sick. I mentioned this that I used to we had quite a lot of case materials to write up and I would turn over some of his papers to my wife. I remember sitting there and she'd be here, and I said, 'Toie, look at this.' For a college student, penmanship lovely, word structure, word choice, sentence structure, use of three- and four-syllable words, which many college students don't use or use them wrong, if they do, but absolutely just perfect. I mean, his thinking he only did work with me in the course. Of course, 'Principles of Managing' in the football season, and he was very busy. But so intelligent and had had apparently an excellent high school background. This is what I mean. I've had other students in my class (in that class) that had been as athletes. I had Steve Regan, a quarterback who started off the fall as fifth-string quarterback in his junior year. I think because he was so little, and others weren't doing well and got injured, and he went in and he became a star. He only weighed about 150 pounds. His brother, Terry Regan, who is now a junior or senior boy that kicks our points after touchdown. But here was Steve Regan, who was too little to make the team really, but he hung on and finally got his chance, and he turned out to be just a pinpoint passer, and he even made a lot of yardage. He was so small he could get behind our big center and then get a lot of yardage through the line. So I've been, and then Steve was a strong 'A Plus' student with me, and I've had good luck with him in attitude. They were prepared. As a matter of fact we have not lost a student in the last two years here for academic deficiency.
Emily: Moving away from athletics now, how was it that in the winter of 1952 you became the dean of faculty?

Marsh: Well, actually in the fall President Chandler came here, of course, he didn't know me from Adam and I didn't know him from Adam, either, but I made his acquaintance then, and he knew I was a department chairman and I was on this athletic committee and he checked through things, as you could have. I had been for years in these positions. I had been on leave just the year before and worked for the state government and so on. So he knew who I was, and Mr. Miller, of course, he was desperate. President Chandler was desperate that very first day when Marshall submitted his resignation. He had no dean. So he asked Mr. Miller, who was the acting president and had been a dean before, if he would please temporarily until he could work things out serve as dean. So Jim did. Now Jim has been rather frail health emotionally in many ways, nervous health, a superb teacher and a very fine scholar. So he agreed to do this. But of course, it became a very very difficult type of thing because with the new president who knew nothing about college activity really. He had taught physics, I think, at the naval academy years before but his whole experience was Naval Academy and military experience. And of course, being his father's son, you know, his father had been here and he grew up, well, actually he was away in the Navy much of the time his father was here, so he did not know too much about it. But actually, he knew how his father worked and so as a naval officer his whole experience was bingo, make decisions
and tell the people what to do, send them a directive. So when he came in with the feeling (I think he had clearly been misled by board members) that the faculty was in chaos and they absolutely needed a strong hand and so on... One of my businessmen friends at Rotary Club last night got to talking with me and said, 'Don't you think that Alvin Chandler was the best president we ever had here at the college? Wasn't he really the man of the hour, the man that was really needed at the time?' And I said, 'Well, I think very highly of President Chandler in many ways. I worked closely with him, but I certainly cannot buy that because he was not the best president the college had.' He created as many problems as he solved. On the other hand, who should have come in? I don't know. Maybe he was the best president at that point because it kind of crystallized issues, and so that may have been the case. And so this is why I had to disagree with him, quietly, but he is sort of a bombastic chap who doesn't know much about college work.

So we got acquainted and knew that I was a responsible member of the faculty and had considerable administrative experience. And so as I indicated the other day to you, on New Year's Eve or New Year's Day, New Year's Eve, I think it was, or maybe it was the 30th, at a reception over at the Nelson House in Yorktown, Mrs. George Blow gave (the whole faculty were there), he buttonholes me and pulls me aside, and he says, 'Now Dr. Marsh, he said, I'm up against a problem.'
Mr. Miller has real health problems and feels he can't stay on until February. This was the plan that he would stay on until the February Board meeting of the first week in February. And he said that he certainly can't go on beyond that. At that time he said he goes out of office in February and he will not continue on if he has health problems and so on. And he said, "Now, I know this might be a surprise to you, you may want to think about it. You may want to talk to your wife and so on." But he said, I have looked around, and I think that probably you would be the best person to come in as the Dean of the Faculty. Well, I was bowled over, of course, honored and pleased in a way. So I said, "Well, I'll certainly think about it and talk to Mrs. Marsh and come in and see you the next day or the following day or whatever it was. And so I did. And I decided," my wife said, "Well, yes, sure, go ahead."

