at the masters' level and get into whatever types of occupations that might be germane to that. So we're happy with staying at this level as long we can have developing stuff around us. But I don't know whether we'd really have developed the masters' program in sociology when we did or if we would have if something else had existed. So it was a pressure of that kind of absence of sociology in the state as much as anything else that provoked me and some others to do anything.

Williams: I've often wondered without physics -- and you spoke a moment ago of how at one time the people who weren't in physics wondered were they going to be gobbled up by it -- without physics, would William and Mary, do you think, have gone into graduate training as they did?

Kernodle: That's a good question. An economics professor I had once at [name] College said, "Who knows what would have been if what is were not." I think the expansions that were going on were such that there were a lot of people around who wanted to get into graduate programs in one thing or another, and there wasn't room for them. Universities had had these programs couldn't expand fast enough to do it and accomodate all of them. It looked like we were in a period of eternal need for producing, you know graduate-trained personnel in all kinds of fields, you know, which short-sighted we aren't by-the-way-of-things-change. By the same token, I might intersperse, that I think we could do a very well at William and Mary and a lot of other places if we started cutting down on law
schools and education schools and other kinds of programs where it has become clear that we're not going to need all those people that we have trained. They're going to have to try each other or sell insurance to each other or study each other or something. But I think probably there would have been enough there by way of perceived need to justify those people who wanted to do it in the first place, but I think physics had a very special kind of influence in making it happen or bringing it about because of all that, you know, man getting a foot in outer space and the adjacency of Langley Field and you know the need for trained scientists, the country was wild on the need to keep up with the Russians and to train scientists and that whole bit got going, you see, so that the colleges had not tended to their business. They should have been training more physicists and scientists and stuff so we could be number one out there in that kind of competition. It was a cultural kind of despair, and so I think colleges that were adjacent to that kind of had an obligation in that way to get in there and do their job.

Williams: Was there something of a jealousy on the part of the departments of these highly trained people coming in and the money being pumped into physics?

Kernodle: Yes, sure. Now how much of it was true and how much wasn't -- it looked pretty clear that there was a lot of gossip about there were high-energy physicists and low-energy physicists and high-something else and low-something else, and
there were rumors about the salary scale at that time. Physicists making more than college presidents. One of the jokes is "My God, they're even making more than the athletic director or the football coach." And I'm sure that was there because you bring in people who can build and run cyclotrons without knowing that they were even going to become obsolete in a few years and cost the college a lot of money, but yes, I think that was there. So the differential you know, kind of salary scale.

Physicists had come out of the nobody at William and Mary ever saw a physicist. They came to the college, they went down to the basement of Rogers and that's the last you ever saw of them. They never came to faculty meetings; they never went to parties; we almost never heard of them again. But now they were out there, very visible. The visibility of physicists — really it was kind of a strange kind of thing. They were not only visible; you know, in terms of more money and graduate programs, but they were beginning to gobble up such positions, you know, as chairman of the curriculum committee or assistant to the dean or in the president's office half the time and so on, and that looked pretty threatening, you know, to a lot of people. Are they going to change this institution into, you know, into a damn technical institute? Maybe? I think that was there.

Williams: On the subject that is related to the sociology department; we had discussed somewhat when I was last here what began as
the Marshall-Wythe Symposium. What was the purpose of this organization?

