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Williams: I wanted to ask you first of all how was it in 1948 that Governor Tuck came to appoint you to the Board of Visitors at William and Mary?

Pollard: As I recall, the Alumni Association recommended me to the governor, but I dare say I was appointed partly because my father had been on the faculty and had been the governor. However, I had done a few things as a student, such as editing the college annual and making Phi Beta Kappa, and I'd gotten my master's and doctor's degrees from Harvard, where I was a junior member of the faculty for a spell at the Harvard Business School. I was told by some alumni that they were particularly pleased that their recommendation (that is, of the association) was taken by the governor, especially because over the years their recommendations were usually of no avail. Appointments were usually political, qualifications of secondary importance, and I regret too often this seemed to be true.

Williams: When you came on to the Board, it's been said, perhaps from hindsight, that relations between Dr. Pomfret and the Board were strained long before the football scandal. Did you, when you came on the Board, sense this sort of thing?

Pollard: No, I did not. I got a feeling that Dr. Pomfret was more of a scholar -- and a distinguished scholar -- than he was an administrator. I think he relied heavily on Charlie Duke and
several others, and that he was happy he could have a set-up of that nature. I regretted that for many reasons—I didn't want Pomfret to resign but the situation was such that he couldn't continue because he was improving the college in areas where any good college would stress the most. I think he was about to be elected, I was told, head of the national Phi Beta Kappa Society. His reputation among scholars, for many reasons, was very good. I wasn't conscious of dissatisfaction. I didn't know of any board members that were dissatisfied in any significant way.

Williams: Did you ever have a feeling that the way he had come in with this slim majority vote in the board had handicapped him in any way?

Pollard: No. I don't particularly remember the vote, actually.

Williams: But then — getting on into this '51 business — would you say that the scandal was the straw that broke the camel's back?

Pollard: No, I did not feel that way. Of course, that would be inconsistent with what I said before because breaking the camel's back is a little thing that climaxes some big things.

Williams: But you feel it was the big thing?

Pollard: Yes, I do. The big thing and the thing. I wouldn't have anticipated his resignation if we'd had a winning football team with no unpleasantness — no public unpleasantness.

Williams: When did it come to your own attention that there was trouble.
in the athletic department? Did you know, say, before the Board of Visitors' hearings began there in August of '51 that something was going on? Or did Judge Shewmake send out a letter and say please come to Richmond and that? when you found out.

Pollard: I think I found it out only when it was brought to the board's attention. We were talking about the scandals, not the overemphasis?

Williams: Right. We're talking about the scandal itself because the overemphasis, I think, must have been obvious.

Pollard: For a number of years—overemphasis from my point of view.

Williams: Judge Shewmake is dead so I can't ask him, but he said that he had learned about the situation from unofficial sources. Do you know how he learned?

Pollard: No, I have no idea. I do recall having the feeling that a number of board members were happy about winning football teams. I recall that the winning coach would be approved and congratulated—. I would guess that a coach would make the most of a favorable attitude by anyone, including board members, and I would guess that problems and opportunities and the hopes of on the part of building up possibilities and building up a football team or keeping it built up, matters of that sort would be talked over with the more interested board members as individuals. I don't know whether the coach would go directly to a board member and say, "we need a certain large budget of funds," and seek support rather than going through channels and
the administration, but I got the feeling there was some "chuminess." I know that the board meetings were scheduled as much as possible on weekends of football games and that the meetings were nearly always adjourned in time to get to the football game, which policy I liked myself because I like football. My enthusiasms were broader than that; I hope that the others' were, too, so it's a difference of emphasis.

I can't help you much on Shawmake's source, but I can imagine.

Williams: Did he and Dr. Pomfret get along personally? I haven't been able to talk to Dr. Pomfret to ask this question of him.

Pollard: I don't have any reaction one way or the other.

Williams: From what you just said about the board -- and I'm not sure who it was who criticized the board in this way -- but somewhere I read -- maybe it was in one of the editorials -- about the "football-minded Board of Visitors" in 1951. So you'd say as a whole -- I'm not trying to put words in your mouth -- but as a whole, this would have been true? [Discussion of letter that follows. Pause to find letter.]

Pollard: Preeminently true. I will show you a letter from Robert H. Land, librarian of the college, written September 18, 1951.

This letter dramatizes the contrast in the interests of the board between academics and athletics. I will read one paragraph from this letter, which was addressed to the governor [John Battle], copies of which were sent to me and other board members. Mr. Land writes:

I should think you and your predecessor, who have named every present member of the board,
would be embarrassed in justifying your appoint-
ment or reappointment of several persons of
mediocre ability and undistinguished reputation
who have proved to my satisfaction that they are
far more interested in athletic victories than in
academic standards. As an indication of this,
may I cite the fact that since 1945, when I was
placed in charge of the William and Mary library,
I could count on one hand the members of the
board who have entered the building. I could
count on one hand, also, evidences of interest
in the library or words of encouragement extended
to me by members of the board. On one occasion,
my feelings of delight on discovering a board
member in the library, became one of disappoint-
ment because his conversation was largely con-
cerned with the gymnasium success which he
hoped the college would achieve. He indicated
his conviction that the college's football team
was establishing a splendid reputation for
William and Mary.

I don't feel that I am too well qualified to comment on the
qualifications of appointments of the members of the board at
that time, but I do feel that, in general, the governors had
given too much consideration in making their appointments to-
politics in the situation.
Williams: I suppose I should ask you why or was this unusual for the board to be almost -- I hesitate to use as strong a word as obsessed, but it will have to do for this purpose -- with football as something to build the prestige of the college? was this the rationale?

Pollard: The whole matter of football has to be considered in its place in our culture, it seems to me, where sports, preeminently football, arouse our enthusiasms and the amazing thing is that even though you've bought the football team -- in other words, made it a commercial enterprise -- for an alma mater, we still like to win and we like to cheer. I think that if I had to guess about that particular period, we had the taste of more winning and more success, which is rather exhilarating -- that's just a guess. In retrospect, I'm amused at a southern university, say, for a basketball team, can hire a lot of good blacks from all over the country local blacks and the team can be predominantly black, and the support and cheers are just as strong as if they'd been all white, which is something two decades ago could never have happened. But such is the charm of successful competition. Some of the blacks are great athletes.

Williams: If this was a policy pushed by the board, why do you think the board's report tended to blame the administration for what had gone on? It's been said that Dr. Pomfret didn't want a big football program; the board did, but yet Dr. Pomfret's the one who had to be scapegoated perhaps.
Pollard: I don't know whether to look at the view of the board toward football primarily as passive approval and response to the coach and others who were responsible for that football program, or whether to look at it as a policy, which I believe you suggested. I would not call it a policy; I would call it a unplanned, but enthusiastic cooperation with what was needed out of their mostly board members acting individual approval. I don't recall the active promotion of big-time football in the board meetings by reason of resolution and that sort of thing.

