

PHIL HOLLIDAY

BLANEY COLMORE

&

BOB OAKES

(On each succeeding page, this tape will be referred to as HC&O)

Bob Oakes: ...attempt to understand it. The only reflection that I've been able to come up with...that has been given to me on this is that the Jonathan that Mike Stickway knew, he doesn't particularly want to see written about.

Colmore: Why?

Oakes: Well, I haven't gone into it...

Colmore: Well, do you know what he means when he says the Jonathan that he knew?...

Oakes: No.

Colmore: You just sort of take that...the way it is?

Oakes: I know a little bit about it, but not much.

Holliday: Does this date primarily from their having had clinical together?

Oakes: Well, I don't know. I don't know how good friends they were, before clinical. But certainly it would include a lot of that material and a lot of the relationship that came out of that summer. Stickway, when I told him that I was going to be over here tonight, got very excited and wanted me to be very sure to talk only about the things that Jonathan had told me, and not at all about the things that he had told him...He

has himself enough integrity...We have talked about Jonathan a great deal, but there has been very little relating on Mike's part of things that he and Jonathan had done. Stickway is not that kind of person to talk about the relationship he has with somebody else. And, you know, I think that's impressive.

Holliday: But, from what I know of it, it stems from not particularly wanting the Jon that they knew to be written about.

Colmore: Bob, you don't have to answer this...but I don't understand if it's a negative or a positive reaction about Jon. In other words...

Oakes: I don't know. I know that Harve and Mike---the three of them--were very close. Harve and Jon did clinical. In fact, did field work together for I think it was two years, down in Providence. And Jon's experiences down in Providence were not at all that dissimilar from his experiences everywhere else. So that the three of them had a great deal in common... a great deal of common experience...

Colmore: Bert? I think Bert's been to see you since he and Carl and I were together. Bert was very concerned about Carl trying to make that episode in our theology section sort of the big catalyst for Jon's decision to go down to Selma in the first place. And Bert had had a run-in with Jon over the way Jon

handled himself in class. And I think Bert was just genuinely afraid of being made out as being the Pontius Pilot of E.T.S., was the way he put it. He just said, "I don't want to be the Pontius Pilot of E.T.S. I'm just not interested in appearing that way for posterity."

Holliday: I don't know the record, but I was close enough to Jon that whole first semester to know that he wasn't trying...

Colmore: Well, the problem was that Bert went and had a long conversation with Jon after that class, and he really felt that Jon at that point was very paranoid. He really felt that Jon thought there were a lot of people out to get him, who Bert knew weren't out to get him at all. He just wasn't interested in going on public record that way about rubbing mud over the martyr.

S: I take it that in this, what happened was that Jon read a conservative paper on the Atonement.

Colmore: It was a lot of things.

S: You were involved in this? Bill doesn't have anything to do with this?

Colmore: The week before in section I had presented a paper and I think it was on the Atonement (I really haven't any idea what the specifics of the thing were) and I had sort of bled all over the table about how one relates to people and all this

sort of thing. It really burned Jon up. But I didn't know it at the time. It was only in retrospect that I learned it burned him up, that he thought it was really sloppy work. And that if one hadn't had a good jesuit education, he ought not to do theology in the first place. So the next week Jon came in with this great that he had stayed up all night working on, and read it out, and Carl tried to interrupt him a couple of times to clarify his language and things, and Jon put him off and just kept going. Finally it stopped. He was three-quarters of the way through it before I realized that it was a direct frontal attack on what I had done the previous week. Then Bert hammered at him at some point later, saying that he didn't think Jon was really interested in doing theology at all, but he was interested in a sort of 'having at' various members of the class. And they had sort of a heated exchange in which Jon said nobody here knew how to do theology, and he was merely trying to point out the proper way to go about it.

S: How did he go about it?

Colmore: Well, I haven't any idea, to tell you the truth. I can't remember anything about his paper except...I wasn't paying very much attention to it I don't think until guys started pointing at me and laughing and things. I wasn't even alert enough

at that point, until people brought it to my attention to realize that I was under discussion in Jon's paper...not directly...He never mentioned my name. But what he'd done is he'd taken about three phrases from my presentation which he considered particularly obnoxious and inserted them in his presentation and attacked them without mentioning my name or saying that I had done it in the previous week or anything. That's when all the lights finally went on and I finally realized what was going on.

I went and talked to Jon about it afterwards. He was laughing...He didn't seem the least bit...I was mad, because I thought he had all this hostility towards me and hadn't told me about it, and I had never picked it up, and it made me mad that he had chosen this way to do it. I told him so. He said he guessed that was wrong, and we laughed and slammed each other on the back and went our ways.

