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Harold L. Fowler

November 4, 1974

These are interviews conducted with Harold L. Fowler on November 4th,
November 11th, and December 2, 1974.

Emily: Now I want to start at the beginning—the logical place—and ask you
how it was that you happened to come to William and Mary?

Beau Fowler: I got my Ph.D. at Harvard in June of 1934. I had an appointment
to continue teaching freshman history in the summer after John
Stewart Bryan had been appointed president, he told Dr. Morton that he
could add somebody to the department. Actually I was a replacement, and there
was some question as to whether the appointment would be made. So
Dr. Morton wrote to Harvard and I assume other places; Roger B. Merriman,
who was in charge of the freshman history at Harvard at that time, was a
personal friend of John Stewart Bryan. Whether John Bryan approached
Dr. Merriman initially for recommendations or whether it was done through
Dr. Morton, I'm not sure. Anyway, the Merriman-Bryan connection
helped, and Mr. Merriman recommended me, particularly since I had my degree
and I was to be (I would have been) the first person with a degree to
continue to teach in the freshman history course at Harvard. Times were
that tough. So I was counting on going back to Harvard. I got my first
communication about the job down here in August. They got my papers from
the Harvard placement office. Then one Sunday in early September we
were at the dinner table at my house—we lived in New Hampshire. My future
wife was there having Sunday dinner with us. The phone rang. It was
Dick Morton
someone wanting to know if I could come down to William and Mary immediately.
I said that I'd do my best, and I knew there was a train out of Boston through
to Washington.

---
I said that if I could find a way to get into Boston this afternoon, I'd be down there on Monday. Well, I managed through a friend, and I got down here on Monday. Registration was already going on. I forget the date, but it must have been about the second week in September. I stayed with the Mortons, and I had to wait a day or two to see Mr. Bryan because he had a cold, or something. So I finally saw him and was appointed right on the spot. I remember the day because it happened to be on my birthday. They thought I could stay down here—I had my stuff shipped down. As I said registration had been over, and they were starting classes. I thought I couldn't do that because half my gear was in Cambridge, where I was going to return next week, and the rest of my stuff was home for the summer. So I said I had to go back. I left here on Thursday, and I got back on Saturday. I started teaching on Monday, having missed the first meeting of each class.

What was it that particularly attracted you to William and Mary?

Dean Fowler: Well...

What kept you from going to Harvard?

Dean Fowler: To be perfectly frank, I had no future at Harvard—I knew this. William and Mary was attractive. While the salary was very low, it was low everywhere in those days. My wife and I were already planning to be married, and she was going to take a job—I guess continue a job, in Boston. So that was certainly a consideration. And of course, William and Mary had a great deal to offer. I had to teach American history my first year. I had never taken any American history in graduate school. Fortunately, as on young graduate, I taught under the old curriculum where all students were required to take one semester of United States history and one semester of Virginia government. So the big, heavy...
enrollment in history was within the introductory survey of United States history and I was to teach the first semester. Fortunately I was better prepared for that. I had a course in colonial history as an undergraduate for the colonial period, particularly. And of course, knowing my English history helped me. So I had to do two sections of that each semester my first year. My first two years here I taught eleven different courses. In 1935 we went into a new curriculum in which the basic requirement if the student chose history was a year of European history. And of course, it was my job to develop that course, which I did, and to teach the American history along with giving European and some English history courses.

**Sally:** This was when Dr. Morton was trying to build up European as a core?

**Dean Fowler:** Right. He and the history department and the faculty when they adopted the new curriculum were all in agreement that there was to be a basic introductory survey course that should be European history rather than American history. So that's what we went into. And from then on we began to go along. And before long the enrollment in European history courses greatly exceeded the enrollment in the American history courses. I'm trying to remember if we added a European historian my second year or whether it was the third year. So there were two of us anyway.

The European offerings became as numerous as the American history. In those days we all alternated courses you see in order. When I came there was Dr. Morton and Judge something. He wasn't even full time in history. So with two and a half of us, shall we say. Then it became three and a half with the second European historian. Then we added another American historian. I guess that's the way we stood going into World War II. We had two people in European history and one of them was a very good friend of mine before Bruce MacCulley in 1940. Is that enough on that?
Emily: You also talked about a colonial life seminar in the late 30s.