Williams: More of an attitude?

Pollard: More of an attitude. At least I'm making it an informal thing rather than a sort of policy. Most alumni, it seems to me, see no inconsistency in promoting winning teams within a certain area of competition and promoting fine academic program. The harmful result isn't so much in promoting football as the relative lack of support for the academic and the allowance of the actual academic program of being altered a little bit or turned a little bit so as to make it easier to get big athletes on the teams and keep them on the teams.

Williams: What then was the reaction of the board members when Dean Marshall presented the results of his investigation? Do you remember this?

Pollard: I don't remember whether Dean Marshall presented it or it was a report of Dean Marshall's presented by the president, nor do I remember any immediate reaction. It was somewhat of a bombshell, but the explosion, as I recall, came after the information con-
tained in the report became public. Then your faces begin to get red, of course. You could worry before, but you've got a double worry when it's public. So, the board obviously knew they were in for some trying problem. I had several thoughts about that period of time at the meetings of the board, and the board acted as if the general attitude was both of which I was opposed to.

Just before you came I was making some notes of this note: "the board's defensive attitude after exposure of football scandal." As I indicated, I was amazed at my fellow board members and how the initial thrust was to immediately establish a position that the board was not responsible in any way, taking this attitude rather than to review objectively to root out the causes — that's why I call it defensive.

Moreover, on the positive side, the board quickly built up a case, talking among ourselves, against Pomfret. And I'm sure a lot of the blame was his. Proof of administrative slackness or incompleteness — I've already indicated weren't his anyway, and I was amazed further at the hostility shown against Dr. Pomfret when they were questioning him as if in a court of law rather than a sympathetic seeking on the part of people in the same boat. You see, I felt we had a common problem and a common failure, and a common problem but the board in its deliberations and questions seemed to feel that Pomfret and the board were antagonists. I felt that we ought to feel that we were in the same boat, and that we should consider foremost
the future of the institution that we all love. And I add here my remarks. Maybe the reason for the unkind atmosphere -- and I definitely felt it was unkind -- in dealing with Mr. Pomfret, quite aside from the facts and that sort of thing, was due to the impulse on the training of lawyers, a number of which profession were leaders on the board, more like a courtroom. Then I add, it wasn't long before I felt a suspicion about me. The board soon passed a motion that pledged secrecy which of course was already my practice, and I lived up to that especially during this difficult period in terms of the specific, although I felt that the board's hostile feeling toward the faculty was something I couldn't hide. I was mostly silent at the meetings. I was alone in having no sympathy nor stomach for the tone and the one-sidedness of the dealings as I looked at it. Incidentally, I sympathized with the board in that I can agree -- I do agree that professors can be unreasonable and difficult. Now another aspect that disappointed me about my fellow board members: I saw little or no evidence any time in this period, and running on up through the election of Chandler, that the board wanted to initiate any reconciliation with the faculty. The board, I feel, was destructive in its relationships rather than constructive. Maybe it wasn't on account of dullness; it may have been on account of the high feelings and the general defensive attitude. The board members felt that the faculty was
getting a hand, and from that position, they concluded that the faculty needed to be put down and put in their place. Of course, that led to the judgment about a new president; that he should be a strong president and one who could reverse a situation which the board considered a bad one from the standpoint of the faculty's power and position. Now I got public prominence as to my minority point of view, I believe, after the election.

Williams: Was Dr. Pomfret's resignation expected by the board and would you say it was desired by the majority of the members?

Pollard: I would say that Dr. Pomfret was expected to resign and that the whole matter, just the facts of the situation plus the coldness of the board, plus the evidence in the meetings prior to his resignation, that feelings against him were too strong to justify even considering staying on. Pomfret's resignation was inevitable. And of course, his resignation had the added benefit, as far as the board was concerned, of confirming the place of the responsibility -- that is, "don't look at us, the board, about what the president failed to do."

Williams: I think that's what I asked the question about the straw that broke the camel's back. Was the cause of this hostility, as you put it, "was it the football business, and you had said that yes, it was, very much so." You commented on the kind of person that the board felt needed to come in now that Dr. Pomfret was gone; it was felt that a very strong person was needed. When was it first suggested in the board or perhaps informally
before that Alvin Duke Chandler would be the next president of the college?

Pollard: You're talking about a regular board meeting scheduled and announced. The fact of consideration and election was almost simultaneous.

Williams: But something obviously had to have gone on before.

Pollard: I call it a secret election. Chandler was elected -- what was it -- the second week in October?

Williams: October 6, 1951.

Pollard: October 6th. Dr. Miller had reported to the Board of Visitors a week or ten days earlier about what had gone on for the period which he had been acting president. One of the things that took place was the election by the faculty of a faculty committee to assist the board in looking for a new president. The day of the election of Dr. Chandler the board invited the faculty committee to report -- which was about three weeks later and which almost inevitably had to be an interim report with a discussion considerable of qualifications. I think this was a called meeting and I don't remember that the notice said that there would be any consideration of election. The meeting wasn't called to elect. We had at the board meeting the report of the faculty committee meeting. There were two or three who came. The board listened in silence -- I would say not chilly silence, but without any particular discussion of what was presented by the faculty. And shortly after they retired the board con-
sidered -- the meeting was opened and discussed the matter of the new president. It was reported to the board, after reviewing the need for a strong executive, and the reasons therefore, a man had been found who seemed to qualify. We've already talked to him; he's Admiral Chandler, and he thinks he would be allowed to resign from the Navy. So after some discussion, with quite a number of members expressing approval, the matter was brought to a vote. The vote was overwhelming everyone except I voted to accept Admiral Chandler. I refrained from voting, as I told the chairman, because I didn't like the hurried manner in which the board was coming to that decision. I had no comments about Chandler as such, but I couldn't agree that the qualifications that Chandler had and that were made prominent in the discussion by board members were the leading characteristics needed for William and Mary or any ordinary college situation. Of course, a minority position got considerable publicity. I would like to tell you about what I did a few hours after Chandler was elected. I came home immediately to Williamsburg and telephoned Chandler at his home (I think he was in Alexandria). I had known the Admiral as "Alvin," as I'd known his father and mother when J.A.C. Chandler was president, and of course, the president's house was their home. So I said, "Alvin, did you know I didn't vote for you? Alvin, I'm sure you've heard that you've been elected president." He said, "Yes, I got a call from the rector just a few
minutes ago." "Do you know I didn't vote for you?" He said, "No, I didn't know that." "Well," I said, "I wanted to tell you that I didn't like the way the board went about the election. I meant nothing personal against you." And Alvin replied, "and I thought was smart and generous -- he said, "Look, Garland, we're going to get along all right as long as we can talk to each other." And as further evidence of his willingness to work with me without prejudice (presumably) I might read you a brief letter he wrote me within a few weeks afterwards. I would like to add in this connection about Chandler's attitude that within a couple of weeks after he took office I received a cordial letter from him inviting Mrs. Pollard and me to lunch and then requesting that I meet with him because there were many problems he'd like to talk to me about. I would like to say, though, to go back a little bit, that the lapse of only three weeks or so between the time the board agreed to meet a committee of the faculty to help select the president and the actual election -- a lapse of only about three weeks and going through the formality of listening to the initial report of the faculty and then within a matter of almost minutes electing a president was just another slap in the face. I would like to add further that it was a little bit a slap in the face to me because I got the feeling that the board -- or most of them -- had informally met in Richmond and arrived at a conclusion which they formalized at the meeting. And one of my good
friends on the board, a resident of Richmond, after the
meeting sort of fumbled around and expressed the feeling
that they had to get moving and sorry I wasn't in on it. Of course, it was better that I wasn't, I suppose, because I guess I was a gadfly. What is a gadfly?