S: Was he aware that he was doing this...?

Colmore: He told me, yes...First of all, he was mad at Carl. He thought Carl was sloppy, and he was mad because Carl was sort of a naval gazer...He was always getting into these little issues, and he never would really deal with the doctrine...as sort of a major piece of work. He thought that I had sort of become more like a protege of Carl's. I was always doing

theology the way Carl wanted us to do it.

Holliday: Well, what I would like to know, just personally, is...Jon was willing to be your friend, though...?

Colmore: Yes, well, I wasn't sure, because I'd never known that he didn't think I was fine beforehand. And it suddenly occurred to me that he was mad as hell at me, but I didn't know about it until he read this paper. So, I wasn't convinced... We did part saying nice things to each other. But I wasn't at all convinced because of the fact that I hadn't known anything about this until suddenly it appeared in the midst of class.

Holliday: You're not willing to trust your own perceptions before the class.

Colmore: What do you mean?

Holliday: Maybe it wasn't all as direct as that. The paper may have been, but it wasn't all that personal.

Colmore: It may well be the case. Yes. I don't remember holding any long animosity towards Jon about it. And I remember when he came back from Selma in the Spring to take his exams, he and I laughed about it. And it all seemed incredibly unimportant at that point. No. I don't think it was something that hung on for a long time.

S: Well, nobody seems to remember what the topic of the paper was...I know it was the atonement...

Colmore: Well, that was the topic of my paper. Because Bert was absolutely positive...the Holy Spirit...That was the one thing about it on which Bert wouldn't back down. It was really the point at which he decided to fight with Carl, and it was as good a place to pick as any, I think.

S: Where is the paper?

Colmore: That's a good question...Nobody knows...Yes, it was written. I don't know if it was written out verbatim, but it was a long thing.

Holliday: I believe it probably was written. And I'm... because I talked to Jonathan about it the night before he gave it, and I'm pretty sure it was the atonement.

S: Well, he wrote a paper on the atonement for Theology 1-12. And that we've got, but this is not the same thing that he delivered in class that day.

Colmore: Well, Carl is positive it was the atonement. Bert is positive it was the Holy Spirit, and I remain agnostic... Bouche was in the class, but I'm not sure he was there that day. Bert, obviously was in the class...I think Abbott was there, but Abbott says he is pretty sure he wasn't there that day. It

must have been damn small. I think maybe it was just Jon and me and Carl and Bert...

Holliday: Well, what was it that came out this afternoon. Was it just that one remark about Pontius Pilot...?

Colmore: Oh, that wasn't this afternoon. I saw Bert get ferocious...mad. I don't know if he was mad when he came over here to see you, but he was really boiling in Carl's office. Well, it was incredible because Bert doesn't get mad like that very often. And Bert kept saying, "You've had this paper for twelve weeks...If you were really interested in it, you would have done something about it." And finally Carl said, "I want you to know, Bert, that that's about the fifteenth time you've mentioned how long I've had this paper." And Bert said, "I'm damn mad." And Carl said, "Well, so am I." And so I said, "Bye, fellas. Have a nice time," and left.

S: Well, when did this take place?

Colmore: About four or five days ago.

S: You mean, this is Bert's paper on this business?

Colmore: Yes, that's right. And this is when Bert just finally grabbed the paper up from Carl and said, "I'll take it to Bill Schneider." Bert's paper on the incident, which he had given to Carl earlier in the Fall.

S: And Carl had never gotten around to it?

Colmore: No, I guess not. I think Bert was just anxious about the whole deal, whether or not it would be a big splash in the book.

S: It might get a line.

-....

...writing a paper on.....I came to the point at which Hammarskjold was a very good illustration of something I wanted to say...incidentally this paper is dedicated to you... It's a very good paper...

S: Am I going to get to read it?

Yes. Well, anyway, I really got going on this because from what Jim told me, Hammarskjold's closest friends were so surprised by Markings, and the topic that I was discussing was what I called "hidden notes." The problem of the christian in today's world was his christianity had remained relatively hidden and I was making a sort of frontal attack on Fletcher, on the dean at Fletcher. I was attacking the idea that christian man acts out of gratitude...that the community between God and Dag Hammarskjold was hidden and that this was a real...But on the other hand you come down in the position... and I've come to this conclusion that a lot of things have to remain hidden, but I'm also convinced that one of the christian attitudes is that after the fact, things are not necessarily

hidden. Obviously, in writing a term paper, I have great cause to be thankful that Markings occurred as an illustration for my term paper...but then, also I am really genuinely thankful and I am also profoundly convinced that a number of documents of the New Testament are precisely this kind of thing...or at least parts of them are...or at least they represent the working over of hidden material. So in talking to Bill about this biography...I really think that a hand like his which is concerned...which is aware of various issues involved, has every right to consider him, taking into account the most hidden material...It depends on the purpose that's going to be made of it...That doesn't mean I wouldn't....but it does justify trying to take everything...

