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Williams: When I talked to you the other day you talked about when you first came to William and Mary, near the end of World War II. I wanted to know what were some of the particular considerations for you as a young faculty member in adjusting to the postwar conditions here at the college.

Kernode: First of all, as I told you, I was the first faculty member hired after World War II. There hadn't been anybody that I knew of during that period of time, students diminished and those who had been added were women, instead of men, and they were kind of on their way to getting degrees so they could try and get men back. They got married and they gave them their term papers and things like that. Really, those people were pretty bright—men coming back from all that experience and they were focusing on getting through and getting into jobs and careers and things, so they were a pretty sharp batch of people, but I guess one of the kinds of things was the limitations of the sociology department for me, that is coming from graduate school (straight) and having been involved in graduate work and all the new things going on in the field and you know coming to a department that was made up of essentially two people; one of them about to retire, Dr. Blocker, and Sharpy Umbeck who was very bright, but already involved to some degree in administrative activities and help-work programs which he was
helping others to design and work out, it meant that you knew there was a limited offering in sociology to begin with and secondly, Umbeck himself hadn't been here long enough to modify the whole structure of courses, and from my view it was a pretty poverty-laden type of offering. It was not at all together unlike some other departments in small colleges. It was characterized by what I would call more of interest. In social welfare types, whose— you know, and that kind of sense it looked like ameliorative values except Umbeck was in there dealing with some interesting courses on social change and sociology of law and things like that, and it was very keen to him, but these other things were highly questionable to me. So that was one problem. Nevertheless, there was a fairly good enrollment in some of these courses — the introductory course and then we had a course called in those days "Social and Personal Disorganization" in which you could talk about nearly anything you wanted, anything going, but focusing on social problems fundamentally, but paid attention to things we might now do in sociology — e.g., health and mental illness and so on, so on. So a lot of students were enrolled in these in courses like "Family" which I was interested in but what happened in that kind of circumstance was that with Umbeck busy partly with administration doing a couple of courses and Dr. Blocker kind of moving out of it, I inherited a lot of students and trying to think about teaching five different preparations each semester and fifteen
hours was the minimum load and nobody thought, you know, of having that broken down even into say, two preparations or three. So I was teaching five different courses, and some of them were things that I either no interest in whatsoever or even if I were interested in them I had no preparation so it was purely a matter of keeping a chapter ahead of the students sometimes, and you know the plus trying to keep with and introduce the stuff I was interested in and keep abreast of the plus keep my head going back for my own future Ph.D. work which was still out there because I'd just received a masters' degree with some work on a Ph.D. and I knew I was going back to finish that so all that was in there as a kind of problem the load of lecturing and preparing when I was very, very (like most graduate students) eager to do a good job and I was the only new faculty member here and I wanted to be sure and do that. So it was really frightening sometimes grading all the papers. So that was one kind of problem that was there, though I must say from looking at it from this point of view it seems more of a problem now than it did then because I was younger and full of beans and you know there were probably a lot of things I didn't do but nonetheless it went well and students liked it and so it carried through. Well, I got some relief from that a little bit by getting involved in this research project, the Hampton Roads research project, which we began to undertake about that time to do the impact of the
war study with Dr. Marsh and myself and Dr. Pate and my wife and Dr. Moss a little bit, So that was a kind of relief, a kind of lull. The second thing that was really kind of depressing to me was, you know, William and Mary -- I didn't know a lot about it to tell you the truth. I got married and was interested in starting to work and having time to do a piece of research for my dissertation so my major advisor at Chapel Hill said, "Well, there's a job open at William and Mary." I'd heard of it and that was about it and I asked him what kind of school it was and he gave it all this high praise, so I came up here and inter-viewed and decided not to come for various reasons -- the salary, you know, $2200, and no place promised to live and the prospect that there wouldn't be any place because there were still a lot of military in the area and so Umbeck promised, you know, that he would take care of that and he looked like somebody that would -- he was very vigorous. At any rate, we decided not to come and got back to Chapel Hill and Sharvy called and had arranged with Dr. Pomfret in developing Hampton Roads Institute to go ahead with that and my wife could become the research assistant to that which would give us another $1500 which we figured we could then pay the rent and eat and so we finally did decide to come up here and see what happened in a year and obviously stayed forever but once into all that it became very quickly apparent to me that sociology was one of the most lowly regarded disciplines at this institution.
and I'd come from an institution in which it was probably either the most highly regarded or among the top two or three, and its national reputation was within the top four or five sociology departments within the United States at that time. So on all sides of me -- except, you know, with Umbeck and his connections with Pomfret, who had a different view of it, the general faculty looked upon sociology as if it had any right to be in the curriculum only by sufferance, and I must say that they had pretty good grounds, up to a point, for that view because it was not really a very good program, so, you know, one had to live within that kind of context and constantly try to demonstrate that in people's minds there was something to it, that it just wasn't ministerial types of pronouncements and all that. And I think to some degree with Sharvy being as capable and as energetic and talented as he was and what I could do with students and other staff, it began to be more tolerable, but still, for some years people in their minds -- scientists, economists -- that sociology was a laughable discipline.