I don't know whether I told you this or not, the previous spring, I had been invited to become a candidate for the presidency of Bowling Green State University in Ohio. My name had been thrown into the hopper by one of my friends who had gone to graduate school with me at Illinois, who was chairman of the department of economics. And their dean, who was chairman of the faculty selection committee (screening committee) came down to see me along in March. I guess so. So it worked out that I was asked to come up for an interview. Well, I was sort of misled in a way. Bowling Green was originally a normal school, you know, like Fredericksburg and
I found later on that the board had insisted that this screening committee bring in at least two names so that they would have a choice and not just say, "Well, here's our candidate, take it or leave it." Well, I found later they pretty well decided on a man from North Carolina, by the way I think McDonald, I believe something like that was the name, a very dynamic man in the field of professional education. He was pretty much their first choice, but I was the stoking horse. They didn't let me know that, you know. And so my family got all concerned and we were interested, and I was sort of ambitious and interested in having wider responsibility, so we went up there. They entertained us royally, and met all the faculty and visited a lot of people and asked a lot of questions and so on. Then a few days after that I got a telephone call from this friend of mine, and he said, "I know you're probably disappointed, but the board has selected this other man." My little girl went out and cried. She thought I was going to be president, it's the most fortunate thing in the world that I didn't go because it went on and he stay'd there for many years, but he had terrible student troubles and things of this kind because he became very unpopular at the end of the 15 or 20 years, that he was there.

And it became a large, what we call a second-rate state university. It is sort of like East Carolina, you know, what I mean? I don't want to throw it off on but I mean that it moved on out really fast and it began to give doctorate degrees and everything else. Of course, they're a reputable institution in the Ohio state system. I would never have had the wonderful experience that I had at Wofford, which was much more my
style of a college. So anyway, I think President Chandler had known about that, too. So that was a part of the fact that I was considered for this position. The faculty accepted my election, I think, well, I was welcomed by them. I was able to be a real help to President Chandler in softening some of the antagonism that existed between them. And I had to take over, though, as I think I told you the other day, about January 10th because Jim Miller virtually cracked up. The doctor told him he just had to stop everything that he was doing and get out of town for a rest. So he and his wife went down to Florida. I believe and were gone for three weeks or so. I moved right into that office with his secretary was very helpful. I thought the other day and it could be that this is something that we don't want to put in but Alyea Newberry had been brought in by Dean Marshall as secretary and then had worked those two years you see there. She may have come in under Dean Umbeck, I think not though, and then worked under Dean Miller and so she was in charge of the office. Then she was my secretary all the time I was there six years. In many ways a very fine person, but she had difficulties. Then when Mr. Jones came in the difficulties became very severe because, of course, she had her own family difficulties with a mother that was very domineering and so on. She tended to be domineering toward other secretarial help that we had and really in some relations with other faculty and so on, overprotective of my office and this type of thing. So she just worked herself out of a job, she had problems and she went to other places and finally was in the state system and was really secretary to a man who became President of ...
R.P.I. in Richmond wasn't working out and then came down here expecting she could step right in to a senior position at the college. It didn't work. She and her mother are here and her mother is retired. She didn't have a normal home life. Her father died and she became an alcoholic. His friends in South Carolina said he became an alcoholic because of the Virginia lady he married, but anyway. This was there. So I was helped by Alma Newberry. I was helped by being there. She lives in town. It could be that she could shed some light on it. But I'm afraid it would be so warped by her own experience and the fact that she's never obtained the job and has had some mental health problems. So it's rather tragic biproduct of this whole thing.

I came in on January 10th and she was helpful and then the Board elected me as Dean, not as acting but elected me as Dean at the February meeting. I stayed on until my resignation to go to Wofford. So that's how it happened.