Dean Fowler: Oh, that was in the summer. All this was connected rather indirectly with the founding of the Institute. John Stuart Bryan and others were interested in seeing in what ways Colonial Williamsburg and the college could cooperate, combining resources and this kind of thing. So in 1938 Wesley Frank Craven, someone who was then at N.Y.U., came down here and spent a year surveying the situation, toying with ideas as to how they could be cooperation and what sound programs they might introduce. One sort of offshoot of this was the scheme to have the colonial seminar in the summer whereby we would bring in about 30 mostly school teachers for a week at a time. We had two weeks with a differing group each week. We worked out a program using college resources, the National Park Service—a nice week's program. And it was all very inexpensive, and that was one thing we wanted to do because even then it was expensive for someone to come to spend a whole week in Williamsburg and do the whole bit. So we housed them in a college dormitory, using Chandler Hall, which was one of the newer women's dormitories then, and we had the whole dorm to ourselves. So Frank Craven ran it the first year; he set it up, and then I ran it for two years after that, and then the war knocked the props out from under it. We had a program of lectures. There were lectures every morning and occasionally some in the evening. They did the tour of course of Colonial Williamsburg. They did Jamestown and Yorktown under the supervision of the Park Service. Then they took a boat trip up the James River after they'd had a lecture on the river plantation. This was a very pleasant day. Then all kinds of people cooperated. Mrs. Taylor, who
then owned the Nelson House in Yorktown, put on a tea and reception for us. So they got a lot out of it. Now obviously there was nothing really scholarly about this. This is not to say that the lectures weren't scholarly, but the emphasis was not on scholarship. It was merely to give these people an opportunity to spend a week here and see the whole historic area. One of the things that was included, and they cooperated, was the Martiner's Museum. They spent an afternoon down there. So it worked very well, and I think this modest venture did lay the groundwork for more serious and significant cooperation, particularly with C.W., It is now C.W. but it was what we called then the Restoration.

Dean Fowler: Oh, yes. When I came in '34 the Palace, the Capitol, the Raleigh Tavern, the Ludwell-Paradise House—those were all done, as were the college buildings, of course. Those that I named were the first exhibition buildings and the only ones. So meanwhile they had already begun the restoration of some of the houses on Duke of Gloucester Street. The whole first block of Duke of Gloucester Street looks essentially as it does now. There have been some changes since, but that was done. There were some quick and sudden changes. Well, the local stores used to be in that first block. The Pender's Colonial stores, what we called vendors then, was where the toymaker is on that corner there. The post office was there in that arcade between the bank and the toymaker. There were two or three restaurants down there. The liquor store was down there. The bank was right where it is now. Williamsburg Drug is where it is now, though both of those have expanded.
Go an example of how quickly changes would occur. For example, just below where Wilson's antique shop is now, on the opposite corner which is the parking space across from Casey's, there was an old shop which I guess was a cobler shop. President Roosevelt was coming down here to visit the college to get a degree. So of course Colonial Williamsburg wanted to have everything as spick and span as they could. And I'll never forget this old shack sitting on that corner. They put a great big chain through one window, through another window from the second or third floor and just yanked the thing down. And it came down. It was nothing but a shack. And so within ten days there was green grass growing there on that corner. That's the way they did things on occasion. There were still shops further down the block where the Bruton Parish House is now. But things were beginning to appear pretty much like they do now.

Emidio: You spoke of having taught eleven different courses in two years.

Dean Fowler: Yes, I think that's accurate.

Emidio: But when you went to California in the 1950's, how would you compare teaching conditions at California Institute of Technology and here?

Dean Fowler: Different. When I went out to Cal Tech they had a good program, but the offerings in history, English, economics, philosophy were limited. So actually my total teaching out there was in the classroom five hours a week, and it was all in a European survey somewhat different to what we were giving here, but not too much different. So it was an academic paradise. I'm still teaching fifteen hours here, taught fifteen hours for years.

Emidio: Going back to Dr. Bryan, he has been described as 'a real Virginia gentleman.' How would you say this was true?

Dean Fowler: I'd say it is entirely true. He is a gentleman and scholar of the nineteenth century vantage. Not only had he gone to the University of Virginia, but then he went on to study law there at Harvard. He used to quote the Bible and Shakespeare with great facility.
and all kinds of things. He had that kind of education. He came from a well-to-do family, and he married into a Virginia wealthy family. So he had that tradition behind him and heritage from his father, a lovely mansion in Richmond called Laburnum, where the Richmond Memorial Hospital is now. So this was part of normal living for him: having servants around and all this kind of thing. He loved to entertain, and he loved people.

When he was down here, which was only about half the time because he was still in charge of the newspaper there, he would entertain as much as he could. He was very informal about it. Not infrequently the telephone might ring at five-thirty, and John Stuart Bryan would say to my wife, and Jimmy Stewart, "You two come over and eat supper with me." He did this kind of thing. He was very casual and warm in that way. But at the same time he was an aristocrat, and you only went so far, shall we say. He expected everybody to be a lady and a gentleman. While he was very informal and friendly, at the same time he was a very dignified person, a man with lovely tastes. His impact of his personality on the faculty and students here was just magnificent. He changed the whole atmosphere of the college in a period of eight years.

Dean Fowler: In what ways?