Williams: This attitude, though, did change, you think?

Kernodle: Oh, yes. It was still there when, as I mentioned last time, I came back from Chapel Hill after having been here a couple of years and did the research with the Hampton Roads thing and took part of that and put it together, conceptually and otherwise and moved it into a dissertation and I completed the degree within eighteen months after I got back, which was
you-know-it surprising to people at Chapel Hill and to people here and to myself. It was partly because I wanted to do it and had some leg on it, but there was also the prospect if I came back here with a degree then Umbeck was probably going to move into the deanship and there would somebody who would be needed to be head of the department and as long as I was the only one there besides Umbeck, it looked like a clear shot even though some people I think had come to like us pretty well, I was still, you know, the youngest guy around, and to trust a whole department to somebody who was kind of wet behind the ears was a little unthinkable, you know for some people around. But William and Mary attracted a number of very many, you-know-it capable and scholarly people from Harvard and Princeton and Dartmouth and all these kinds of things and you-know-it they had been here a good while and many moving slowly up through the ranks and you-know-it people had been here a generation waiting to be chairman of a department or head of a department as it was called then and hadn't been and you-know-it the idea of somebody like this could be a head of the department, sitting up there talking with them and making decisions was understandable and resistance on their part. But I not only perceived that possibility but in effect had been given that kind of notion by both President Pomfret and by Sherry Umbeck and Jim Moss seemed to be favorably inclined and Albion Taylor who I mentioned before that I think is one of the giants that came through here on
the faculty, as a person and as a scholar and teacher. He had taught both sociology and economics; the department used to be called that and he was keen enough towards it so I thought there was enough there to make it go -- at least it was enough there to hasten me and get going and came back with that intention but in the meantime another person had been added to the department; it had grown some, and despite the fact that I had very little background in criminology I taught it a couple of times and students liked it. I developed a little feeling for it and you know (it's not entirely impossible to teach a special area course using the discipline) but it looked like a lot of people were attracted toward that and Umbeck's social legislation course so a fellow named Robert Caldwell was brought in, you know, as the third member of the department; Dr. Blocker had retired. Bob had been at Delaware, and he had written a book on the study of what was called "Red Hannah" (the whipping post). You tie people to a post and lash them and he'd written kind of a neat book on that and he was here and Bob had also some inclination toward the law and ultimately passed the bar in Virginia but in his mind he came thinking he would be head of the department. So here was this. When I got back, he was here and I met him and all that, and was friendly with him and we did some things together but then as the time approached when Umbeck was going to move into the deanship and give up -- I'm not sure; I think Sharvy kept the head of the department
a year while he was dean which always is the problem is leaning over so far backwards that the department got far less than it might have gotten with somebody else. But during that period of time I think both Bob and I assumed that we were going to be the next head of the department without thinking really seriously that the other one would be. I think the dynamics of it were such that for whatever reasons they may have been partly personal, they may have been academic, they may have been decisions and perceptions on the part of the dean and the president at what would happen to sociology if I had it rather than Bob at least that's what happened and there was some little nastiness going there. It didn't affect me too much. There was a little problem but I didn't think too much about it. He left, went to Ohio or someplace but it was from those kind of times that the department still wasn't highly regarded among a lot of people. So once I was appointed head of the department -- in those days it was assumed if you were appointed head you would be head until you died or quit or run out or whatever and I wanted to be chairman of the department mainly to reorganize it and restructure it, to do with it what I knew from my own background it was possible to do with sociology in a liberal arts college. So contrary to the usual notions and ideas that you ought to keep your head and not do anything unusual or try to make too many changes and all of a sudden get your feet on the ground and so forth I didn't
think I had that kind of time, because the longer we continued
that kind of program, that set of courses, the more
I would become associated with it, so I spent a great deal of
time putting together an entirely new sociology curriculum,
radically different from anything that had been in existence.