Williams: Someone who messes things up?

Pollard: Anyway, every now and then during this period I would hear from a faculty member or see a faculty member I felt that my sympathy and interest was something that they needed.

Williams: When you went to the board meeting that day, then, you didn't know that there was going to be a vote on the president, that day, but you think that several other board members did?

Pollard: Definitely.

Williams: Who would have discussed this—who would have been elected to have been discussing this with Admiral Chandler do you know that? You said you felt that he had been approached.

Pollard: No, I do not. I would think -- Mr. Shewmake, I believe, was chairman, and I had a feeling -- Hudnall Ware was a good friend of his and might well have talked with him. [Mrs. Pollard comes in.]

Williams: Were there any other candidates other than Alvin Chandler considered for the presidency after Dr. Pomfret resigned?

Pollard: I can't remember any. If any other would have been considered, it would have been very briefly and perfunctory. It was soon clear that the predominant sentiment was already for Chandler that matter had been thoroughly explored and that the board felt -- as they would have put it, since the faculty was some-
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In answer to your question as to how I acted on this feeling, let me say that some of the faculty members had been my friends for years. I liked them and understood their striving for academic excellence and their emphasis on academic independence.

For some time -- as reflected in Dean Marshall's report -- they had been concerned about the lowering of standards which was revealed in the athletic situation. This must have implied to them that the board was more interested in sports than in academics, in so far as having at that time a great football team. (Many active alumni seemed to think likewise).

As I did not share in this view (so painful to faculty members) I could not let my friends think that I did. The morale of the faculty was low and many of them were discouraged. They seemed to sense that not much help was coming from the board as a whole or from the individual members.

Whether any board member other than myself showed any sympathy I don't know. In any event I was under no illusion that I could alter the view of the board or the course of events. But in the matter of board-faculty relationships at that time, I felt that the board was more at fault than the faculty and that some of my faculty friends should know that this was my opinion. My judgment could have been wrong, of course; but I think that it is good and just to acknowledge shortcomings, -- in this case shortcomings of the boards of which I was a member and in which I shared in its doings.
what out of control, it was important to act without further delay.

Williams: Did you feel that you were the only board member who hadn't been in on these informal discussions?

Pollard: Not necessarily. I felt that most of them had either been there or informed of it and had given their approval because it went along so smoothly -- that is, the making of a major decision -- smoothly and briefly.

Williams: I hadn't mentioned this before, but why do you think that Judge Shewmake after the meeting went out and told the press that it might be spring before a new president was elected, when they had just sat in there and elected a new president?

Pollard: I don't recall that, if you mean immediately after the meeting.

Williams: Yes.

Pollard: I suppose that he felt he had to check with Chandler again. Maybe Chandler hadn't gotten full and final approval from the navy authorities. However, wasn't it the next day it came out in the papers?

Williams: This was on Saturday and I think it came out on Monday; I believe that's right.

Pollard: Another slap in the face was that the acting president as well as everyone else on the faculty, but particularly the acting president, had to learn of the election through the press. Ordinary courtesy informs the incumbent, even just an acting president, suggests the incumbent be informed at least two minutes before.
Williams: Was it ever considered in that meeting to let Jim Miller know that he was no longer going to be the acting president, or did it just not occur to people in the heat of the moment?

Pollard: Well, Dr. Miller, I seem to recall, somewhat reluctantly accepted the position of acting president, and there wasn't any reason to feel that there was an embarrassment merely by replacing him rather promptly. I don't recall that there was any discussion as to sequence of who will get the information.

Williams: What reaction, then, did you perceive to the manner of selection of a new president?

Pollard: I was pleased that quite a number of alumni wrote me, approving my position, and the fact that occasionally reference was made to my stand in the press approving same. One particularly good editorial was in the Roanoke World-Telegram, the editor of which is an alumnus of the Mr. Andrews. George Baskerville Zehmer, who was at that time a dean at the University of Virginia, wrote a letter of approval to the "voice of the people" for called the Times-Dispatch. Another is a letter received from Bob Calkins, who was then executive of the General Education Board, who expressed approval and quite constructively suggested that we (and other alumni) take a greater part in recommending board members when the time came up for them to be appointed.

Following the announcement of the new president, the faculty's spirits seemed to be very low, and the atmosphere at the
college was quite bad. I think Admiral Chandler got off on the wrong foot in his early relations with the faculty. Did I mention before about the board presenting to him undoubtedly that the great need of the college at the time was to use a strong hand? They wanted to put the faculty down, I believe I did say, put it in its place, which I think is the background out of which the Admiral said not too long after he had been at the college that he believed in that connection—that he believed in "loyalty up and loyalty down," which was either addressed to the college in general or to the faculty, which expression, I believe, comes from the military and which undoubtedly has great merit in the purposes for which it was intended. It was apparently interpreted by faculty that it was an expression of strong administrative control, which made it difficult to portend what would be in the future. The general unhappiness and suspicion on the campus as held by a number of faculty members was dramatized to me by a letter I received shortly afterwards from Nelson Marshall, whose contribution to the disclosure of academic irregularities was, I think, notable and courageous. He had resigned, and in a postscript in a letter to me, he says: "I'll be glad when I get things cleaned out of the office at the college, for I have an uneasy feeling that my coming and going may be interpreted as trouble-making. Today (Sunday) being quiet on campus, I hope to get up there and finish up the odds and ends with a minimum of disturbance." This reflects to me
a failure on the part of the board to seek a constructive
growth out of what was obviously a nasty situation, and I
think the board lost an opportunity there.