Emily: You were speaking the other day of this. What qualities would you say this situation called for in a dean of the faculty at that time?

Marsh: Of course, the main thing I had to be the reconciler between the members of the faculty, many of them leaders of the faculty, they were hostile to the President. In effect, virtually no one on the faculty was enthusiastic about his company. Under the circumstances you can see how that would be. Some were very vigorously opposed and just decided that it was a complete mistake and didn't see how it could ever work out.
Well, I knew, and I found as I worked with him, there was no man was ever a harder-working man and more devoted. He, of course, had his affection for his father and knew that his father had helped build it, and he sort of felt that the board had led him to believe that the time had come for another strong Chandler to come in and make his mark. And he did do this: He opened the way for stronger financial support to the college by the state. He went up there, and he really made progress and got things started so that Mr. Paschal could come along and have his glorious ten years. You've seen this, of course? [Mr. Marsh pointed to a copy of Highlights of Progress, 1960-1970.]

Emily: Yes.

Marsh: But Mr. Chandler got things started that way. The one thing about him is he was a man that never did any delaying or postponing. He'd get an idea, and he would go to work on it right away and would force it through if he could. He could be (and he was to me and could be) a very charming person and absolutely lovely wife who was very helpful to him in smoothing him and even went with him and did a lot of driving for him when they went on trips because he worked so hard many hours that he would have a tendency to go to sleep on the road. So she did a lot of his driving as for they'd go out, talks to alumni groups and things of this kind. But they had no children. They were very gracious entertainers at the President's House.

And he could be just as gracious and thoughtful as could be at times.

Then he could just turn on you when he thought things were coming to a head and just be very difficult to work with, even though you were working with him. I think I mentioned the other day he looked at me a time or two and said, 'The trouble with you Chuck is that you're just
too nice. So you may have heard the quote from Leo Durocher.

"Nice guys finish last." Well, of course, in the college teaching world you're working with college teachers, you don't have to be attracted to them to be led. They have to have a feeling of confidence in the persons that they are working with, the presidents, the deans under whom they are working. I was conscious of this, of course. While sometimes you lose speed in achieving some solutions to problems, in the long run you gain through it. This was the difficulty of the president. He never won the support of the faculty. You would just get going, and you'd be all ready to say, "Isn't he a wonderful person?" His father was the same way. You'd get the feeling, "Well, think of what this man is doing for the college, and then bingo. He would do something utterly arbitrary and petty. They'd get so angry with particular individuals. In a way Mr. Nixon did some of this same sort of thing. This was some of the problems with getting up his list of enemies, you know, and this type of thing. And with Congressmen, he did the same thing with Congressmen that Chandler did with faculty. And students have to work through Congressmen; they have to lead them and so on. This is where Johnson, with all of his weaknesses, knew how to work with Congress. Mr. Nixon, poor guy, didn't. This is where a lot of his difficulties came with Congressmen and cabinet members as far as that's concerned. He worked with these people that he could achieve complete loyalty with. You remember this: this is Madison Avenue boys, the men who came in, and this proved to be his undoing.
Emily: What did the Admiral expect of his faculty?

Marsh: Well, he expected them to just move ahead and do everything possible to improve the college in terms of his own frame of mind, in terms of his own philosophy as to what was best for the college. I don't believe there was too much real conflict in basic objectives between the president and the faculty, but there was tremendous conflict in short-term objectives and the means of achieving the objectives. And of course, I mentioned the other day he would have grandiose patterns quickly doing one in particular that I had to really lock horns with him on and that was this business of trying to set up a school of business which would include the Norfolk Division and R.P.I. and would have a dean of the School of business here who would be in effect be boss of these things, have a sort of have a sub-dean down in those other places but working under the dean up here. And you just can't work that way. And of course we weren't ready, I felt and the faculty in general felt that we were not ready to move to this much of a professional program at that time. Our school of business or our department of business here with a related field of accountancy, this is the way he worked it out and worked very closely with the economics department. We were doing a good job. We were a strong outfit by and large for the job. We simply were not ready to leave all of that. We had won the battle finally of relating this important professional area, business management to the liberal arts because we continued it within the pattern within the liberal arts the first two years our students were exactly the same as the students in any of the major fields. And even in the last two years they were encouraged to take work in the other fields. Indeed, instead of putting in
certain special courses in which we now have courses in behavioral
science courses in management, we would ask them to take sociology
and to take liberal arts, philosophy, and psychology courses, you
see, to take these outside the department, whereas the school tends to be
self-contained. True, you may take courses outside, and our boys do that
even now, but it's a different situation, and yet we have now reached the
point where our courses in the school of business—a good school of
business—are so affected by the social sciences and the natural sciences,
mathematics, and so forth that really we are working with them, but we
are developing our own courses, working with the approach this material.
We were ready for it by 1968, we weren't ready for it in 1954.