Williams: You set the orientation when you first came with social wel-
fare. What was the orientation then?

Kernodle: I set it toward, you know, like discipline, sociology in which
I set out a progression of courses, for example. Before, it
was pretty largely if you could take any course you wanted to
at any time. No course had any particular
 prerequisite and none built
another on and like if you go into Chemistry 101 or 102,
overtly, you're doing something there that means that later
you can take in organic and all that and I think that's true
in sociology for the person who's going to concentrate
in it and become a professional sociologist by way of research,
going to graduate school, and so on. At the same time, making
it possible for other students to elect this without necessarily
 going through that progression, as you can do in history or
humanities. Not only that, in the social sciences
-- not counting psychology in that as though it weren't in
social science at that time -- sociology in the social sci-
ences was really the only one, in my view, that was really a
social science. History was more of humanities; it didn't
really utilize the methodology of scientific investigation,
and development of hypotheses and bringing, you know, data to
bear, research, you know, toward those, proceeding which is perfectly all right to do that kind of thing. It's not like English or history in that sense. Government in those days was more of an art than it was a science, you know, so we had that. Maybe economics might have been in the science sense what I wanted to do was develop a curriculum, you know, we've got lots of these flying around, so I set out to build a curriculum which the student would go through principles. I didn't know any other department in the country that had a whole year for introduction of principles of sociology. They usually had introductory sociology and social problems they did at Chapel Hill. And I didn't know of any other place that did but I felt that it should be. You had Economics 201-202 and Chemistry 101-102, and Biology 101-102 and I thought that there was enough there for a year. I'd always had indigestion trying to get through Sociology 201 myself or to try to teach it as a graduate student in my first 2 years of work. And so I designed that as a package and the students majoring in sociology would have to take 201A-202 and then they'd have to take sociological theory, and then they would have to take a course in statistics to be able to interpret the kinds of scientific research and (that would be in your junior year). In the beginning they'd take -- and most of the time people didn't major in sociology didn't start majors until they were juniors, they had with all these distribution courses. So I put in 201A-202. They could take that as sophomores, I hoped, or if possible take it
as juniors, but they could concurrently take 201 and 303,[just take the first half of the beginning course and the theory], and then take the 202 and statistics in the junior year. Then in the senior year they were required to take, in the fall, there would be a course in research methodology, you knew the method of research, how you put together a research project, how you develop hypotheses and test them and what kind of research possibilities there are and techniques that you use: sampling and questionnaires and all this and the other end; at the end of that semester they would come out with a design for a piece of research they would do the next semester. So every sociology major was required to go through that to develop a research proposal and then undertake to do that in the spring of their senior year. So they could do it two people together or three or four, but each person was responsible for their work, and each person wrote a senior thesis and that was the core, and then they had to elect a certain number of other courses. How the difficulty that I had was one difficulty that I had at that time was that sociology -- to show you how it was disregarded or denigrated -- is that in the old distribution of array in the social sciences, students could elect -- they had to take twelve hours of social sciences as freshmen and sophomores; they had to take in the natural sciences either physics, chemistry, or biology 101, 102. In social sciences you could take either history and government or economics and history or some combination of history, economics, and government to make up your twelve hours but not sociology.
That was not worth, you know, six hours in the distribution, so in effect, what the college and the faculty was saying was that sociology is tolerated but it's not worth as much as these other disciplines.