.....

Well, I have not any reservations at all about saying things that I know about Jon, except that I would want whoever was taking note of them, mainly you, in this case, I guess,...that I wasn't particularly close to Jon. Jon and I sort of passed from time to time, and very often talked about things about which both of us got excited. But it was never really an enduring thing. We exchanged books on occasion, We for which we were excited about. He was sort of off to the third floor and I was on the first floor and it was just happenstance when we ran into each other. We didn't make a big effort to see a lot of each other...And, I sort of think of Jon as a

celebrity now. He's been in all the newspapers and everything. And I tend to not trust my memories of a celebrity. I remember the time that I met Bing Crosby, all that I can remember about it is that he went...you know...because...This really ought to be taken into account if you are really interested in what I am saying. I can never tell to what extent it's colored by the fact that Jon has been made a martyr...But I don't share any ...reservations about saying...I remember Jon as a very excitable person, and this is the way I had contact with him, because I am this kind of a person too. He hit on something when he was reading that he'd get excited about, and he might be walking through the hall, and if you were the next guy to run into him he would read it to you. And I did the same kind of a thing, and he would always respond the way I wanted him to. He really could read me...so, he would give me an appropriate response. But I was always a little wary of Jon...afraid of him, because I thought he was smarter than I was, especially after this thing in the class. I knew he was smarter than I was, and I thought he was really dumping on my ability to come across with something intellectually respectable. So I wasn't sure just whether or not I wanted to be that open with him. And, it wasn't until he came back from Selma--whenever it was in the Spring to take his exams. And he and I sat on the steps of Lawrence Hall--nice sunny day--and I just wanted to know what he was

doing and whether or not he was--thought he was--accomplishing anything...And we had an awful long talk then. The only kind of quote that I could sort of pull out of the hat would be one...We were talking about Bill and all I can remember is that he said, "He wouldn't have the guts to go into Harlem and do what had done." He thought Harlem was a tinderbox about to blow up. He thought any white man was crazy to go and get mixed up in Harlem. I asked him if he didn't feel pretty much the same way about where he was and he said, "No, not at all." He said at least white people can walk around. He said he felt in Harlem it was...and we talked about all the things that says about Harlem. But he was very happy, and I don't remember ever seeing Jon that happy. And he was much more relaxed than when I had last seen him before he went down the first time to Selma. I had never really been able to talk to Jon for long. And we did talk for about two hours or more. He was able to even to sit still on the step, which I'd never seen him able to do for any length of time. Before he'd always jump up and run off somewhere. And he was extremely friendly towards me in a way that he'd never...you know, we were comfortable together in a way that I think we'd never been before. So I'd say that after he came back from Selma that he was really very very happy about what he was doing, and he felt it was important and that he was doing well at whatever it was that

he was doing...

Phil Holliday: When Jon first came, his junior year, I was aware of him primarily because he was a Danforth Fellow... I found him a little enigmatic. I wasn't very interested in him, but we were acquaintances. His first year was the year I was...We were on the same floor. He would come down, and I was giving him my pitch about who I was and why I was going into the ministry because he seemed a little alienated from what was going on, and I thought if that could clear any air why I would throw it out. It didn't seem to do much. He didn't seem terribly interested in that or in any other particular issue. he was just, I suppose, coming out of what I was aware, with the skeptical period. He consequently was a little alienated' from what was going on. He didn't consider his classes were very straight forward, and he didn't know whether the place was very straightforward, whether he could take it as being very straightforward. Whether the language that flew around meant much to him...whether he liked the people very well...It was his first term. Second term we talked, I think, a little bit about more substantive issues...They were petty...We continued to sort of a kind of acquaintanceship...that we had... such that I would bring him over something or get him interested in some group. And I was really never much more close to him than that. I wouldn't have any recollection

Well, one thing I should tell about it is that he was a

regular member of what has come to be called The Upper Cambridge Esoteric Society which is its exoteric name. Its esoteric name is the Society. I was a member of it for awhile and never did know what meant, that's how esoteric it was. I don't have a clue what it means, but I don't ever want to know...He came to every meeting, I think, and Jerry...Carol... Harold and sometimes Judy and myself and Jon. I forget. I don't think he gave a paper, but the group at the time was devolving into violent arguments on the resurrection after every meeting no matter what the paper was. There he would evince...he was at the end of this sort of period...he'd had this work in graduate studies in English so that he had a certain kind of critical way of approaching things.