Williams: I wondered if you were the board member who wasn't informed
that Chandler's installation had been moved up one day? I
read in the paper that one board member arrived on the day it had
been announced, but in fact it had taken place the day before.

Pollard: I don't recall that. I don't recall any of the board treating
me discourteously or making me feel embarrassed, and I don't
think I broke my relationship with the other members was
bad—or certainly polite, not always cordial. sometimes
there were whisperings when board members were together that
indicated I wasn't privy to everything going on, but not in
any way to make me feel embarrassed. In other words, they were
always gentlemen in relation to me, and I can't put it quite
that strongly in their relation to Mr. Pomfret during these hearings—or cross-
examinations.

I was a little bit sore at my fellow board members at times.

Williams: You have alluded to this previously, but did you feel that the
manner in which the board brought Admiral Chandler in was fair
to him?

Pollard: I can only conjecture. I feel that the board was sincere in
their feeling about the faculty and the feeling about quick ac-
tion, quick decisions, but my diagnosis of what would be
best in restoring the college to somewhat normal relationships
was obviously different from the board, and I can only in view of
the way Chandler acted. I can't escape the conclusion he was
given an unsympathetic steer as to what was needed of the president to establish a good working relationship between the administration and the faculty.

Williams: Also at this time there came up another -- what looked like might be another scandal -- and this was about the lodges. I found that you were on the finance committee, so they called you to Richmond to testify about them. Do you remember this event in the winter of '52 at all? And do you think that the publicity about it was indicative of, say, the charged atmosphere in Williamsburg of the times?

Pollard: At the moment I don't recall anything particularly associating the lodge matters with the football scandal. You're talking about the fraternity lodges? And it seems that's a periodic problem of one sort or another.

Williams: Well, it's been talked about that they cost too much, was what the problem was at this time. No, this isn't the drinking of beer situation.

Pollard: I don't think that I can make any particular contributions to that. I'm somewhat blank on that right now. That's one of my recollections I can't remember.

Williams: This question really goes back to what you were talking about a few minutes ago -- what kind of president the board expected Alvin D. Chandler to be. What kind of president did they find him to be?

Pollard: That's a big question. I seem to recall that his strong stand in terms of being the boss of the institution was in accord with what
the board had hoped for. One of the early indications of his executive ability was his extensive and thorough written report prepared ahead of time for the board. It reflected application to the problems and careful analyses, a desire to keep the board informed, a device for covering a lot of ground promptly in a relatively short meeting, and suggested a grasp of the problems and what was going on. I don't know if there was any early dissatisfaction—certainly the board members on the part of the board members—the board members would have been reluctant to make it prominent because this was their man installed in such an unusual hurry. I think it was a long process to build a feeling of cooperation. I'm not sure that faculty members, at least in the initial period, felt comfortable in conferring with him. I put that negatively because I don't have anything positive to say about it.

Williams: Not long before you went off the board in 1956, there was another disturbance in the life of the college. I know historians are guilty of thinking that history moves from crisis to crisis, which is precisely what I'm doing right now, but in '55 there was this student protest that began with beer -- I'll get to that later -- then Dr. Miller wrote a stinging letter to the Times-Dispatch why he was resigning from the college; Warner Moss, I think, wrote a similarly toned letter.

Pollard: Do you recall what Dr. Miller said, fill me in-- I mean the general
tenor of it.

Williams: It was Dr. Miller's feeling that Alvin Chandler was destroying the College of William and Mary and — as, I think, he put it, academically, which of course would be Dr. Miller's main concern, he said, rather than remaining at William and Mary to witness the destruction of much of his life's work, he was going on. And he catalogued his grievances with President Chandler at this point. He seemed to feel that there was a chance — and he apparently was not alone in this — that there was a chance in 1955, with these student disturbances and this faculty unrest, that Chandler could have lost the confidence of the board at this time. Do you think this was a possibility — after he had lost the board that had appointed him — was this a possibility?

Follard: I never thought that any loss of confidence — I don't know how much it was — was of sufficient importance or scope to bring about Chandler's resignation. Certainly, the board members would deplore genuine dissatisfaction on the part of faculty members and making such public. I think things have to get pretty bad as to the feelings and the sensitivities of the faculty members have to get pretty bad before a board member, especially one who had gone through the scandals and about the attitude toward the faculty at that time — would have to be pretty bad before a board member would give a great deal of weight and sympathy to what a "crazy" faculty member would do (crazy in quotes). In other words, I guess we all are victims of our general orientations, and we see specifics in terms of our
background, and the background of most board members, seems to me, was to undervalue or understand the trials and tribulations and pains of people in academia. So I do not recall that a crisis of the proportions that Miller may have anticipated was actually developing. Of course, if the unrest, so to speak, on the part of students and faculty had expanded or grown more difficult, that would be another question. I think, too, without recalling who was governor at the time), that any governor more readily takes the point of view—any governor would more readily take the point of view of the administrator of the college than the faculty members; and would be sympathetic with the problems and keeping things on an even keel. And I think, too, if there was a board to consideration given trying to crowd Chandler out, on the part of the board, the rector or a member of the board who had close relationships with the governor, would talk to the governor first. The governor, since William and Mary was a state institution, would, with any institution, like to avoid unfavorable publicity. And the governor, being a politician, normally thinks readily of reconciliation or getting by the crisis and letting time heal or what have you. So if things had gotten so that some on the board were considering a vote of no confidence, it would have certainly gone to the governor before they'd promote such an end.

Williams: Is this then why Governor Stanley's office didn't want to get into this whole business?
Pollard: I can't say about what the governor wanted; I mean I was just saying what my guess what any governor would do.

Williams: And would this have been true also back in '51? I understand that there was some talk of going to Governor Battle in protest of this whole business of the selection of Chandler.

Pollard: I would make no exception of that one.

Williams: It's been said by other people that once a president -- really of any institution -- loses the board that appoints him that he does not have as much control as he did or support -- that's a better word than control -- as much support as he did by the board that appointed him. Did you see this as true after the members gradually retired or were replaced from the 1951 board?

Pollard: I gathered that some members of the board were going through periods of questioning as to how the president was doing, although I was never brought into any discussion nor do I remember any discussion in the board. One of the new members, or later members of the board, was Lester Hooker. Have you heard of him?

Williams: Yes, I've talked to him in fact.

Pollard: And somehow I got the feeling that he was probably put there by the governor. Lester Hooker, and his brother and the family, have been inside the inside ring of "the machine" as it was called, the political machine which was a good machine of its type -- that he was put there to just see what could be done -- I say put there by the governor, I mean by the governor -- to see what could be done to either improve the public image
of William and Mary in its unsettled state or to see
actually what could be done by making some changes. My guess
is that he reported to the governor, as would be certainly legiti-

miate for any citizen member of the board do.