Williams: Did you get sociology included in the distribution?

Kernodle: Okay, that was a big fight. Once I got this program designed, then I had to take it before the entire faculty, not to the curriculum committee which you would now do to the Educational Policy Committee, you'd take any change that would affect educational policy -- which this was. This was calling for the restructuring of a concentration, and at the same time, I was for Sociology 291-292 to be included in the distribution. You know, that's where you contact students, and if they're going to get six hours of credit for it, then they're more likely to take it to try it and you know, than to just elect on top of the, you know, the twelve hours in social science they've got to take. So that was really -- now, if it was in the modern day, I would have sued them, you know, for arbitrary denial and stuff, but in that time you had to take that kind of stuff, you know, directly to the floor of the faculty and present it and then everybody on the faculty could take potshots, whether they were in chemistry or law or biology or whatever they were in, they could take potshots at it and depending on a lot of things, I guess -- how prominent the person was in the eyes of the faculty, whether he knew anything about sociology or not, or somebody who might know something
-- the faculty could be swayed. And there was always
that, you know, part of the faculty that wasn't going to
be too receptive anyway. They just didn't think sociology
was anything worth having so I had it together, got it all
done up and presented and distributed out and defended it and
got a lot of various types of reactions but fortunately with
some intelligent people (heads of departments and leaders of the
faculty like Dr. Guy and Albion Taylor and Chuck Marsh and
Arthur Phelps in the law school) I guess I played tennis with
some of these people, too, but it was on the merits of what
it was, there was enough to pass it, except the social science
people -- not the heads of the departments particularly --
but the staff -- we had more historians, I guess, than any-
body else in the division -- they would argue vehemently against
the acceptance of sociology into the distribution, and the
faculty supported that. I was pretty sure -- and still pretty
sure -- that that was simply an effort to protect their own
enrollments, but I won't question either their right to be
suspect of the discipline. So that didn't happen, but we
put it into effect and then I argued for some help for staff,
Caldwell had left and Umbeck was new and we got two people,
and pretty rapidly without even being in the distribution we
began to really go. The students would hear about it and
they would elect it, and they'd like what was happening. We had some lively people about that time,
I added anthropology -- general anthropology and cultural anthro-
anthropology -- two courses. We brought in Ken Moreland, a fellow named who had been at Chapel Hill and some work at Yale and at Chapel Hill, and came up here and that struck a chord, so we were coming along pretty well. But it wasn't until there was a general review of the curriculum that began after Admiral Chandler came here and I'd been chairman of the curriculum committee and had set out a series of discussions on the whole curriculum to try to think about some modification of what's been called "the 1935 curriculum" which Jim Miller and Fowler and some others set down which was a damn good, you know, basic piece of work. It was a great core kind of thing to be done but it had been a long time, nearly twenty years or close to it. We had divisions at that time, too, and during the time I kept bringing up the point of getting sociology, you know, into the distribution. I said, "Look how it's grown. People like it. What's wrong with it now?" And by this time everybody was kind of admitting, "Yeah, it's okay." Not only were we getting more students but the number of students were attracting who were among the highest students, you know, in the student body. We were getting a lot of Phi Beta Kappa types and so on. So, you know, the respect was growing, but they still wouldn't cave in on the distribution and it was a little hard for me to argue that, you know, during the time that I was chairman of the curriculum committee. But when that study was over and then they had to delay something because that curriculum study wasn't passed somewhere along the line. The
faculty passed it and if it went through we would be in the new package. If somebody brought it up or something but that didn't get anywhere above the faculty level. It died somewhere out there, and it wasn't until much later that this got done, but I was finally very tired of all that, obviously, so I went to the admiral and said, "Look, the rest of the curriculum apparently isn't going anywhere, but I want sociology to be included in the distribution. I find no reasons why it shouldn't be." Some members of the faculty correctly said that that shouldn't be done piecemeal but it's been promised before and didn't paid off and it's been promised now and now and I don't know how long it's going to be. So at any rate Admiral Chandler said, "Do it." And carried it through somewhere and it was done and you know that made some of my own friends mad a little bit, not because they didn't believe sociology ought to be in there but because they felt that I had, you-know, somehow or other, I guess, taken some of the steam out of trying to put pressure on to adopt the whole faculty curriculum proposal, but I don't think it had anything to do with it. But at any rate that was the way that kind of thing happened and then we were in there from then on as a reasonably acceptable and performing department, and as I suspected and I think as other people suspected, the department spurted even more, and by that time we were into you-know, post-war affluence area and students were coming back by droves and the college was expanding and all the disciplines were
growing and our type of growth spurt was such that we
not only grew from these kinds of things which we had nothing
really essentially to do with except that they were num-
bere but we grew more than most people and I by this
time had added an anthropologist to the staff, Nathan
Altschuler, and he began to move that pretty well for
we were a joint department and students had a really
delightful kind of array to pick from between sociology
and anthropology for a major. In essence they had one
of the first interdisciplinary majors or double majors
that a student at William and Mary could have, all within
regulations. So that meant we were confronted, you know,
with some tasks in that period of growth, two or three years
after that, of adding several people to the staff in a year, as
and everybody else through the country was, so we had gigantic
wrestling matches getting good
getting a good staff and getting a lot of it at once and
socializing but it worked.