S: When did this group start moving?

Phil Holliday: Toward the end of his junior year and then through his year. It had a meeting at the very end of the year at which he was present. I suppose...didn't it?

Colmore: I don't remember. I just remember I was there for about four meetings...before Selma. The first meeting I went to was the last meeting Jon was at, I think. I remember going back because we'd had a big flare-up--and it may have been the first time you were there too--because the new people there didn't understand what the hell anybody was talking about, namely me and I guess Bob...

...If we were smart enough to get on at that point, then that was fine, but we shouldn't slow down the group. And Jon sided with the "No-Nothing" party. I remember I was so happy because I knew he'd been with the group since the beginning, but he supported me later on and said, "Well, those guys are all just a bunch of jerks...just trying to hear themselves talk..." And I was really glad that he said that because I felt like a damn fool.

Well, now, this was so sort of an expression of the attitude that he had taken. He didn't pretend to--I would always use the word 'condescend', to reverse the metaphor--he didn't condescend to understand what we were talking about. He would, from his more skeptical period, get involved in extended issues of language analysis. That night he was dealing substantively with theology in a sort of confessional context... But he never would do that. He would always pick apart people's language and quarrel with them on almost an analytical, linguistic point of view. I saw this as an expression of his skeptical side which I was aware he had. Then he would be very explicit that behind these motives really there was a theological self within him that was more conservative than anything we were saying. He really wasn't interested in talking with us about...He wasn't sure...about these funny issues, that he was just going to hold us to the discipline of talking so that he could understand. So it was perfectly consistent...So I, of course, regarded him

as reactionary...A. I recall that night, I was coming out like ...not necessarily conservative, but...very, very confessionally, and he was sympathizing to a degree, but he wanted to go much further toward a blunt statement of the resurrection the way...

S: Is this a point at which I might break in or were you going to go on, Phil? Because I've just thought of something and maybe the three of you being there can reconstruct for me the meeting at the St. John's Society--this is a week from where you were, but maybe we can go back again. But the discussion that took place at the St. John's Society prior to Selma--I gather it must have been at least months prior to Selma--where he objected--maybe January or something...February--to people going into diocese where the bishop had not given his permission. Can you kind of the three of you together...?

Phil:Holliday: I wasn't there. Bob was there.

Colmore: I can't remember. I remember, but I don't know whether it's because I was told about it or because I was actually there. Maybe you can help me, Bob.

Oakes: I remember exactly what happened...what the issue was, but I'm not sure I remember what Jonathan said.

Colmore: What was the issue?

Oakes: The National Council or the Executive Committee of

the National Council had supported, in a quick meeting, and not everyone was there, the Bishop of Alabama's request that no National Council money be used to support clergymen who were asked--from outside--by the Bishop of Alabama not to come in.

Colmore: And we were voting on whether or not we ought to condemn the action?

Oakes: That's right. The Executive Council...right. We were told that part of the issue was confused by the fact that Bill Wolf had handled the document himself, and half the faculty hadn't been there. The faculty had taken a vote, you see, and this was presented to us. They had voted to recommend that the Executive Council rescind this order. The faculty hadn't been there, and somebody probably had simply pointed out that it was that half of the faculty which was held in highest esteem by the student body and this kind of thing. Guthrie wasn't there, Patterson wasn't there, the Dean wasn't there, Fletcher was out of town...And here we were voting. Yes, Dr. Wolf was the one who brought it to the meeting. And he was asked to explain it. And I believe Jonathan asked him to explain it. Jonathan asked him if somebody from the faculty would explain why the faculty had taken this particular position. Bill, is that right? Do you know?

S: Well, I wasn't at the meeting, but I remember this issue because it came up at probably just the same time before the clergy of the diocese in a called meeting of all the clergy, where we unanimously recommended that they rescind the order.

Oakes: Well, what I'm saying is that you heard of the incident?

S: I've heard of the incident. I've heard that Jon stood for the position which the Executive Council had taken.

Oakes: Yes. I think Jon's basic point of view, as I remember it, and I don't have a recollection of the words...but the attitude as I remember it was that we were an Episcopal church and, if a bishop of the church decided something about his diocese then who the hell were we to try and overturn the bishop's decision? That this was flying in the face of the whole point of our church polity. And it was not only presumptuous, it would eventually be disastrous, if we felt that we could sort of on a personalistic basis overturn a decision by a bishop of the church regardless of the issue. Whose to say that a different kind of an issue won't come up next time...and once the precedent has been established, the whole structure of the church might well crumble. And I remember the great boos and things at that point.