Kernodle: Well, I think (if I can recall correctly) it started out as a kind of opportunity to bring some people into the college from outside who would provide an additional ingredient to the educational life of the college. So that you could, you know, think of bringing in three or four or five speakers a year who would talk around some kind of basic theme. I think Albion Taylor had a lot to do with thinking about that and putting it together; so it was essentially a social science kind of notion. There was no program of lectures at the time at the college. We didn't have art, lectures, music. There were plays and there were things but the appearance of somebody on campus that wasn't a professor, you know, just somebody from New York or Harvard or Yale or somebody talking on an essentially academic theme or matter. You might get somebody who would come and talk about something not having to do with academic life and ideas. This wasn't around and it was a good idea, you know. So that was, I think, the beginning of it and kind of after Taylor quit doing it went down a little bit, and Chuck Marsh got an idea that you could use it to break the "lockstep with education," as he used to call it (you know, going through the distribution, going through the major, all this fertile, it was the same idea: to bring in some vital minds, somebody who excite the students, give them some new ideas. Somewhere along that period of time he brought in a pretty good bunch of
speakers at that time and it livened up and it kind of became the property of the social science division, but then it started going downhill again for some reason. As I said last time, we had divisions, and at a division meeting to discuss the Marshall-Wythe Symposium, the resolution or motion essentially that brought the meeting together was to abolish it, to do away with it. I think that Dr. Southworth was one that was making that motion because he didn't see what there weren't enough students taking it, the interest had declined, and so on. But I asked Dr. Marsh and Albion Taylor and some others if they would agree — that their departments could agree — that we would have one more shake at it. They said, "Well, do you mean that you will take it over?" I said, "Well, sure, I'll try." And so we added a credit, one credit; juniors and seniors may take it — they may take it once as a junior and once as a senior. It'd be in the spring; it'd be a fortnightly series of lectures and (that sort of description which you can find in the record) and the students may take it no more than twice and take it for one hour of credit which, you know, was an idea. There was nothing else in the college you could take for one hour. A lot of students ended up by virtue of the way the course load as freshmen, fourteen hours, and so they ended up frequently needing two hours to graduate, and about the only thing around was "Introduction to Law" for two hours but at any rate we got that accepted; that there would be two hours and they would have to attend the lectures.
(all of them or most of them) and that they would have to have an examination. We started enrolling 50 and 75 and 100 and 175. That began to be a real problem of who's going to grade them—who’s going to grade the papers because we tried to pick a topic. Everybody in the division would send a representative, each department on the Marshall-Wythe Symposium committee and we would pick a theme for the next year, and that person representing the department would agree to grade questions on the examination which were in their particular bailiwick. So we just started out with, you know, a good background and some help from those people like Taylor and Marsh and Moss and so on. I just decided to start writing—once you've got a theme—I thought up a few and I was lucky with what was happening in a way because one year the things were beginning to go scientifically around and I don't know, in my head, I thought about, you know, about outer space. You know, what's going on there, what effect that'll have on society, mankind, this, that and the other and nothing had really gone up in the air yet so I picked up the phone and called Allen Waterman, who was director of the National Science Foundation, and I told him what the symposium was and what we were trying to do, and I said, would you come down to William and Mary in—[whatever the date was]—and give a talk to this symposium on a topic like you know, "Man's with one foot in outer space." And he said, "Well, I'll think about it. I'm not sure that I can clear my dates, but
it's a fascinating topic." And so a week later, Sputnik went up in the air and my phone rang about two days after that and Waterman said, "I'm coming to William and Mary. Anybody that can think of what's going to happen before it happens..." And so he did and I got some other people I explained to them, dealing with, you know, the -- as I explained to him, "in your position, you're, you know, one of the leading people in your discipline, you've written a lot of books; you've done a lot of thinking about it. Now, what's our society going to be like in the next decade? Tell us what you think as a scholar and a professional person what the next decade of our century is going to be like. Now I don't want any fancy, gobbledygook and, you know, all that jazz. I want to know what you think realistically is going to be our way of life within the next ten-year period." And the response was really fantastic. You know, I got all kinds of interesting people who agreed to come, and the students responded to it. There really wasn't much going that was live for them and there were some nationally prominent people that were on television and the news and that kind of stuff, and if you announced that you know, this kind of person is coming to William and Mary, the students -- so we began to get appeals from local citizens, and C.W. wanted to know if their people could come to the symposium so I developed a list of you know, people around the community, and so on that we would invite -- but I still wanted to keep
it as a class and not just a public lecture form so we did that. We used to have, you know, the head of Colonial Williamsburg would regularly come and I know four or five other people over there. They were delighted to be invited, you know, and occasionally somebody from Richmond would come down for the special speaker. Well, students liked that, too, you know, because here were these various people around. The newspapers were frequently there, and were taping recording all this stuff for posterity. So it got a real nice little reputation and then I argued for and received support from the college to give us a little money to publish these lectures under the Marshall-Wythe Symposium name and so I edited three volumes of that, and they were published, and they received, you know, very good notice. Libraries all over the country kept writing to get copies of these because they were I'd edited the lectures. We'd taped recorded them, had them transcribed, and sent copies back to these people, and they re-edited them, and then I wrote a commentary on each of them and they furnished a really kind of set-up, valuable insights and lectures and essays on a variety of questions. So it went very well. I enjoyed that time, both in terms of doing it and helping make it successful and getting a lot of people involved and helping me and I enjoyed the stimulation of people and I always made it a point when these people came down to be sure that at least two students were involved in meeting the person personally and having dinner with them and you know pre-dinner.
or if they stayed over night to have something out at my house, a drink or two, or whatever, sit around on the floor. They had primary access to people like that, and it was in a time when there wasn’t a helluva lot going like that, and so I thoroughly enjoyed it.