Emily: You mentioned that this was one of the occasions when you and

President Chandler disagreed. Was he willing to take the advice of his deans?

Marsh: Not if it completely opposed any of his pet projects. If, on the other
hand, he was feeling his way in marginal situations, yes, he would take
advice there. But he would be more likely to come along and say,

"This is my decision, which is all right. He was the top officer of the
College, I have no objection to that. But there, during my own
presidential career, nothing I enjoyed more than to call attention to the
fact that this is a contribution of such-and-such a faculty member.
But of course, that was a smaller college, there at Wofford. But even so,
I feel that the president is a coordinator and a leader, and I do not
like (I've never liked) college presidents who have gone out and said,
"You see what I have done?" And many of them do just that. And many people
want to do that. They say, 'Well, isn't he a great president?' when often
times he's been a great president because of the way in which he has
chosen people and worked through them and got things done and given
credit to these other people.

Emily: You mentioned the other day that Chandler did not often meet with
the faculty—was this part of the whole problem?

Marsh: I think so, yes. Well, I think he thought that it was better not
for him to do that. Now he did come on occasion. My memory is a
little foggy on that. I think he came in fairly often, but he was not
the residing officer of the faculty. Dean there in a small college you are. But of course
now (particularly at William and Mary when we're set up with our separate
schools) the president is always welcome and the academic vice-president
is welcome, but when the faculty of arts and sciences meet Dean Fowler
was residing. And Dean Wittmer resides as dean of the school of business,
and Dean Brooks did reside at the school of education meetings and so on,
you see. This is a normal thing for deans to reside at meetings but
but the college was a unitary college, and I think I believe Pomfret
presided at the faculty meetings. Isn't this right?

Emily: Yes.

Marsh: But you see, President Chandler did foresee the fact that we were
growing. As we were growing we were really becoming more of a university.
He and I were in that rocky period of moving toward that status, you see.
which did not really come until after the expansion of the college and particularly getting more money. We were a college of liberal arts with a few professional fields, but the professional fields closely geared to the liberal arts program. Well, we still are in that situation compared with many institutions, but nevertheless we do have the separate professional schools now.

Emily: During your period as dean of faculty the question came up more than once about faculty morale, and a gentleman who later became a member of the Board of Visitors wrote a report to the Board of Visitors that the faculty had the mistaken idea that they were to determine policy. Also, you were on a committee that set up the faculty advisory council. I was wondering what sort of a role you would you refute this man's statement that the faculty did have this idea?

Marsh: Well, I would say this: that the faculty did have the idea, and rightly so, of determining academic policy, and they should have it, always recognizing that they act as a advisory body, the Board may overturn them because to the degree that academic policy involves additional financial obligations and additional faculty and new building and all this sort of thing, a new public image will quite obviously the Board of Visitors can't abdicate final authority. So the faculty comes along with recommendations things. Now the situation should be developed in such a way that there is a clear understanding of this. Even at Wofford...

...we knew that any major curricula change, any major developments in the area of student affairs, and all that would eventually affect the faculty,
would approve them subject to approval by the Board. And there need be no conflict there. And this man was thinking that in terms of the athletic situation the faculty had issued its manifesto and came out... This ranged of course in the eyes of the Board because the faculty had to take this position because the Board simply were part of a conspiratorial group at that time. The origins were really strong builders up of that, very frankly, the young man who took my position as President at Wofford, Paul Hardin, who had been a professor of law at Duke, an extremely able person who accomplished an awful lot in four years, so much so that he was well-known President of S.M.U. He lasted at S.M.U. two years when his predecessor, President, was requested because he dared to question the big loan that S.M.U. had quite a bearing on it could be the spark of other things also that happened.