S: Well, I heard that there weren't only boos, but that somebody got up at that point and made some very fiery statement-- I don't know who that was...

Oakes: Yes, in fact, more than one person responded against Jon. No, you (Phil) were on his side. And I think you made a speech too, didn't you?

Holliday: Well, not a speech about the issue.

Oakes: You made a speech about the church history or something...

Holliday: No...Somebody had made a statement in favor of it, and I was willing to discuss that statement...and I was...it got lost...

S: I get the decided impression that bull sessions, St. John Society meetings and classes at E.T.S. are all pretty much the same...

I don't think...answer....particularly...insofar as excepting the fact that it was one more example or one more incident in which you could say that in sort of psychological terms, Jon's paranoia became...fed. I don't care to talk in those terms. It was another incident that led to a kind of discontentment with the situation that he was in.

I was never sure in situations like that whether Jon spoke from a really deep feeling about the particular subject or whether he was--he was so talented verbally and on his feet--that it wasn't just a hell of a lot of fun for him to take the opposite issue from somebody else because he could

argue either side of almost any point very eloquently. And I never really knew. That's why I very seldom got engaged in an argument with him, because I was never sure I wasn't being played for the fool. And in a situation like that, it was clear that the tide was running in the direction that Dr. Wolf wanted it to go in. And I had a certain kind of an emotional investment in seeing Dr. Wolf overturned...And I think Jon did too. I know damn well that you did.

Yes, I did..!

Yes, but Jon, of course, did it...Jon would never get up and say, you know, "I just think Dr. Wolf is a damn fool, and I hope we'll all go against him." He was too smart to do that. He got up and very cleverly wove an argument which was damn fine in terms of...you're a member of the Episcopal church, you subscribe to certain kinds of polity that means this kind of thing...you know...And he was quite right.

And, if I remember it right, he summed it up by saying, "And now I'd like a rebuttal from the faculty." He didn't say it that way...He just said, "I wonder if we could have a member of the faculty here to talk...to give the reason why the faculty voted..."

...because Dr. Wolf wasn't saying anything. Somebody pointed out that it wasn't a unanimous vote of the faculty, and

if there were any faculty members present...

And so Wolf got up and said something particularly short and...

....

Holliday: The only other conversation...Bob and I have some things to exchange on after he was dead, but the only other thing I have to say before he died was that when I heard at the funeral in the funeral oration that Dr. Wolf read that he had had an experience which was a call, and E.T.S..... I wasn't the least surprised. Because, as I've said, when I was with him before he went down, I was certain that this was a call--we didn't say this explicitly--but because of the of his behavior, a certain fierceness about the whole thing. And that was very largely understood between us. I think explicitly between us, although it wasn't said. On that basis and that basis alone did I approve of what he was doing. If I hadn't been so certain of that, I wouldn't... I would have sat him down and raised all kinds of questions about he himself...running off to the South and this kind of thing.

S: Well, you know that I had a terrible 'go to' with him over this, and I would stop at the point where he said, when he came back to me and said, "I have promises to keep and I just have to go." And at that point I said, "Well, I can't say any more.

I have gone as far as I will go."

Holliday: Yes. I had a call like this once in my life, and I suspect it was a year and a half before I said anything about it. I would have been very reticent to be explicit about it. It's just one of those things...which is an example of hiddenness, but there again there comes a time for testimonial. Consequently, I gave him some money which was all I could do. Other people were being sweet and all kinds of things...

One day at lunch we had a discussion about non-violence and he was more or less explicit...He was telling about death... and he wasn't sure that he was committed to non-violence at all... I've told you about this...And I said I could understand that because I didn't think I was a pacifist in principle. This was when he was back and before he was going down again and had had some experience with SNCC people. He was really reflecting pretty hot and heavy on this. There...into my mind this great revelation which I have since capitalized on considerably and substantively in my thinking and that was that I told him I don't think the Gospel is interested in pacifism in principle or the non-return of evil in principle. It's a tactic of success. It's a tactic of licking your enemies and it's offered, from my sense of the New Testament, purely in those terms. And he was intrigued by that idea. He didn't say, "Oh, yes, of course,"... He was just intrigued. And that was evidently our last exchange.