So those were some of the kind of problems that I think we
had and you know that I can remember.

Williams: Did your rapidly expanding enrollment give sociology some
respectability, do you think, in the eyes of the others on the faculty?

Kernodle: Oh yes, I think so and there were a lot of other, you know,
different kinds of people coming into the faculty by that time,
you see, so that two years after I had first come and gone away
and come back by the time I was coming back there were two
or three or four others had been added and a lot more and they
were the kind of people by age and training and circumstance that I was or we had maybe another little problem --

I don't know whether it was a problem or not, it was a delight to me, just being the younger member of the faculty --
and the only one among most people there for five, ten, fifteen years, older in experience and everything else.

They were very, very kind to us. I couldn't ask for any more kind, generous treatment, personally, by members of the faculty. It was expected that we would spend more time with students than with some of these people (socially and otherwise), and we did. And we found it delightful and they found us attractive and young and energetic, and so we'd take the students part a lot and lived with them a little bit in terms of coming back. They were our age and they were our friends and never thought of it at the time but I expect there was a little bit of concern or question as to, you know, what faculty members are doing. Is he just currying favor with students, or what is he doing? But I don't sense any real problem at this point.

Williams: You mentioned the Hampton Roads study. Did that have any bearing on the department of sociology or did that simply have a bearing on bringing you to the department of sociology?

Kernodle: Well, I think it gave credibility to the department because Shary Umeck was instrumental, kind of in putting this together. He had started a study of his own of what he was calling "a war-boom community" which Williamsburg and James City County
kind of was when Camp Peary was all ready in out there, you see, where it was and that was a training area and Fort Rustis was kind of near by. All this community had become kind of partly a military community. An R and R area the inn was taken over kind of as an R and R and so Shary was out of the Chicago sociology school and that area and interested in you know that type of urban phenomena, so he undertook started a study of Williamsburg area a wartime boom community and then Chuck Marsh and a couple of others with him saw the prospect of a much larger kind of study of the impact of the war on the whole Hampton Roads peninsula area so that got funded. In part, I guess, I came originally to do a study of the effects of the war in the Hampton Roads area on the recreational life of that community. I had some interest in leisure recreation at that time and I got more fascinated with the effects on family structure and family behavior, changing customs and practices of such behavior, marital relations and divorce and separations and war brides and that kind so dovetailed getting involved in that end with Shary's keenness and professional capacity and be attached to it and then getting that I guess was one of the first real joint research projects that this college ever set in that kind of sense. I think gave some credibility to sociology which people may not have seen you know before. At least it drew me a lot and it resulted in a publication which was kind of a good resource thing for Norfolk and Newport
News and their lower peninsula planning commission, which Dr. Pate did a lot of special work in and family councils in Norfolk used my stuff, and Dr. Moss's stuff with business. So it became a kind of a thing and received a pretty good critical notice in the American Sociological Review and then in some other journals where it was reviewed. So it gave the college a little pin on something which I think, you know, redounded to those who worked on it.