Williams: You talked when I was last here about the unusual circumstances surrounding the appearance of Brooks Hays in 1957, I think it was.

Kernodle: Well, as you can imagine when the desegregation question was pretty hot (‘54 being the decision) and Brooks Hays being from Arkansas and having taken a position as a moderate had received -- well, he had helped the president, you know, to see the moderate points of this and get it accepted partly but his own constituency had kind of given him flak back home and around the country. But Brooks Hays was essentially a very moderate type of person; he was what you would today call conservative, but his position was fundamentally we’ve got to make this thing work. We need to go ahead and think intelligently about how to do this, but nonetheless he picked up the label of “radical” among all those who wanted to “massively resist” and who were determined to do that and the state was loaded with those kinds of people. So when I wrote Brooks Hays and asked him if he would come down to discuss -- that was the year we were doing unfinished issues, unresolved issues in American society, and one of them was obviously race (which is still unresolved). And I said, “You represent
for me one of the people that stands in the middle, not wisely-washy, but in the moderate position, and that's the toughest spot that I can imagine for anybody to be on this issue, because if you're totally reactionary and massive resistance, you've lots of friends; they're with you, you can justify. If you're completely radical on it ("let's go and go fast," you don't give a damn about what anybody thinks about, except those that are with you. But if you're moderate, the moderate has no where to go; you're attacked on all sides." And he said, "That's right. That's exactly it." I said, "How about talking to us about it?" And he said, "I don't have time to write a formal speech for a lecture about this." I said, "Okay, if you let me tape record what you say." "Well, that'll be okay," he said. So he came down and did that. Well, by the time he got here -- as I told you last time -- it had been put in the papers, Brooks Hays would speak at the Marshall-Wythe Symposium. Well, that had stirred up the White Citizens' Councils in Newport News and Hampton and the surrounding area, and they had written letters to the editor objecting, and then and so on, and they had threatened to protest and come up here and see that it was not done, that he couldn't speak, and I guess the Admiral had gone out of town, the president on a meeting, and the news got to him that this was occurring, and so he sent back word that the Marshall-Wythe Symposium would either be postponed or cancelled, and the final word was that it was to be cancelled, and I said
"No, you can't do that. For what reason?" I said, "That's no way. It fits into the middle of an influence that's going to stop any kind of thinking or any kind of variance or anything. That's not what an educational institution is." Whether it was a flare-up or not, I interpreted it to be that if I let that symposium go on with Brooks Hays, that would be the end of my connection with the college. But I did it anyway. Of course by this time, the students knew about it and they were concerned, and they were determined it was going to go on, and they would support me in that, and so would my colleagues. It was a very fine time so I got Brooks Hays off the plane and brought him in and as I said, the White Citizens' Councils were here. They had planks and they were in front of Washington Hall where we had these lectures, and somebody suggested that it would be better for security if we took him around through the back and came in there, and I explained this to Brooks Hays and told him I was quite willing to do that. And he said, no, not going to do that; he was going in the same way everybody else went. So he walked in, and they came around a little closer and jeered and all that, and signs and Hays stopped and simply said to them, "I appreciate your coming very much, and I understand why you're here. I'd like to invite all of you to come in and listen to the lecture, if you'd like. If you can get a seat. Also, I'd just like to say to you that this is the second time that I have been demonstrated against. The last time was by the Communist Party." At any
rate, we went in and had the speech and came out. They were still there. As I told you, our students encircled them and just started walking, and they walked over to Jamestown Road, and when they got the White Citizens' Council people in the middle of Jamestown Road, the students fell away and left them standing.