The only other experience I had with him was...I sort of, purely by accident, dropped into this party that they were having sort of at the end of the year and...you were there...And they were having beer and passing around pictures of Selma. This was during the exam period after he and Judy had come back. Mrs. Daniels was there and I met her. And on my way out, he was very friendly, very relaxed, and I asked him if he'd gotten some more money which I'd sent him while he was down there, and he said yes, and thanked me. He never wrote to me at all which was funny...I never heard anything from him. And I had the feeling that I was one of those people who were standing around who sort of knew what was going on and who derive a certain orientation from those people, but they aren't necessarily people you talk to about...And I didn't particularly want to get involved... At the time, and I later wrote about this in a letter which I wrote to him on a Saturday morning...Bob called me up last summer telling me about this...got me out of bed...I wrote this in a letter describing it at the time. He was very affectionate that night, and I was writing to him, not as if he were still alive and in heaven someplace, but as if he were dead...that I was writing to him back. The letter was in the form of two regrets. One was that he would be...as soon as says...

...because I didn't like what was going to be made out of it at all. I don't agree with martyrdom...I don't like atonement theory...When Dr. Wolf used...associated atonement theory with him...and when he used the word 'martyrdom' from the pulpit... I said sure enough, I was right...

Well, he was not particularly nervously affable that evening, but he was being very affectionate. And the second thing that I regretted was that I hadn't been able to return his affection.

.....

And, Phil, if I remember correctly, there was a second half to the reaction.

Holliday: Oh. That's what the two of us were going to talk about. We're going to talk about it now. I said, Bob and I've been saying this back and forth to each other...I said to myself, my second reaction was, isn't he lucky? He's really lucky that he's been let off the hook in this way. What I meant was that, not too arrogantly...I thought that somebody from...with his cast of mind...with his skeptical background, losing faith after his father died and so forth... and then what I regard as hyper-conservative reactions setting in...It was going to have a very...I think everybody in his life...theologically unsettled, but he was going to have a sort of painfully unsettled life for many many years to come. Because he was really sort of a skeptical person. He really

did have a primarily secular identity. And I was convinced that things were moving in his spiritual life and that for several years to come, it would just be a process of sort of getting this....out of him, blow by blow. And I thought that was sort of an unpleasant prospect. Not that it would have been...

And the other thing was--and Bob has comment on this-- and that is his life around school--or his life, period-- having been to Selma, having had a call...See, I was convinced that he'd had a call. And, therefore, he was going to have to work out the call, and from my personal experience, that's very unpleasant.

Colmore: What do you think he would have done this year, having not been shot? Would he have come back this year, do you think?

Holliday: I think so. I think he had every intention of coming back.

Colmore: You do? I think he would have gone up the wall.

Holliday: I think he went up the wall every year he was here. I think we all would have become very involved in this.

Colmore: The reason I ask about this is because...your reaction...in thinking about my reaction in first hearing about it...this is probably completely irrelevant to what you're doing... but I have often thought...I just burst into tears when I found

out. I was just enraged, and I hadn't been that close to Jon. I sort of ran upstairs to my wife and just started screaming at her...My poor wife hadn't even seen the paper, and I'm not sure she would have known who he was had she read the paper until she read down further. And she didn't know what was going on. I was really incoherent. I've never really understood my reaction. Did you react anything like that?

Holliday: I found out...such a long time...a number of hours to sink into me...the possibility to sink into me. I heard at approximately 6:00 that an Episcopal priest from New Haven, Connecticut, by the name of Jon Daniels had been shot...And forgot about it. I exchanged a very strange glance with Mike Stickway. We listened to the news, and there was nothing on the news, so I forgot about it. Two hours later Mike said to me, let's go get beer and I said, "What's wrong?" And he said, "Well, I just don't know what's gone on down in Selma, Alabama or Haynesville." And then I remembered what he was talking about...bothering him. On our way down we passed the newspaper office...Patterson, New Jersey...and went upstairs to look at the teletype. And, of course, gradually the story... So I never had much of a shock. It was bit by bit...the story became correct. And, we finally called New Hampshire and talked to Mrs. Daniels. While we're right here at this point I'll say something which has bearing on what you and I have