Williams: There were no students, though, involved in it?

Kernode: No, this was just as it ended up Chuck Marsh, a kind of key person who was overall director, and my wife was the research assistant who kept the gears going and edited the manuscripts and kept the data and she had an assistant secretary. It was as I thought her kind of an assistant secretary and Dr. Pate in government and Dr. Moss was doing one small piece of work in political life and there was another economist, McGuire, who did something. Bob Caldwell was supposed to do something on the effects of the war on crime and delinquents and so forth but he never came up with the data or any manuscript or anything else. He had more money than I did to live on. But it was faculty not students.

Williams: The question I have asked was when sociology moved into graduate level, did it encounter opposition again as it had when you were trying to make it a distribution course?

Kernode: What I think I essentially said there was that I didn't think

*At this point the tape malfunctioned, when this was realized a new tape was put in and the interviewer and interviewee summarized what had been said about the graduate program.*
that it did meet that kind of opposition, certainly not the same kind. By this time the department was well established and accepted, and any kind of resistance that it would have picked up then would have been resistance to graduate work in general rather than specifically to sociology.

So that I think that's primarily what's in that. And then I did go on to say that the concerns about graduate work at William and Mary by a lot of people probably was legitimate in their minds from the notion that it would take away from resources and involvement and so forth for the undergraduate program and had the potential, I guess, what they might say of the tail swinging the dog that the graduate programs by virtue of the fact that they were graduate, they'd need more money, more staff, more library facilities, more everything and in competition with that something would have to give, and that would be the undergraduate program and as long as undergraduates were making up the larger part of the student body there monies and all that were what William and Mary was and had been and that seemed unless there was real assurance that graduate work would not rebound to the disadvantage of the undergraduate program. I think there was some logic in their resistance to it on those grounds.

Williams: Have these fears of what this would do to the undergraduate program proven to be unfounded, do you think?

Kernodle: I don't know whether it's been bad but maybe as a part of the
general development of graduate programs which, certainly, didn't spawn, but which created the climate of opportunity for certain parts of the academic world at William and Mary, like education and business and formerly jurisprudence, which we were an inherent part of, a liberal arts college and training and curriculum and all their stuff came through the faculty and through and their destinies were our destinies, everyone's destiny was the same. The graduate programs designated a slightly different departure from that, and that meant there would be some people in physics and chemistry and biology and psychology and government and sociology and so forth there would be some people in that whose eyes would be in that direction of professional disciplines, more than just you know, the broad scope of liberal arts. With that, it probably gave these people the stimulus and maybe the lynch pin to argue more successfully their need for distinction, a distinctness, from, you know, the undergraduate college and that's when we began to move into that era in which the battles were fought (and are still somewhat there, I guess) with regard to the competition for all those things that are needed by expanding the school of education and expanding business school and expanding the law school and think of dormitory space, libraries, office space, monies of all kinds -- and that threat became greater to the liberal arts college than graduate programs in the disciplines per se. So in a way, you
know, looking at it from that perspective, the development of
can be a business
graduate programs didn't spawn those. Those things were
desired, I'm sure, long ago by some people, but it
graduate liberal arts disciplines how can you say we can't have
school, education school, law school?

Williams: You had said that sociology could more or less go into
graduate work if the department decided it wanted to.
Was this the desire particularly of the president?
I know of at least one department where the state wanted
the college to offer that course at a graduate level. Where
was the push coming from?