By which time Brooks and I and whoever I was with -- I've forgotten -- moved on over towards the other side and gotten in a car and gone to the hotel. No, I guess he was staying in the Brufferton. But it was a very interesting time, and it turned out all right, and when the Admiral got back after he was a little disturbed that I had taken the prerogative of making a decision which was opposed to the administrative decision. But there was a lot of hollering that went on in a fury, but in-between that he calmed down and listened, you know, to what I said and why I did it and so on, and after all that, I am happy to say, he changed his mind and I'm pleased he did, of course. But I'm proud of him that he did, and he took some risks in doing so, but I think he learned something in the situation, and from that time he and I still disagreed over a lot of things, but we talked to each other pretty straight and he knew I always told him what I was thinking; he said so.

We had lots of differences of opinion over other different things, but I think he always felt that I was a straight shooter, and being in the military I guess he liked straight shooters.

But that was, you know, one of those kind of -- and we always had a little, you know, whenever we had anybody that had a taint
of you know some kind of liberal view. I ran one section back-to-back with John Roche who in those days was a very bright, young, energetic, free-thinking professor of government at Haverford College, who then went to Brandeis and he was publishing in *New Republic* and things like that and taking some issue with the status quo and politics of the day and (some on segregation, that kind of stuff). So I wanted John Roche to come down and talk to the students about his perspective, why he felt the way what he did, what his viewpoints were, how he interpreted the future. Then also, I wanted Russell Kirk, who in my view, the person who represented the most absolutely conservative point of view that you could possibly imagine anybody having. If anybody was ever conservative by genetics, it's Russell Kirk and he kind of says that himself. So, you know, my plan was to represent both extremes and both those men knew each other; they'd been on the same platform from time to time, and they both knew each other was coming and you know, well they disagreed at great ends from one another; they respected each other, you know, professionally and neither of them had any objections. They agreed but when Roche was coming first then I got lots of some flak from both people on the faculty and people in the state and so on as to why are you bringing John Roche to the College of William and Mary? He's a Communist. Years have proved that John Roche was more conservative than he was liberal. At any rate at that time he had that reputation and
that's why I brought him here, but I got lots of flak.

"Why are you bringing John Roche to the campus? Why are you bringing a Communist to the campus? But why do you have to do that?" And I said, "Well, I'm bringing Russell Kirk."

"Then why don't you bring Russell Kirk first?" But there was, you know, that kind of constant controversy that centered around the Marshall-Wythe Symposium if you tried to do anything that was, you know, a little bit different. Then I brought a labor leader, one of the Reuther (Victor), a bombastic, determined, demanding, "What is a labor leader doing in a college? Is he going to organize the faculty or a labor union?" Labor unions are not legal in the state of Virginia and so on. With anybody like that, it was a controversial circumstance at that time. It wouldn't be now, obviously. But always in a little bit of hot water about that, you knew with the pressure on and you had to always be alert and prove, you know, that you had your program in order so they couldn't get you or something. Nevertheless, I determined to go ahead.

Williams: What, then, was the connection between the Marshall-Wythe Symposium and the Marshall-Wythe Institute, or was there one?