But I don't recall anything specific, and I might add, perhaps
my limited knowledge is partly due that I live off the beaten
track, as compared with the fellow who lived in Washington or Nor-
folk -- they're rubbing elbows all the time. Others could prob-
ably tell you a whole lot about that which I couldn't.

Williams: At the time of these student protests in '55 about the beer
did you remember this event?

Pollard: No, I do not remember this as a major problem.

Williams: Dr. Miller wanted me to ask you this: When I interviewed Dr.
Miller, one of the things he did was to go into his files and
pull out a twenty-page statement he had written and re-filed in
1955 in which he told why he was dissatisfied with the college.
He read a one-page statement for the newspapers. The he men-
tioned in there that in 1953 he had represented to a great
Virginian, whom he did not mention by name, the faculty's dis-
satisfaction with the president that had been elected by the
board. After he finished reading the statement, he said
to me, "Who do you think the great Virginian was?" And I said,
"I don't know." He said, "Well, that's funny. I don't remem-
ber either." And the longer he thought about it the more he
thought it was you. He said for me to ask you if you remembered
any such as this -- it was a great Virginian that was a board
member, and he told him that in '53 the board was still in an ugly mood." He said the only person he could possibly think of it could have been would have been you.

Pollard: Well, are you asking me to comment on the great Virginian? Miller was informed that the board was still in an ugly mood? When you say "ugly mood" do you mean that they were in a vindictive or...

Williams: Well, that was his word and it was in quotes; apparently, it had been quoted from the person who had told him this. I took it by the way, that he said that.

Pollard: Do you think he means "ugly mood" in general or "ugly mood" with respect to something specific?

Williams: No, I think he meant in general... That the board, in other words, would not be ready in '53 to hear a faculty statement of dissatisfaction with the president. I assume that's what was meant.

Pollard: I would never have chosen the word "ugly." I would say, as I perhaps indicated, it took a long time for things to heal and I felt throughout that board members did not understand the minds of professors. And I say further, that businessmen or the type of men put on boards are people who do things and see the advantage of good organization -- loyalty up and loyalty down -- and so if I did make the comment about the mood of the board, which I might well have done to Dr. Miller or there are some others I knew pretty well (you recall my father was on the faculty) -- I returned regularly to see friends and especially to the annual I did express my unhappiness with the "mood" of the board, -- to Dr. Miller and to a few others. You realize of course that I knew some of the professors pretty well. My home was in Wasburg, when my father was on the faculty, and I returned from time to time to see my friends, espe
Further, the faculty had its "mood," too, which to a large degree I thought justified. But justified or not, if they had presented to the board at that time a strong statement of dissatisfaction with the president, relationships probably would have grown worse. The board, I believe, would have reacted defensively and combatively and thus strengthen their mutual antagonisms.

Phi Beta Kappa occasion -- they finally elected me president -- and I felt a sympathy for them and I felt a desire to help them out of periods of discouragement; so Dr. Miller could conclude that I felt the board was not sympathetic board. Is that ugly? [Break.]

Williams: We had been talking a little bit ago about why it was you were close to many of the older faculty people at William and Mary.

Pollard: That was very natural because I not only been a student and known a lot of them for four years in my undergraduate work, but a couple of years after, in my junior year, my father was elected to the faculty and we established our residence there. Our home was along a group of houses where there were other professors -- Dr. Morton and Dr. Swem were next door neighbors, and Dr. Fowler a little later came next to as well as many more -- so that after I graduated and returned to our residence, especially in the summertime or Christmastime, when I'd come down from Boston, I'd see my friends and my family's friends again, members of the faculty. So when they became worried, I became worried -- I was sympathetic and I'm sure that background made it possible for me to see their side of the question and the suffering they went through during what they called the crisis -- the athletic crisis.

Williams: How was it that you happened to choose William and Mary as your college when you were a young man?

Pollard: I was like most youngsters of those days; you consulted with your family about what you were going to
For the bill. We were residents of Richmond for a while at the time when I had to make the decision. I was going to John Marshall High School in Richmond. Dr. Chandler, I think, had been superintendent of public schools in the city and previously had been a professor of English at Richmond University, where my grandfather taught English, so Dr. Chandler and my father were friends, and I'm sure, although I don't remember specifically, that my father asked Chandler about Chandler's new job as president and mentioned my name and undoubtedly, of course, Chandler picked William and Mary as the ideal place for me to go. Incidentally, it was a state-supported school, which made the cost relatively low; perhaps William and Mary was one of the lowest in the state. One of our distinguished alumni named Stephens, who got to be lieutenant-governor and was active among the alumni, was one of five Stephens' brothers born and brought up here in Northumberland County here in the Northern Neck. His father was a country merchant, and he tells the story when the oldest one was ready to go to college, his father wrote away to get catalogs from various colleges and found that William and Mary cost fifteen dollars less than the nearest other college. So he said, "Boys, five fifteen is five dollars. All of you'll go to William and Mary." So that's the way they got there, and it might have contributed to my father's decision. My father was not a wealthy man, and later on I'll comment about how cir-
Cumstances had made him decide to join the faculty. At one time I thought I might go into teaching, and that's why I hung around up at the Harvard Business School and got my doctor's degree because it was a good label. It often gets you places. I don't think I was ruined by doing advanced work; I hope not.

Williams: It's been portrayed to me by other people that William and Mary at this time, more so than right now in the 1970's, was the poor relation of the University of Virginia. Did you have this feeling; did you run into this?

Pollard: No. We enjoyed thinking of the University of Virginia, and telling some of the proud graduates of the University of Virginia that one of our alumni founded their institution. The University of Virginia also bragged on its honor system, most of them never realizing it originated at William and Mary. The University of Virginia was a school (not now so much), especially for boys who'd gone to private schools, which implies they were from pretty wealthy families, not always, but frequently. William and Mary, on the other hand, I would say, was a school at that time primarily for students from rural and small towns and relatively poor Virginians. But we felt no inferiority complex.

Williams: Well now, I did a little research. You had mentioned earlier that you were editor of the Colonial Echo when you were at William and Mary, found out some of the clubs you were in, such as the F.H.C, the Cotillion Club, the T.M.T. Ribbon Society. What
were the functions of--I know the dance clubs were the Cotillion Club, the Ribbon Society. What was the function of the dance clubs in the social life when you were there as a student?