Kernodle: Well, I think the push here was really -- I was of two minds
about this as were some of my colleagues. The college never
asked us to do this, insisted, or argued that we should or
anything else of the kind. I had been very happy with the
fact that there was no graduate work in sociology in the en-
tire commonwealth of Virginia and that again was a product
of people not knowing what it was or not regarding it suffi-
ciently for it. But the very idea that there was not a
single program in sociology in the entire commonwealth ap-
palled me because I would like for some students that we
had who were really damned good. They were high quality
people -- they were going to Harvard and they were going to
U.N.C. and they were going to, you know, like L.S.U. and
Tulane and so forth but you know some of them should be
going in-state. And we also should have had, you know, the
guidance and model and all that coming from a graduate department, and all that coming from a graduate department, which always described a bunch of very, very capable, scholarly people in sociology went to U.Va. from time to time and after about two years, they retired from being a Cavalier and you know they never did any more research, they never did anything too productive and besides, U.Va. was predominantly a male school in those days and we, you know, had both men and women but we had a lot of women who are attracted to the discipline -- always has been. So they didn't see much need for having, you know, more than one or two courses around that, you know, the men could play with among other more serious kinds of things, so I first proposed at the state level and to the president of U.Va. that they start a graduate pro-
gram. First of all, I suggested that they develop a good under-
graduate major in sociology and upon that, then, to build a graduate Ph.D. program in sociology. That received some light consideration from the U.Va. people until Edgar Shannon be-
came president and then he got interested in it, so he hired a fellow named Rex Winter, who was an anthropologist to go up and start a graduate program in sociology. Well, Winter didn't do that. He went there, but anthropologists are on location a year or two and then they're out in the field somewhere, and graduate students kind of gather around and do field work and the sociologists still didn't get anywhere. At one juncture
I almost -- well, I was asked, I was interviewed, I talked to them and I may have gone to U.Va. at one time to build the department up there, but I did not get the kind of assurances that I wanted with the money, staffing, future, so I stayed here. The point of all that is that I decided since nobody else was going to do it then I would do it. So Ed Rhyne and I were here and Nat Altschuler and a couple of other people by that time so I just sat down and we talked this all over and we wrote a graduate proposal and submitted it and of course it had to go through by that time all the approvals of the Council of Higher Education, and it was a fortunate time to do it because the resistance hadn't grown up and people that worried about money. We all already had a good staff on hand by this time. -- a little bit with the governor's help, special fund, the CASS grant -- so we were really sitting here with the best sociology staff in the state of Virginia in terms of its representation and quality and so on. As a matter of fact, the Southern Sociological Society had about that time had a meeting in New Orleans and judged William and Mary's undergraduate sociology as the best undergraduate sociology department in the South because we had by that time twelve or fourteen people; we had 165 undergraduate majors; we had, you know, all kinds of stuff going, and we had a good library. somebody had done some pretty good work back in there somewhere (Albion Taylor and others), so the classical stuff was there,
and then we had begun to add, you know, all the new stuff that was going along. So we were sitting here, really, with the best sociology staff, easily, in the Commonwealth of Virginia and if nobody else was going to do it, we would do it. So we did and so for a while we had the only graduate program. Then very shortly after that they hired a very strong professional sociologist at U.Va. and he's a good administrator and he fights hard and he came there to do exactly what I had originally thought I would do and he's done so.

He's gathered some way or the other, got lots of money, has put together a very outstanding group of people that he's brought in from all over the country. They offer a Ph.D. program, which is great and they're on the way and they're behind schedule, you know, with U.N.C. and some other states, but they're coming and they will now furnish the Ph.D. level type of graduate sociology. And I'm glad of that. I hated to think of the prospect of us moving into at William and Mary doing Ph.D. work in sociology for everybody in the state because I didn't see that's who we really were. But I was going to do it or try to do it if somebody else didn't. So that's there. Then V.P.I. has changed; they have one. O.D.U. is attempting to get something underway; they may even say they do have and V.C.U. So we don't really need to do that. We can run a pre-doctoral type of sociology graduate program, fundamentally, with our eyes on maybe most of those people going on somewhere else, to do their Ph.D. work, or some may stop