They had a 24 member Board of Trustees, and then under that they had a 20 member Board of governors. But actually it was a group of around three to six little insiders who said, 'This is our college. We're the ones who make the decisions.' They didn't want a president to come in and make decisions. They wanted to make them, especially on big-time football, and so forth. And so Paul, and yet as it came out, the young President, he was only 44 when he went there and was 63 when he left. He came out of the whole thing smelling like roses and the S.M.U. Board came out not looking good at all in the national publicity. Now the University of Texas has just come through a similar situation with the same deal and often times it has been the athletic situation with the same people with money who up there and you...
san, they've got a perfectly good stadium on their campus, but they don't want to use that; they want to use the Cotton Bowl stadium downtown where the national football area. This is what broke that out.

This has been a constant threat. The better institutions do not have this threat because faculty and board because there is understanding on both sides, both on the part of the faculty and on the part of the Board as to what the situation is; and by and large, the faculty are in the best position to go ahead and do the spade work of study and so forth and come up with recommendations as to policy that affects the academic activity and that affects athletics as far as that's concerned, to come to recommend it. They should recognize, on the other hand, that the Board has different responsibilities and they have to be concerned with the broader constituency of the college. Many faculty people are narrow and selfish and opinionated as all get out, and usually there are enough faculty so that decisions that come out are pretty good, but not always. And so the Board has a final authority, and of course, the Board is an entire president. The statement has been made sometime by one observer of colleges who made the statement that it is impossible to have a strong college without a strong board.

It's the Boards that make it because they appoint a president, you see. And he said this: that was the leading item on the agenda of every Board meeting should be, Shall we fire the president? If not, why not?

Well, this is true. It does emphasize the fact that this is the basic factor.
It should be emphasized that a major duty of college board members as well is this: in talking about duties of trustees, duties of directors, one of the major duties of directors is to ask discerning questions at every meeting. They cannot and should not get into the details of operation as they try and do often times, and overturn things as they see in connection with football. They had no business (the William and Mary Board had no business) getting into trying to build up big-time football on their own with no recognition of the faculty role. On the other hand the faculty cannot go ahead and say we think football should be abolished except on a club basis or something of this kind. They can make their statement, but then it's up to the Board up to the President and the Board to finally make the decisions. And if the Board doesn't like what the President's doing, they can fire him. He has no tenure. College Presidents have no tenure whatsoever. And this is as it should be. But of course there are plenty of college presidents who have served their 20 years as Charles Humbeck did, I served for ten years at Wofford until I retired and we had no squabbles. And indeed we had no it was an air of good feeling because I had a lot to do with because this is the only way you have to work colleges. It's got to be a place of good feeling or you can't do it. Now this doesn't mean it's a place in which everybody gets together and agrees on the lowest common denominator, not at all. But you work cooperatively and get the best fruits of thinking from everybody and come out that way. I think President Graves is doing an excellent job. Of course he's had tremendous administrative experience and knows what a president of any organization is supposed to do. And he is doing that and that is to listen, give everybody a chance to make their decision, make his decision, pass it on a recommendation to the Board and get the Board to accept it if they
Emily: Did you feel that your experience here as dean of faculty perhaps reinforced this belief?

Marsh: Oh yes. I was a far better college president due to having had this experience. Now I was too old; I was 54 years old when I went to Wofford as president. That's an age when colonels in the army are all retired by then. They are considered too old for that. But it so happened that Wofford had been through the experience of a young man who had come in his early 30s and there were some real difficulties. He was actually dismissed, although it was covered as a resignation. He was there almost five years and this almost tore the college apart.