Kernodle: Well, there was no Marshall-Wythe Institute; the Marshall-Wythe Symposium was it, and there was a little money somewhere -- I don't know where it came from, part of it, -- I always argued that the money from the Marshall-Wythe Symposium, when I was running it, came from the tuition that the students
paid and the time that I had it going for a few years, this
proctoring of 200 or 250 students, they were paying
more money than I was spending for speakers and,
you know, I was giving people like John Roche, you know, twenty-five-
$250 dollars plus maybe fifty dollars to come down here, and we'd
put him up in the Braggerton and I'd feed him at my house or
Brooks Hays would charge you nothing. I managed on a budget
$500, and you know, like the
tuitions paid that but there was some money connected in the
somewhere, they said, from the Cutler fund. So Dr. Moss always
felt he had some kind of special involvement with that because
-- he knows more about this than I do -- when the money was given
originally for government and (the John Marshall professorship
Warner was a good
doctor of government) and so on. They wanted to get a friend of the
symposium but it was that kind of connection.

It was in the social science division and so on, but there was
no Marshall-Wythe Institute so it was partly an involvement
with the Marshall-Wythe Symposium and the growth of the social
science division and my experience at Chapel Hill with a
social science research institute at Chapel Hill which combined
the research efforts and staff of economics and sociology and
some people in government and politics and a few in business.
It was fundamentally as a sociology predominantly kind of
operation but some very important key people from these others
at Chapel Hill, they formed the institute and they under Howard Odom it was
formed and they originated as a journal and lots
of government research and so on. I thought that would be a good thing for us to have for the social sciences because the natural sciences had, you know, their kind of funding from grant agencies and so on and so on. I thought social sciences always got a little short shrift, at least that was my paranoid and so I wanted to see if we could package something like this and so we talked about with Mel Jones and President Paschall, I believe. Started with the Admiral, thinking about it, trying to put it together, and then finally we got agreement, wrote the design of it what it would be and have a director and an associate director and how the different departments would be involved in it and represented and they would have some funding from the college and they kind of agreed to that.

About that time there was about to be a change in who was going to be the chairman of the government department and so and Dr. Moss -- I might argue he shouldn't have been but there was no prior agreement that any particular person would be chairman of the government research institute. But Paschall apparently decided that he would be a good one to move into that since he wasn't going to be chairman of the government department any longer but that surprised me a little bit. Warner had some of his own ideas as to how it should operate and run and maybe he was right, I'm not arguing that, but he felt that there shouldn't be an associate director because he liked to operate a little bit more independently. But I felt that was bad because I wanted
to get that position funded and have the associate director do an awful lot of the leg work and the running of the gears and getting grants for the institute from federal governments and state and this, that and the other, and you know, doing that kind of office management (like a managing editor of a newspaper does) and running the symposium and leave the director to represent the institute, you know, like professionally and scholarly and you know, like keep the thing going by way of ideas but that never got quite done.

And then it was still to the Marshall-Wythe Symposium which it did, Dr. Moss took over and ran that for awhile but it also never materialized, I don't know, lack of financial support and I think the administration misused the institute a little bit for its own reasons. To use it for one thing rather than for the purposes it had been set out to do so it never really developed, you know, in the directions that we had originally hoped for for a few years because it never really furnished the opportunity for all the members of the social science departments to get leadership in research involvement, research activity, help them to write grants and this, that and the other. So it was about to be abolished when Dr. Moss was going to retire of the idea that it was maybe time to give up the Marshall-Wythe Symposium, I mean the Marshall-Wythe Institute. It was just a piece of paper kind of thing and you know, nothing significant what would be missing if you did away with it? Well, I guess partly because when you help give birth to something you don't like to see it die unless
it's really something that should never have been born)ex
at least, like to try. See some of us got our heads to-
gether and said "what about seeing if we can't reinvigorate
that thing and restructure it a little bit. Dr. Moss is
retiring and he did some good things but why don't we see
somebody appointed to that who can give it a kind of go,
and give him the kind of assistance and office space and
that sort of thing. But I kept being determined to have
that space down there. We had a lot more space originally
designed for the Marshall-Wythe Institute than they now
have. It would house a lot of research volumes and studies
and census materials and secretarial staff that could do a
lot of manuscript typing and work for everybody in the division,
etc., etc., but that got scrapped around. But they did
agree to appoint a capable new director and got
do enough, you know, so they did get Clyde Haulman and Len
Schifrin helped with that and Clyde himself and so he's
taken that over gradually and now is more rapidly pulling
it into more or less, the kind of thing we initially had
in mind for it to do and I currently think Clyde's doing a
really great job. He's pulling, you know, people from different
departments in and this, that, and the other and stimulates
staff of his own and now it's beginning to have that kind of
function. So I'm glad it was saved and moved.