Pollard: Somebody or a group had to sponsor the major dances and of course, there are a lot of things in connection with getting the decorations, getting the orchestra, arranging the refreshments or whatever. I don't recall then as being noteworthy or burdensome, but they were big occasions in contrast to the very few things going on in a sleepy little village. So we had a good time. In that connection, I might say that there was very little drinking at William and Mary. I don't think you could buy liquor or beer. Virginia had a prohibition system. I don't think most of us missed it; most of us didn't drink. I didn't drink a drop when I was in college and don't remember it as a denial.

Williams: You don't think this was an unusual experience, then, for boys your age?

Pollard: Not unusual, and I've tried to make up for it since. The interesting thing is the students were pledged, as I recall, not to drink -- this is personal and not in a group -- after 2 P.M. on the day of the cotillion (or the dance). And that was pretty well generally observed. The only numbers of students who might have missed the alcohol were the veterans of 1919. Many veterans or numerous veterans came, and they were older and used to the life of soldiers, but not a discordant element at all.
Williams: They were not set apart from the other students or did not set themselves apart.

Pollard: They didn't set them apart, and whatever drinking they did the drinking as such wasn't heavy, if they ever broke the drinking rules they must have sneaked it. I know I must have sneaked some of those clubs -- TNT, I think it must have been a lot of bologna or something. I don't remember doing a whole lot.

Williams: Do you remember anything about the F.H.O. at the time?

Pollard: That was called the Flat Hat Club. It was supposed to be a little bit of an honor, but I don't know what we did except acknowledge the distinction. We might have had one or two meetings. There was also an unusual thing in terms of there were two literary societies, the Phoenix and the Philomathean.

Williams: What was their function?

Pollard: They had regular meetings for presenting little essays, conducting debates, and it was a way of making ones literary studies a little more beneficial. I must say that the interest was in the decline and that sort of thing.

Williams: I was wondering if these debates were serious occasions.

Pollard: They were serious but not widely attended or thought to be of any great consequence.

Williams: You spoke of the sleepy little village that Williamsburg was at the time. How would you describe the town in 1919 it was
Pollard: You know, of course, that Williamsburg had not really grown since it had been the capital of the state, and this meant that colonial buildings were not replaced, as they would've been in many towns and cities where there had been growth and commercial development. So there was a preponderance of old buildings -- not all of them colonial, but old, run-down on a street which probably was just about being paved in the center part of it to reduce the dust and the mud. The stores were country stores with a lot of merchandise that was purchased not only by the villagers but by farmers in the local trading area. A country store, of course, has an appearance all its own, with a lot of merchandise piled irregularly on great tables and along the aisles. I don't think there was a movie at first. I think the only place open at night was a Greek restaurant which had a long counter running from the front to the rear. Sometimes I don't recall any tables occasionally, if we wanted something to eat after dark, some of us would go to the Greek restaurant. The proprietors -- I believe three Greek brothers, all of them known as Angelo -- later they were enterprising, later they built a modern restaurant near the college and built the new movie house. Their shop was located just below the Courthouse green on the opposite side and across from that, the Greek restaurant was the Colonial Inn, which was a two-story inn, where you could get simple accommodations, and there might have been a
bath or two down the hall; there was a dining room. Occasionally, I believe, they managed to have a dance or two on some town social occasion. The pace of course was leisurely. Many farmers still came to town in their wagons, and I would say we made no particular note of things going on because it was just the country style of life everywhere.

Williams: As a student, did you find a close identification between the town and the college?

Pollard: No, nor did I find any antagonism. I think that perhaps on several occasions before my father came down and we became residents, that I was invited into some of the homes. Some of the townspeople had sons at the college, so I was invited into their homes occasionally. I remember particularly a warm friendship with the Bozarth family. (Billy Bozarth for years had an auction house -- quite a big one, prominent in the state.) We didn't have automobiles in those days; we didn't get around as much.

I made a few notes here before your arrival and put a cover remark how it came about that my father joined the faculty, and then my two disappointments in William and Mary. It will be convenient if I refer to them as I go along. As I look at it, there were three related factors why my father came to William and Mary. Incidentally, I might say preparatory to that he was fifty years old and had no previous background as a college professor. His father, however, was a professor of English at Richmond College, which my father attended before
taking his law degree at Columbia College, now George Washington University. Several conditions prevailed in 1920 and '21 which account for my father joining the faculty. One was J.A.C. Chandler, who had become the new president a couple of years previously. Dr. Chandler was an excellent and aggressive promoter. They had known each other in Richmond when Chandler was superintendent of schools, I believe, and where my father practiced law. At this particular time, my father was out of a job. For a couple of years after World War I and after his return from his overseas service with the Y.M.C.A., he filled an unexpired term on the Federal Trade Commission, appointed by Woodrow Wilson. But with the coming of a Republican administration he was not considered for any further Washington position. So at this time he was open and flexible. He made one of the great decisions of his life, and this decision stemmed from his background. He was deeply committed to Christian principles. (Incidentally, both his father and older brother were clergymen, Baptist clergymen.) While his activity in church was great, including teaching adult Bible classes for decades (that was his most brilliant teaching job), his most notable contribution was in public service, both governmental and private. Thus in 1920, '21, when he was looking for a new job, service to others was uppermost in his mind. I heard him say that he wanted to spend the rest of his life in constructive ways for the benefit of his fellow man, which meant he
Chandler must have pictured a great opportunity for William and Mary where my father, pretty much, could write his own ticket. It must have had a great appeal to him. He told me that he turned down a lucrative job in another field, one offering over ten times the William and Mary salary which was $4,500 at its highest. My father, as I considered him, a man of modest means, and he managed to supplement the William and Mary stipend by developing the acreage near the college, which he named and is now called Chandler Court. This is the area where we lived and had faculty members as neighbors. One of the first things he did at the college was to establish the Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship. The title reflected his central interest, especially in citizenship as compared with government. He was interested in government, but as a democracy, he felt, depended for its success on the informed and concerned participation of its citizens. Nevertheless, he would say, democracy in practice is the least worst form of government. Democracy was far short of its potential, he felt, because of the low level of knowledge and interest on the part of citizens in government and in its manifold aspects. Very little citizenship education and stimulation was being provided by institutions of higher learning. In other words, this was a field that was pretty well unmet. Hence, the need and opportunity at William and Mary for con-
structive action in an area basic to the welfare and happiness of all the people. His course in Virginia government and citizenship became a required course for all Virginia freshmen. His manner of teaching was all his own. One of his characteristics was pragmatism, often colored in the background by responsibility. He used to say, time and again, "It's not what you know, but what you do with what you know that counts." How else could good citizenship be brought to bear on government? Citizenship at William and Mary faded after my father left to be governor for the term 1918-19. Emphasis began to shift to a law school, which took over the name of Marshall-Wythe that had previously designated the School of Government and Citizenship. The Commonwealth needed another law school at that time like a hole in the head, but the early history of the college and the interest of some influential alumni prevailed. The change in focus reflected a lack of vision as viewed by this prejudiced son of Governor Pollard. In his own words, he used to say, 'that he was more interested in what the law ought to be than what they are or what it is. He had spent so much of his life on what the law is through his authorship of the Annotated Code of Virginia (which was used by most lawyers), his own legal practice, and his four-year term as attorney-general of the state. The great need, he felt, was to improve the laws and the government. The creative opportunity lay in these areas — and still does. Today the viability of democracy is widely
questioned. How good is its base, its citizenship, the people? Good law schools are much to be desired, but they are not directed at the heart of the matter, that is, the successful working of democracy. So, William and Mary, in my opinion, dropped an opportunity to do a pioneering job in a field where there was little competition and where, if the college had enjoyed success over a number of years, it would have distinguished itself as a leader in meeting present and future problems. So you see why I was disappointed.