And what the college and its relations with the church — he was a man that had a drinking problem, even on a church-affiliated college this was fierce. He was a handsome six-foot-five man carrying in a dumpy, stubby five-foot-five person was a disaster, but they knew they needed someone who had a strong academic background, who knew what the academic world was about, someone who knew the Methodist church and worked with it as a layman and I knew that my job was a healing, reconciling one as it was hered, and certainly by the time President Chandler left here and by the time I left, things were moving along pretty harmoniously.

In that way I was successful as a dean and Dr. Moss, my neighbor across the street, who was the leader of the faculty opposition they had no use for him. He wrote me an extremely nice letter as I was leaving indicating that I had done a good job. I'm not saying this to be cocky or anything like that, but looking at it factually they needed somebody like me with my experience here and Wofford had the same problem. I am not a great innovator.
but I'm apparently a person who sees the need of working with both parties.

I told you, didn't I, about my experience with the professor in philosophy?

This is what I had to do at both of these places, you see, although my predecessor at Wofford was very easy because there was no two sides there. It was just this, everybody recognized that we did some good things.

He got some support from the college and so on, but most people realized that he was gone by the time I got there and they got him a job; he resigned but actually they got him a job as vice-president in a bank in charge of new business, and he just stayed there a few months and then went on to the University of Arizona. But the point was that I was received with open arms. They needed somebody who was not glamorous and who would have some academic experience and ability to work with the church. And that's what I did. And so we had a great period of growth and development in peace and harmony.

Emily: Your last couple of years at William and Mary appeared to have been fairly peaceful and harmonious, but just before that there had been complete uproar in 1955.

Marsh: In 1955, that's right. Now this was very interesting. As it came out, really Jim Miller was in the center of it to some degree. He had at least precipitated it by at that time, smaller colleges generally (and I think they were right) had anti-semitism regulations, particularly with respect to husbands and wives in the same department. Now you can say all you want to about it, say oh well, there shouldn't be any problem,
problem but there is, especially small departments. Supposing there are four people in a department, if a husband and wife are one and the husband becomes chairman of the department, and his wife is one of the three members. You've got some extra factors there that complicate the normal friction and problems of a department. And well, after Jim Miller resigned as dean and as chairman of the philosophy department, he brought in a man named Sidney Rown about through the Harvard degree. Well, Sidney was Jewish and he was a friend of mine, and a good academic person I talked with later, and said, "Yeah, everybody at Harvard thought he was a slob" and he was. He was an orneriness but bright, ornery sort of person in many ways, but he married a perfectly beautiful and brilliant, really very gracious lady. She was Jewish also—Beatrice. She was a graduate student at Harvard. Well, when she came down here, they came on and she wanted to do something. So they made her almost as a graduate assistant, and even though she was doing her work and was behind, doing her work at Harvard. And what she did, the philosophy department then—I don't know if they still do it this way or not. Miller had this marvelous course in introduction to philosophy, which is really a history of philosophy, and a big lecture section of 250 or so and met two times a week and then once a week he had quiz sections. Small groups of 15 to 20, and frankly, it's a good system for a course like philosophy or a course like Mr. Fowler's big history course, it works in them. So they did this, and Beatrice was assigned quite a lot of the grading work for all the sections and things of this kind. Gradually, she received sections of her own and then she moved on.
and she was approaching her doctorate, and the point was instead of being, as just a graduate assistant, shouldn't she be an instructor? And then the next question was, shouldn't she be an assistant professor? Well, then we were running head up against (lightly or vaguely) regulation of the college board against wives and husbands being at least in the same department, well, being at the college as far as that's concerned, but less rigorous enforcement than in the same department. Well, this gradually came to a head, because she became increasingly popular as a teacher.

She was superb, and she taught a course in philosophy of religion which was just great, and this was what she was writing her dissertation in. So this went on and then in the meantime Chandler had arrived.