said. Mike made the call. And I don't know whether Mrs. Daniels has said this to anybody else, but she said to Michael, "Well, Mike, it finally happened." And that's a direct quote. Which would seem to me to be something...subterranean way of saying some of the things that I would say. I mean, perhaps I had better not tie it in right away...may become evident later on. But, one of my reactions to Jonathan's having gone to Selma was simply a thanksgiving at God's graciousness. That here was ...I knew that school was an intolerable place for Jon, and it had just built up to the point where finally there was something else. A door had opened and he had gone through it, and it seemed to me to be a kind of...Well, I took it to be a kind of revelation...to me...I thought of telling it to Jon, and then I decided I wouldn't right then. He probably had enough to cope with. So I didn't...Yes. I did tell it to him when he came back, in the Spring. I think he was probably very happy then, but I do know that he didn't listen to me either. So when I finally did tell him, he didn't have the ears to hear it. Now I don't know what that...whether I was wrong in thinking that he wouldn't have been able to hear me if I'd told him at the beginning or not but be that as it may. And so some of the things that we had talked about...the thing which came to my mind the other night when Phil and I were talking about this was that I had somewhat the same reaction, not isn't he lucky... that he was shot?, but here was another situation where somehow

something that had become intolerable in history, God entered it and solved it right away.

We were saying that in talking about this, we don't really see any solution to the whole set of problems that we would articulate in his life and that consequently this fierceness on the part of God in calling him into this kind of thing was very gracious. It sort of burnt him up.

S: I was going to ask, did you feel was this operative on all levels in his life?

Absolutely. And I think I'll get into that a little bit. The way I would see it is sort of...Here God had done something which had gotten really out of hand...It got out of hand at one point at E.T.S. and then it got out of hand at Haynesville, Alabama, too. And that in a sense what was happening was God was solving, you know--trying to make it all tolerable.

I would say that, yes, one would suppose that Jon was put in these difficult situations for him to make certain responses which would have perhaps then made things much easier. We don't really just see him making any of these responses.

S: In trying to relate these to several--I guess they're really feelings more than anything else that I have about the situation, because I have absolutely no proof and there would be no way of

getting it, but I'm trying to relate this to certain things that have been going on in me about it. Number one, that I think that Jon was on his way home, and he was through with this whole business. I think that had he come back, he wouldn't have been involved, except where he sort of had to be because of certain pressures that would have been on him here. You know, and one thing or another would have been around, but I think that was going to be just about as much touch with this whole movement as he was going to have when he got back. Now, he never said that to me, but I think that was right.

I'm also trying to tie it in with a feeling that I'm having a hard time articulating. Go on. I'll come back to it.

Holliday: Well, I think this is another good reason for him getting it in the back of the neck, because maybe that wasn't good enough for God...That decision. If Jon was making...If Jon had sort of implicitly made a decision here that was really going to hold for the rest of his life...which could be...and it was the wrong decision...I'm not saying God was punishing him, but he was just sort of, rather than producing more violent juncture than this, he was just sort of terminating the account... When Jon, you know, was still sort of in good standing.

Let me reply first of all, Bill, to your first statement, because it's purely intuitive...

Well, no, what I get is that it was historical...If, he was planning to come back and forget about it, that in a way, to my interpretation or my reflection on it is it doesn't make any difference for what we're saying now. Right now, what we're saying doesn't make any difference because the intolerable-ness of the situation regardless of whether Jon was going to continue in his fighting...What I want to say is that he made it...Made himself as intolerable to people at E.T.S. as he made himself intolerable to Tom Coleman and maybe more so.

S: Well, those were on different...so that he never would have gotten through completely.

Colmore: Well, I don't know that we're so sure of that. At least here there was the personal. The people at E.T.S., at least certain ones, Harve and Mike and you all too, could pick specific things out which could personalize which for Coleman weren't true. He had never met Jon Daniels.

Well, you haven't read the remark, Carl.

Colmore: All right. Then come back at me again because I didn't.

Well, whether Jon would personally make it intolerable...What he stood for was intolerable to Coleman.

Colmore: He would have shot anybody. The fact that he aimed the gun and shot and the girl was knocked down and that he then

knocked somebody else...

You don't know that. If the Klan really set this up, I'm a romantic enough to think that they might have been out to get him.

Colmore: Well, even if they were, they were also out to get ~~me~~, and I haven't met but I doubt if they would have triggered the same kind of things except that they were both involved in the same things.

Well, okay. But you see this is very often the problem at E.T.S. is that the atmospheric disturbances which people create have no correspondence with their personalities... or a very indirect one.

Or with their persons.

Colmore: Well, I want to raise another question just so I'm sure that again I'm not reading you wrong...

Did you see what I mean about E.T.S.?

Colmore: I certainly did. But Jon was not specifically at this point and at this time trying to get shot. In other words... Because my feeling is that if Jon was sitting here now...honest in what he was saying, he would be very surprised that he was shot in Haynesville, Alabama. I don't think he expected to get it there.