Now the other disappointment I had was later and truly personal. If anybody on the faculty hears what I have to say, I'd like for them to hear this. Some decades later, my youngest son was finishing his fifth year of work up at the University of Virginia in science and thought he'd like to go into teaching. William and Mary was developing its graduate school in physics (I think they still have it); and so my son wrote a letter asking saying that he would like to apply to be a junior teacher or instructor at William and Mary in that department. The proper papers for application were sent to him and a request for a transcript of his record at the University of Virginia. Well, for weeks and weeks he got no final answer—And got no answer except for the original correspondence. So here was a young man who was completing his undergraduate work in an engineering course -- the course he took was five years -- who had to look forward to making his living and who was handicapped in settling on a job because of failure to hear from the college,
even though he followed up his inquiry. Well, I think that is an example of somebody's insensitivity to the stress that a young man goes through in trying to get a job when he's got to make a living. That didn't appeal to me as being particularly good relations on the part of somebody. Incidentally, I did not mention this to anyone at the college until years after. Dean Jones said, "Why didn't you let me know? Why didn't you write me?" But I sort of inherited from my father a reluctance to use any privileged contacts to get something done, get something for me or mine. Quite incidentally, I recall that I got my doctor's degree at Harvard in 1931, and one of my fields was statistics. I couldn't get a job; I came home to do odd jobs and I was asked by the director of the motor vehicles division if I would set up a statistical department or record-keeping system for the accidents taking place on the highways. They hadn't had any statistical basis for that, and they thought I was qualified. And they offered me the job at $1800 a year. I went to my father and I said, "I'm just living on you right now."

We were living in the executive mansion, and I didn't find it painful, but I found it a little bit embarrassing; and my father's reply was this which was characteristic -- this would have been in 1931. He said, "Son, I'd rather you not take the job because a good bit of my time of every day is taken up with people out of job, looking for a job, or a mother coming and asking me to help her son or husband, and it would be embarrassing to me if you took
even though you can do it. What do you call it, methodism?

Williams: Let me ask you about your father coming, about the government and citizenship that you just talked about. He had he and Dr. Chandler talked about this and was this one of the reasons he came to set up this school or after he got there did this become a project of his?

Pollard: I can't say for sure, but I can't imagine my father accepting a job as just a faculty member. He accepted it because it was a means or channel or machinery by which he could promote some of his ideas.

Williams: He and Dr. Chandler were very close, I take it?

Pollard: I would say they were. I would say that Dr. Chandler's demeanor or attitude or his manner of acting with my father might have been different from the typical faculty member, especially the younger ones coming in. But my father found, as far as I know, nothing but cooperation in developing what my father had in mind.

Williams: Now when I was reading the Flat Hats for some time around -- I guess it was 1929 -- I found these little articles that hinted that J.A.C. Chandler was going to run for governor that year, but in fact, the governor who was elected then was John Garland Pollard. What was Dr. Chandler's attitude toward your father's candidacy?

Pollard: My father announced privately I don't recall whether it was
publicly) that he would not respond to those who were promoting his candidacy one way or the other, until Chandler had made up his mind. So there was no conflict. (Incidentally this hasn't any to do with college but it has a lot to do with machine politics in Virginia. The "machine," -- then called the "Byrd machine" -- took the initiative and came to my father and said they wanted to support him. My father's background in Virginia politics was he admired the Byrds, is anti-machine; it was not anti-Byrd in my, but he didn't like the practice of an industrious, small, powerful group having the say about things, even though most of the time their decisions were pretty good, and the only reason they could come to him, I can imagine is, because of the unusual circumstances of Virginia -- powerful voting Republican leaving the Democratic Party and becoming Hoovercrats -- the machine was scared the Republicans and Hoovercrats would put a hostile member as governor, and my father certainly wasn't hostile to many of the fine machine people.

Incidentally, one of the remarkable things -- and this is getting farther afield -- but it's remarkable that few people could know this, but after my father was elected and began making appointments, Mr. Byrd never came to my father and asked to ask him my father to make an appointment -- a thing he might well have done as a matter of give-and-take and reciprocity which reflected the respect the men had for each other and their integrity and putting the good of the state first.
Williams: That is remarkable, it was not what might be expected from knowledge of a "machine."

Pollard: That's one reason that it survived for a long time because it had high standards, certainly in the time of Byrd.

Williams: You spoke of Harry Byrd's involvement in state politics. How involved was J.A.C. Chandler in state politics? He must have had a tremendous amount of pull to have been able to develop William and Mary from what he came to and what he left.

Pollard: He was highly regarded as an able man, and his technique was such that he could dramatize the compelling need for more money, which was basically to get students there and to have overcrowded conditions. And I might add in this connection that my father told me one time that he was embarrassed in having to dampen some of J.A.C.'s enthusiasm for more money. My father felt, as governor and being concerned with making up a budget as every governor is -- he was concerned that he not only be prejudiced in favor of William and Mary through the appropriations but not to give the appearance of favoring William and Mary. When Chandler would come to my father as governor -- as perhaps he had done to previous governors -- and say, "Look, we find that we're overcrowded this year, and we didn't anticipate it. How about a supplemental appropriation?" the governor, as you know, has certain discretions if the money is there -- and my father wasn't usually able to respond favorably.
Williams: Through principle or through financial stringencies?

Pollard: Through--respond-favorably to Chandler by awarding interim funds beyond the budget. You see, always in states, there are emergencies and unexpected things. There have to be requests for supplemental appropriations.

In other words, I don't think Chandler tried to trade on any friendship they had or any connection my father had with William and Mary, but he certainly must have felt that my father would understand the pressing needs, but as I said before, my father wanted not only to be fair to all but to give appearance of being fair. So I think Chandler was disappointed at some points.

Williams: Had the Depression not intervened, do you think there would have been more he could have done for Chandler, or did this have any effect?