But it was an interesting, you know, and difficult kind of thing
to convince people to have a research institute in the social
sciences. This is part of the same continuing theme. And
A lot of people in those departments were suspicious of it. Why can't we have just our own research? Why join in with historians and sociologists, you know? Of course, history had its own nice, well-funded, well put together, you know, great institute of research in early American history, and that is fine. They didn't really -- at least many of the historians didn't need any kind of thing of this kind, and therefore they didn't feel inclined to put their energies and efforts into supporting it, and so I don't blame them. But at the same time they were developing more people in American history and intellectual history and contemporary history, and some of those, like Dick Sherman and so on, they were interested, and so they threw their support to it in its latter day, and that helped. And I'm sure people like Thad Tate and others were very happy, too. They don't mind; they don't have this institute doesn't and couldn't threaten anything that they do; it never had any intent to do so in the first place. Well, that's essentially the history of that.

There's one other little piece in there. It's kind of a part of that. There's a Virginia Social Science Association; people in all the social sciences have an annual meeting and a lot of us used to go to that. It's not a real strong organization, but we developed in that organization, called the Virginia Social Science Journal. It hadn't published very much of any quality, occasionally, so they
were about to abandon that because the fellow that had been doing it wasn't well, and he didn't think he could continue. So I got with President Paschal and asked him if he would find enough money to bring that to William and Mary, to support it at least for the first year, to guarantee it in terms of publication costs, and we would edit it from here and what I had in mind was to use that journal out of William and Mary as a voice for social sciences in the state and bring to bear some influence on policy decisions in the state, in the legislature, and so on by publishing good works from social scientists in the state—lawyers, business, economics, sociologists, and so on—addressing certain kinds of questions, like criminal justice or segregation or whatever they happened to be. So we got that going for a while and it didn't pan out as well as we had hoped because people assigned to really I didn't want to take on the editorship of it but that was a problem in there and it wasn't followed through as carefully as it should be and I've always regretted that because we could today at William and Mary have a very good social science journal which the institute, you could have. They would represent stuff from the state but this could be the place that that was funding in and Clyde Haulman is here now. He could be editing—or somebody else—and we could, by now, having a quality of article and productivity and influence on certain issues in the state through a journal which we just,
you can't have. And I thought it a particular tragedy that that opportunity was lost.

Williams: It was lost because of funding and interest?

Kernodle: Well, it was lost by virtue of lack of sufficient funding to do certain kinds of things but also by virtue of just the default of a couple of people who were responsible for seeing to it that the manuscripts were gotten in, the publication dates were met, that sort of thing. Which I wouldn't lay entirely to the door of the administration and I'll take responsibility in part for helping to choose one or two of the people who were supposed to— but I think we still could have rescued it but one of those people on his own, without discussing this with me or with the college or anybody else, made arrangements to have the editorship of that transferred to another institution, where it now is and did so, I think, to rescue his own default. But that hurt me a little bit. In retrospect, you know, with all the other things you're doing you make decisions and I decided not to do that one—not to edit it myself—and I probably should have, anyway, to make sure I had been in who I supported. I'm sure that the person who was appointed to do it was appointed by virtue of my strong argument in that direction. But thinking back over it I really can't imagine having made any other decision at the time because the person had all the characteristics and experience and background and ability and everything else to do so and was for that particular purpose...
more qualified than I was. (I'd edited a newspaper in college, but, you know, and I'd done some symposium editing, but I didn't want to take on. I'm not a Thad-Tacus guy. If we'd had Thad do it we'd be in great shape, but that's that.) Of course, but we didn't have that kind of foresight, so that's all a disappointing part of our social science history at this point.
November 11, 1975