So here it moved, and Sidney and Beatrice began to work on it—propagandize or it from their rostrums, in their teaching position, began to talk about it, isn't it terrible, the college has this regulation, and so on. Well, there were a few other situations. There are always you know you can fill up a college this way. Well now the college was moved much more feministically, and we've gotten away from it and probably just as well, except I think it is still a very serious problem of the two people being in the same department, especially if one of them becomes chairman, and so on. There are difficulties, but I won't get into what's done now I think we've eliminated it, the college here. But that went on and frankly that was the issue that came to a head, and in 1955 the year my son was a senior, he was opposed to the 'revolution.' But the president of the student body and others, they had a
big mass meeting and it came about this way. That the idea as to whether she should be promoted to assistant professor or whether she was already assistant professor and whether she should be promoted to associate professor and have tenure and things of that kind. And the board took the position that no, we recognize she was fine in classes. I think we did finally say, okay, she can be assistant professor but no farther and that even then it would be a limited appointment of three years or something of this kind. Well, we were approaching the end of that period. That's the thing that came to a head over it and President Chandler took the very vigorous position and the board did. We had hearings for the board, and we got into the facts as to what other colleges were doing and the vast majority of colleges did have similar regulations. So that's what happened and came to a head. And then the Rones decided to leave, and he got a chance to go with the Ram Corporation. So they're leaving. Jim Miller resigned. He got a job at McGill.

There was another thing a year earlier both the dean of students and the dean of women resigned and went to other places, and part because they didn't like President Chandler. I can't remember now. The dean of women went to Jackson College at Tufts, and the dean of students went to Delaware (Johnny Hocutt). He's still there. He's an alumnus of the college. They moved out, and they said that actually this really had nothing to do with President Chandler, but they had these better openings. But it was a part of this type of thing.
Emily: It was often hinted that perhaps there was a great turnover in the faculty because of Chandler.

Marsh: Well, there was. It wasn't serious, but it was dramatic in the case of Jim Miller, who had been here since 1933.

Emily: Or in the case of the Romeys. Did it ever occur to the Board to keep her and terminate his contract?

Marsh: No.

Emily: That's a modern idea.

Marsh: No, that was too modern. That would have never occurred. He was already there with tenure. He was associate professor, I believe. He had come in as assistant and became associate professor, but that was it.

But interestingly enough she was one of the problems with this nepotism business, so often the wife is better than the man, and this creates some difficult situations.

Emily: Was there any problem during the time you were Dean of the faculty with the faculty hiring, not because of low salaries, or at one time I think the faculty-student ratio was jeopardizing the accreditation?

Marsh: Well, yes, we did have to keep working on it. Now faculty salaries were beginning to improve in that period. Fortunately, The period which was really bad was from '45 to '53 or so. The McGraw-Hill Company dramatized this very sad situation of the faculty salaries with a series of articles and wonderfully expressive diagram showing what had happened to other classes, industrial workers, business executives, professional people, and so forth, and college teachers. And were at the bottom of the heap as far as what happened, the real income of the college teachers during that period of rising prices and so on. And by the mid '50s that was beginning to change, and President Chandler was beginning to get some relief from the state, you see, in connection with this, whereas his predecessor had not gotten anything. We were just falling
behind. And so there was improvement in salaries but they were low. But we were not in danger of losing accreditation. Now there was another situation during that period which you may have run into; I don't know what the minutes would show on it. We had a young man who was teaching French and there were some problems of his relationships with one of the male students. His relationship, I mean it was a one-to-one relationship of being together night after night and so on.

The boy was a very brilliant student, and the man was a bachelor and a fairly good teacher. And other members of his department that raised questions about it and just felt that it was a homosexual situation where the teacher was. Again it came to a head one night when the teacher had been out to dinner in town and both of them did some drinking. The teacher walked the boy back to the dormitory drunk one night late. This and other things came to a head where we took action with respect to this man. We had no basis for saying what it was;

but at least beyond professional relation, excessive friendship, and this was right in the middle of this other business and we carried this and this went to the AAUP and we had hearings and but that went on and on and on. I wish we never heard of the case. But the man did resign finally but then he resigned under pressure and I had a problem with the letters I had to write to provide some measure of support for him to other colleges. The time I was dean, really something. But it was one of those little specific things, thoughtless, improper conduct on the part of the faculty and the student. This is what deans have to do sometimes, suffer through things of this kind and they go on for years.
This was one of the undercurrents in this and of course there were other things. Faculty had to be let go and so on. But in general we had no loss, we lost people but all colleges do.