Pollard: No, this wouldn't have had any bearing -- that is for William and Mary as compared with other schools. It wouldn't have made one iota of difference. Incidentally, in those days, the political philosophy in Virginia was to tighten your belt when revenues decline. And there were two cuts of 10 percent so as to keep the budget balanced, and that applied to all employees, including the governor. And public school teachers -- my father was one of the planks of his platform was to improve public education, and many of the school teachers gave my father credit for 'hail Columbia' when he cut the salaries, which I thought was ungenerous when they knew the revenue was going down and that the cost of living was dropping sharply.
bably-bacon and eggs had gone down—more—than their salaries had been cut. Such was the life of a peons: public servant.

Williams: You talked about what couldn't be done. What was done in relation to higher education in Virginia in this period of '30 to '34, specifically William and Mary?

Pollard: I just don't recall. I can't imagine much being done that required more funds than had been coming to the school. It was a trying period. There were hunger marches, and unemployment, which often meant that the head of the family would lose his job and that would be the only income-earning person in the family, whereas today, typically over 33,000,000 women working or whatever it is, for a mere male to lose his job doesn't mean that they're too far out on the limb. But it was distressing, suicides of people who out of their mind and depressed and felt hopeless.

Williams: This is backtracking somewhat, but I had put in a list of topics: academics and notable professors when you were a student. Did you make any notes on this subject?

Pollard: I did. Well, let's comment on Mr. Rockefeller. Of course, he was a Yankee. That's a point you hardly think of in present-day time, and I don't think there was much prejudice as to the unfortunate place where he was born and brought up or even to the taking over the town and changing its status quo. The most any objection that might have been raised was overcome by the very high prices he paid for the property, although a few pieces of property were bought at the normal market value before it was
announced that Rockefeller was in it. Some of the property in Williamsburg was owned by the town for its municipal purposes -- firehouse, you know, courthouse, and the like -- and the purchase of them by Rockefeller or the Restoration had to be approved by the town council. My father was then mayor, and he gladly helped smooth the transition. He liked the Restoration idea, and he thought highly of Mr. Rockefeller, partly because he felt Mr. Rockefeller was a man of religious commitment. Some people felt that Mr. Rockefeller might be interested in endowing the college -- I don't know if you've run into that -- but only if it would be divorced from the state. I really don't know if that idea was explored in depth.

Now, I'll comment about W.A.R. Goodwin. He was a charming man; [He had] charisma. While we were in Williamsburg, my sister had joined the Episcopal church while away at school, and soon my mother followed suit in joining Bruton Parish. Somewhat later, my father was walking down Duke of Gloucester Street, and ran across Dr. Goodwin near the old church. He remarked to my father that he was pleased that his wife and daughter had joined the Episcopal church and that he thought that my father would soon be following their suit in joining the church. And my father replied -- he was a staunch Baptist, you see, and taught Sunday school class for years in the Baptist -- my father replied to Dr. Goodwin, "I'll be damned
if I will!" And Dr. Goodwin broke into a broad smile and said, "Oh, now you're coming our way. You're beginning to cuss." That's the Baptist version of that conversation. The part that Dr. Goodwin played in getting Mr. Rockefeller interested in the Restoration is well known, and I think [it was] at a Phi Beta Kappa meeting in New York where the interest was initially sparked. We are, I think, indebted to Dr. Goodwin. Someone said he tried to get Mr. Ford interested prior to that. I don't know whether that's true or not.

Now Dr. J.A.C. Chandler in my student days: A student doesn't often have an opportunity to react to a president unless something special is going on -- to react in any personal way. I would see him from time to time, as any student would in a small college -- must not have been over three hundred when I entered -- and I always found him pleasant and usually in high gear -- when he was walking he move fast -- and while he had time for a greeting, he didn't have time for small talk. He soon developed a reputation as a builder, bringing in the students and getting new buildings, etc. physical facilities. Constantly we were being overcrowded in some of our facilities, which was a good background to put pressure on the state for greater appropriations. After my student days, I gathered the impression that many of the faculty were afraid of him. It could have been his manner. I dare say he could not have declared at some college presidents that he was concerned primarily with serving the faculty -- considered himself a servant of the faculty.
But this is mere conjecture on my part.

That might have been out of keeping because I state that negatively. If on the faculty perhaps Dr. Hall was the most memorable. All took his freshman English. He was a good teacher as well as a good showman. During the beginning weeks of freshman English, it seemed he always found in his class a student who was descended from a distinguished family, and Dr. Hall would chat with him encouragingly during the class session about his forebears. Then as a climax he would unexpectedly come out to the class with this caution: "You'd better get to be careful how you look up your family tree -- you might find a turkey buzzard up there." That was a bit of deflation, wasn't it? My father's quip along the same line and somewhat later was to offer this definition of an aristocrat: an aristocrat is a member of a family that has long been descending. There you go.

I played tennis frequently with Dr. Robb, my professor of chemistry. He was a gentleman, a lovely man, and as I remarked earlier, I'm sure that his forebears had much to do with his personality. The kind of people the Robbs were can be illustrated by quoting an old colored servant who lived many years in the ancestral plantation home of the Robbs in Caroline County whose job was to welcome guests at the front door. These are the words in a little book written by Professor Robb's brother, quoting the old man: "Come in and make yourself at home. We're always glad to have you." And his farewell: "You must all come again. You'll find our doors hanging on welcome hinges." How much warmer could you be?

"Sum in and make yoseff at home. We'z always glad to have yu." And his farewell, "Yawl cum agin. Yu'll find de doz dm welcome hinges."
Tennis, which has become such a popular game, had no real status when I was a student. Only two courts were provided, clay courts, poorly maintained. Generally the players had to mark off the lines themselves and usually with "plume.

I was captain of the team. If we went anywhere to play another college we had to provide our own transportation. Among the college-supported intercollegiate athletics, William and Mary did best in baseball. Baseball was quite popular throughout Virginia in those days. High schools had active baseball programs and there were many communities which had adult citizen teams. In Lancaster County, I added parenthetically, there were no gymnasiums for basketball, no football teams. Most of the boys had to go home and do the chores on the farm, you see. Then besides, how are you going to get home when the bus has already gone at three o'clock? And no college high school bands. Our county, and many others in Virginia, until after the Second World War were disadvantaged, but we didn't think of ourselves as such — that's a modern concept. So that takes care of personalities that occurred to me particularly. I remember also Dr. Roscoe Conkling Young who taught physics. I found him a great inspiration probably because my expanding knowledge of the world through physics just gave me such a bang, and Dr. Young would take plenty of time to work with a student who would do the work.

Williams: You went into economics after you left William and Mary but had