Kernodle: Well, I guess, you know, I came in 1945 first (I talked about that particular period of time being the first young faculty member out of graduate school, still in graduate school) and an
keen interest in sports and athletics because I had been an
athlete myself and you know liked baseball and track, some
-tennis though tennis wasn't my major sport as far as ability was concerned, however.
It was fast becoming one of my main interests and then
Sharvy Umbeck was chairman of the athletic committee and
head of my department. William and Mary had had a previous
to the war - it became to develop a class-type of athletic
collegiate program in football with Carl Voyles who was here
and the alumni and board, all the college. I don't know
how much the faculty prior to my coming were that enthusiastic
but somewhere and then Umbeck, of course, was building this
great, fabulous tennis team before the war and was all ready
very clearly producing a super tennis team and two of those
fellows got killed in the war and didn't get back. But they
put it together again so that by the time I got here, the athlet-
tic program was at a very high peak. Similarly in basketball
they were doing very well. So a lot had gone on just about the
time I got here and so, you know, I was very happy with that
look at that time. It looked like a going interest and competi-
tive kind of operation. I didn't know anything else about the-
for the college

college, what that might imply because I'd come out of a
fairly large university system in North Carolina, as you may
know, people are insane about sports, more than they are in
Virginia. So I was happy with that and being the age I was
I jumped right into participation and knew all the athletes
personally. They were my age, sort of, and we lived in the
Tucker Court area with them— in the U.K. houses and other
military housing, so they were, among our
friends and buddies,
and then their wives, and helped babysit their kids and that
sort of thing. So I was right along in that and then Rube
McCray came in, of course, as head coach and was also athletic
director, and was head of the physical education department,
and the head coach of football. And I guess Barney Wilson
pretty soon came in as head basketball coach -- that was a
big era in there of that. So that was rocking on pretty
well. I enjoyed that, and Umbeck was kind to me and saw that
I got to lots of games and on trips with the football team, and
you know, that was all very good. And then I went back to
Caldwell College after two years and when I came back things were
you know, really rocking in that direction in a bigger and better.

I don't know what other people had been smelling around and
seeing; I'm sure there was a lot of other faculty members who'd
been here longer than I, far longer than I had had some
ideas about bigness and its problems and so on but nobody ever
openly said anything that I heard about that end of it.

But then when some things began to come along and Nelson Marshall
became dean of the faculty. He was in biology and marine
science and Nelson and I played a lot of handball together.
We were very good friends and so -- I can't remember whether
Nelson was interested in athletics -- I believe he was. I've forgotten who was
-- maybe it was chairman of the athletic committee at the time with Sharvy.

Williams: Marshall was at one time, but the board requested that he step down.

Kernodle: I guess it was Nelson Marshall because what happened -- and I
don't know whether anybody knows this except Nelson and I or
whether anybody else has mentioned it -- but a football player
who was in my class came to me and was very unhappy about what
was happening to him in football and what he said was happening
to some other players. His complaint was not any physical
abuse or anything of that kind, but that he claimed that his
grant and aid was going to be taken away from him because
he had injured his knee badly and was not going to be able to
play so that he described to me his (grant and aid -- football
scholarship was what we called them in those days which is what
they still are) -- and so I said, "I don't think that's possible."
And he said, "That's what they say." And I said, "Who
says?" And he said, "The coach," and all these other things.
And I said, "Well, I just don't think that's possible."
"Would you testify to that? Would you be willing to tell the
chairman of the faculty committee on athletics and the dean of
the faculty what you're telling me?" And he said he'd think
about it and two days later he came back and said he would.