Emily: How would you evaluate Chandler's administration just sum it up when you left in 1958, what was it at that point?

Marsh: Well, I must say this: One progress in various areas. He was very much interested in building our relations with the English outfits, the Mary Strengthening that program and developing the Draper scholarship. However, that came to a head really after I left and Mel Jones did a lot and had received recognition for it as dean as to what he did to really systematize the program. But President Chandler was right in the middle and back of that type of thing. And he was very energetic in doing this in opening the way toward greater financial support for the college or the legislature. Along with this was the unnecessary frictions that we had to work with all the time here at the college. I was in the middle of that type of thing. They had begun to ease toward the end of my career and Mel did not have as difficult problems as I did yet he still have the same problem of the President and the faculty not having respect for each other. Now as I said, Mr. Chandler was an outstanding worker—Not a lazy bone in his body. He developed friends for the college, he brought in some people that provided some financial help for the college and certainly opened the doors of the legislature, was respected in the community in general. But both faculty and students for the most part didn't have too great an interest. He was not a man who inspired
affection from the people he worked with. He was too used to the old naval approach. He suspected this type of thing. 'Nice guys finish last;' if you're too nice to people they take advantage of you, you've got to let them know who's boss, you've got to give orders and directives and see that they are carried out. But as he said, these faculty people, they're strange birds. Well, they are. But that's the way they are. He never understood them, never fully respected them, and they certainly never—there were very few faculty people that had any real feelings and said, well, we have to work for him and recognized the good things he'd done, bringing the additional help. But it was not only faculty members but staff members, too. Hugh Sisson, who was the business manager before Mr. English came in, had health problems and finally resigned, and went to a position in the North somewhere, and now he's at Old Dominion. He just couldn't take him at all. There were others: Mr. Oliver, who was the head of the department of education and left here to become President of R.P.I., and he was the last president of R.P.I. I don't think he was the President of V.C.U. I think that came after he retired, but he had the same problems and indeed, all of us, the administrative staff would go into these meetings, which were every two weeks, I think every week. We would go in, and sometimes they were very constructive meetings, looking at specific problems of the college in the admissions field, academic field, faculty recruiting, and so on, and we would keep him up to date with our various administrative areas and keep each other up to date. Well, often times they would develop into get-togethers in which he would spend the whole time harrasing us, not necessarily about what
what we were doing, but about what some faculty member was doing, where what was going on elsewhere, or these students, or something of this kind. And sometimes you'd come out of there thinking, poor man, what ticks with him, anyway? He must be a little tetchy.

But on other times we would have some very constructive meetings. He could be just as nice and constructive and positive as could be. But often times there would be these other periods in which he would be just be on high ground and launch a tirade on something that was really not a major factor in the college, but something that was bothering him personally. Yet with all that, he made contributions to the college and got the ideal financial resources and in this way maybe he was the man that was needed to at least fight our way into, fight our way out of the inertia in the relations between the college and the state which existed previously. Paschall, of course, gets most of the credit for breaking that open because he came, of course, with such enlightened associations with the legislature, having been state superintendent of education for some years and being the type of man he was. He was able to pat people on the back and so on.

Well, Mr. Chandler could do some of that if they weren't people that were not working for him, you see. So he was pretty careful with his relations with the legislature and many of them never quite understood why he was having troubles down here and were inclined to assume that it was entirely the students, the faculty, or the administrators, that it was rather
than his. But it was a joint problem, and I think he was just cast that way. I don't think he could help it. I mean he was himself, and you had the good with the bad as you do with all of us. My problem has always been that I have been a little bit too much more harmonizing and at times have not been forceful enough to break things open. I think in the college field generally my type of weakness and my type of strength were less harmful than they would have been in industry and probably less harmful, certainly, than the approach of Mr. Chandler.

Emily: I want to talk to you also about your role in the business department and the conflict between the liberal arts and profession, but I think this would be a good place to stop for today.

Marsh: Fine.

[The sequence in which the two interviews were taped has been reversed here to put Mr. Marsh's account into chronological order.]