Holliday: No, I think this is true...Bob and I were talking one time about this side of the word paranoia...I use the word 'paranoia' in the...sense...not in the accurate...We were talking about this, and I was speculating as to the subjective side of it from Jon. And Bob, from his physics course at Dartmouth pointed out that...I was wondering why Jon didn't fall on the girl instead of push her...and he was pointing out that he would have had to have stepped back and run at her to fall on her. He either had to push her down and then fall on her or he had to run back and hit her. She was in front of him...not very far in front of him. So if he wanted to get her down, the only way for him to do it when he was that close to her was to push her. Which obviates the...

S: I suppose the suicidal side of this is a tricky one.

Holliday: Well, it's the one I was discussing. I think Bob's comment is very significant factually.

Oakes: You see the point. If you push, you can't go with it. It's not possible to push and go with it....had to make another second effort to fall.

Holliday: And this conversation we had at lunch...talking about death and so forth, he was quite clear that death was involved in this. I think he sensed this. And when he came back and went back down...But his instinct was that he had a very hard

time being non-violent, because he didn't want somebody to kill him...

Colmore: And he didn't expect to be killed, did he?

S: He knew it was possible.

Holliday: Well, he had been shot at...Twice during that week... His car had been shot at or something like this. Mrs. arranged to get him a car, another car that wasn't recognizable, because Judy's Volkswagon was so familiar. Am I right about this, Bill? Wasn't this a fact?

S: I honestly know, but he did have another car. I don't know who financed it.

Holliday: I think she told me that...have you talked to her?

S: I have talked to her. She didn't...tell me that particular point...

Holliday: To go back for a minute...increase my other statements ...I think that this is a situation where while he was down there he was beautiful, and when he was back here he was in a pretty ugly situation. And so God, if you wish to look at it this way, he was taken while he was beautiful rather than when he was ugly...which was to close out the account in black...

The reason I'm so conservative is because I've been in the situation where when I responded to the call I received...very quickly

there was death in it only it was suicide...and consequently I immediately responded to his situation, there was sort of this intuitive sense that we were dealing with very dangerous situations that we'd been put in.

Bill, so many of my problems come from the fact that I have suppose learned as much about Jon Daniels since he died as I knew about him before, and the information that I have learned has been sort of not the kind of information that one deals with in an offhand manner. It's been sort of this emotional type stuff. So, this has set up a kind of... my atmospheric disturbance...that I have an atmospheric disturbance too in my recollection. But, I met Jon the first weekend I was here, and we both had dates one Sunday, and we found out, I think in our second or first conversation, that we were both going to go to the Church of the Advent. And it turned out that it was a snowy day, and I had a car. And, so, we...And from that time on, my relationship with Jon was as much a mystery to me as anything because he was always willing to be more generous and more affectionate than I realized and thought the relationship called for. Do you follow me?...In other words, he was always, it seemed to me presupposing more than I had been aware of, in the relationship. And this was always kind of a mystery to me. We never became close in talking to one another until last year, first semester, and even then it was always the kind of situation where he would be...we

would comment in the halls...Some day we're going to have to sit down and talk...And it would come, and then we wouldn't have another opportunity for a long time after. It would often go on late into the night and things like this.

Before I forget it, and I know I will if I don't say something right now, have you talked to Ted ?

S: No. Let me talk to you...It's really quite unessential... But I'll tell you about that...I guess I will...Ted and I were at seminary together, and I know Ted pretty well. I also have everything that he's written about this. I also have a number of letters that he's written since this. Frankly, they're not very helpful. I don't think. Now, maybe actually sitting down and confronting him with this, it might be helpful. I don't know. But I haven't gotten anything from him that I have felt opened very much up.

Okay,...then there's Jack Inman...would be a friendly advocate. A couple of really hostile advocates would be Frank Robinson, who is a priest, and I don't know where. He used to be at Rochester at the hospital. Another hostile advocate would be . I don't know whether knew Jon very well...

and Jon had a great falling out...violent falling out... He graduated out first year, whenever that was. Class of '64. I don't know whether...If you haven't already run into somebody who just spewed out a lot of hostile verbage to you, you would

probably get it from ...might or might not be instructive. I think Frank Robinson, unless you know him. Do you know him? You could get in touch with him probably through Ed in Hanover...who was his best man. They're good friends. They were at Berkeley together.

I don't know just where to go to from there, partially because I just simply have very little recollection as to what we talked about and when and why...I have to say also that facts are also deceiving when you are not intimately...when you're not there connected with...So there are a few incidents which I can talk about, but which because I wasn't there I couldn't be faithful about. People that he knew for instance at Willard Hospital. Frank Robinson was in that group, by the way. So I don't really think that there's anything I could tell you that you don't probably already know...or know about.