ted Sarbin's as well. That was a labor of love. It really is a pleasure to have finished that job and to look forward to the publication of that book.

The second book is a sequel to the book that I mentioned previously, *The Drama of Everyday Life*, which was published by Harvard in 2000. This new book is also going to be published by Palgrave Macmillan, because they were willing to offer two

contracts. The second book is *Deep Drama: Explorations in Psychology and Theater*, which I just completed drafting last week. I told my son in a note I sent to him, "I think I have just written the final page of the final chapter of the final book that I shall ever write." I think that is the case. Not to say that there isn't an enormous amount of work yet to be done on the book--because there is, but the basic drafting is done.

I mentioned to you earlier in this interview that I wanted to come up to *Hamilton* again, because in some ways it's a good point with which to conclude. The major satisfaction of my career at Wesleyan has been in teaching and of seeing former students go on and do remarkable things, most of them in psychology. There are a lot of psychology professors all around the country who have taken courses here, and who have been students of mine, and with whom I maintain contact. This May, a number of people are coming back who are members of the class of 1967, celebrating their 50th anniversary, and a number of them are psychologists whom I had the pleasure of teaching when they were undergraduates back in the mid-60s.

Lin-Manuel Miranda, who is the author, progenitor and actor, at least in the early versions of *Hamilton*, was a student who happened into my course in the year 2001. He was assigned to me as an advisee back when he was a freshman, just arbitrarily, It turned out we had a lot in common, because he always had an interest in psychology, because his mother's a psychologist, and in theater, because he went to an advanced theater high school program in New York, at Hunter College High School. I met Lin when he was a freshman, and he continued to come around a lot. He took my course as soon as he could, in his junior year. In that year, I attended his first performances of the play that later became *In the Heights* in New York, his first major success. I came to know him well.

Hamilton is a phenomenon no one could have predicted, no one did predict. It's the biggest thing to have hit Broadway since *My Fair Lady* or *West Side Story*. It's just that big, if not bigger. It's called *Hamilton: The Revolution* because it really is revolutionary in a sense. It blends people of all races, it uses hip-hop and rap music styles, which most people like you and me probably think is kind of alien as an idiom in music. But it does so with brilliance and a diction that you can understand, and a guiding intelligence that is not only

intelligible, but is revelatory. It's an amazing experience to go to *Hamilton* and to see it unfold in front of you. I remember hearing some critic saying as he was sitting in *Hamilton*, "You know what? I think this is the best musical I've ever seen in my life." And he thought that was probably true for most of the people in the audience that evening.

Lin-Manuel himself has won a MacArthur Genius Award, has won something like 11 Tony's by this past year, and he was nominated for an Academy Award for another engagement in the movies.. It's been a remarkable phenomenon to have this connection with *Hamilton* through Lin-Manuel. And also through another fellow with whom I just had correspondence today. His name is Owen Panettieri.

Owen was a student in my Dramaturgical Approach to Psychology course the year after Lin. They became good friends. They were both theater majors. Owen became ... not an agent for Lin, but what I call a factotum. He was the guy who did everything, all of the chores, allowing Lin freedom to compose, and to write, and to develop his ideas and his ingenious music.

When I came to cast the chapters for the *Deep Drama* book, which I mentioned to you I've just completed, I thought that I would write a chapter at the end of the book called "Wisdom From *Hamilton*," because if there is one thing that *Hamilton* does successfully, it's to combine insights and approaches to human understanding that are based in psychological theory and fact, together with theater, quite obviously, and to do so in a dramatically revolutionary way. I thought that would comprise a fitting capstone to this enterprise of trying to write something that would show the utility of combining the perspectives of psychology and theater, so *Hamilton* served as a vehicle for that synthesis. Although I just finished the chapter last week, I think it's pretty decent, in the sense that it delivers on what it promises, namely it reveals something of the potential of that combination.

Hamilton is political. *Hamilton* is ideologically driven in some sense. It is not a simple ideology: it's pluralistic, it's inclusive, it's strongly dedicated to what you think of politically as Hamiltonianism. That is to say the importance of unity in the government and sense of nationhood of the United States of America. Because the major transformation that Hamilton himself succeeded in ushering in was

the transformation from a group of 13 colonies to one nation with a single Constitution that starts with the preamble, "We, the people of the United States of America." Not, "We, the citizens of New York, and Pennsylvania, and Virginia, and Massachusetts," but "We, the people of the United States of America." And that objective hasn't been realized in full, still, so in some sense, the play still has a job to do.

I think that's terrific, because it leaves us open to see new vistas in the future. You work at a university for your entire career, and you do what you can by way of writing and teaching, but you don't ultimately succeed in doing everything that you are trying to do. Rather, the hope is that you have made a positive difference here and there. I've often thought in some ways there's something pretentious about the role of being a professor, because being a professor means that you can profess knowledge. Being a student means that you're absorbing it. To me, the identity and stature of a student is far more legitimate than that of the professor. And the professor, in order to be a good professor, it seems to me, should still be the student always, until the very end. In this way, I want to again express gratitude to Wesleyan University, because it's allowed me in a variety of ways to continue to be not just a professor, but a student. That is, someone who's continuing to learn, to develop, and to remain open to new facts and new perspectives and new ways of understanding. I think this makes sense.

Christine Foster: Absolutely.

Karl Scheibe: I hope so. Then why don't we quit there?

Christine Foster: That sounds like a great place. Thank you so much, Karl.

Karl Scheibe: You're welcome. Thank you for doing this.