Dean Fowler: Well, I don't want to run down his predecessor, President Chandler, but he was totally different. In his later years he was not well, and he had lost his wife. Toward the end, at least, he did no entertaining. Of course, in those days there was Prohibition before 1924, and President Chandler was very much against drinking anyway. I could go through all kinds of stories about the amount of corn liquor there was around the community. But no member of the faculty was supposed to have a drink, or a student. Of course, that all changed. But perhaps the law would have changed then.
He was just a different kind of person, and eventually killed himself by overwork. He was working in his office almost every night during the week. Mr. Bryan didn't work during office hours.

Dean Fowler: That's right. But so did the faculty. That plan wouldn't have been made directly to do with the adoption of the new curriculum in 1935; and that's what made the major transformation. But changes were already underway before old Dr. Chandler went. The basic policy of selective process of admission, this was already underway. He was placing more and more emphasis on quality of the student body. There were some very fine faculty members here before 1934. Some of them were beaten down. Any member of the faculty who amounted to anything was fired at least once by Chandler and then rehired the next day--this kind of thing. And then, of course, the college went through the depression, and the faculty had suffered two salary cuts shortly before I came down here. But this was going on throughout the country, and it was going on throughout Virginia. So times were tough, then. But getting away from the emphasis on teacher training obviously had started before '34. And then what we did was to abolish a concentration in education, and that really cut into it. Most people who were in education agreed that the thing to do was to give future teachers a good liberal arts education, and let them have what technical and methods courses they needed, and let it go at that. So there was no great uproar about cutting back on the teacher training. I think there was a very wide
agreement on this.

Emily: You and Dr. Bryan both came during hard times, which you have said. What ways did the depression affect the faculty and Williamsburg?

Dean Fowler: If you want to take Williamsburg first, Williamsburg didn't feel the depression because this was when the Restoration was going on. You see all this money was being pumped into the community. So as a community they didn't feel the depression like -- well, I came from New mill.

England, and I saw it. I saw New England little towns just laid low. Williamsburg was fortunate; it was spared then.

The way the faculty felt the depression was through what the state had to do because of financial exigencies in holding the line on expenditures and forcing all state employees to take a pay cut and so forth.

Emily: Even after you came?

Dean Fowler: No, was said over by '34. In a sense I suppose it could be said that the faculty who were here before this regime and after the worst of the depression --
Dean Fowler. I think I'm correct in saying that those faculty never got that ten percent cutback. They got one of them back which was only temporary.

So this put the whole faculty salary scale down. They managed. They understood. Many of them had recently built homes. Everything was inexpensive then. The dollar went a long way. Dr. someone built his house over there and that's where I first lived when I came home. I had a room the first semester. I was still a bachelor. I had one room and in the wing of the house apart from the Dean Lambert had the other one. Something about a master bedroom. So we all became very close friends the first semester I was here. Then I got married the day after Christmas, and we got back down here around the 2nd or 3rd of January. The first nine months we were married we lived in the house next door. Supposedly it was furnished, but very sparsely. We could manage. Then this place became available in September of '35 and we were fortunate enough to get it. We have been here ever since. We've lived in this house for thirty-nine years. This was all faculty. This is the newest house in the court right here. That was built I forget, in the '40's. Next door were the Stokes, history. On the corner was Dr. Robey, chairman of the chemistry department. Diagonally over here was old Dr. Geiger, who was head of psychology. He died in '35. The house next to him, the faculty who built that was somebody in education. Then Dr. Swem was the next house. The first house in the court when you come in this way.
So it was a faculty community. This house just below mine, which
now has half a dozen apartments, was built by the them chairman
of modern languages, a man named Williams, whom Dr. Chandler,
for reasons we don't need to go into, sent down to the Norfolk
division—what in those days was referred to as being sent to
Siberia.

Dean Fowler: Down at Norfolk in the '30's there was a
great scandal and what was
Dr. Bryan's reaction to this?

Dean Fowler: He couldn't have been more upset because our
creditation was threatened. As a matter of fact, as I recall, we were mildly
censured by Kappa Kappa, which upset Dr. Swem terribly. The man who was dean
down there, Dean Hodges, had been dean up here—I guess he was dean of
students up here under Chandler and was sent down there to run the Norfolk
Division. He was guilty of this, trying to help students down there
get into the Naval Academy. That's where it was caught. There wasn't any
worse crime in the academic world than forging or changing academic
records. William and Mary up here was perfectly innocent. One of the
problems we had for years and as a result of that very unhappy experience,
there was great improvement. But for years after President Chandler had
founded the divisions—the Norfolk Division and R.P.I. in Richmond—there
wasn't adequate supervision from William and Mary. So things went on which
should not have gone on, and as a result of that experience they began to
be much more supervision. If you talk to Jim Miller, who was dean
when this mess developed after Dean Holt was replaced in 1938 by Jim
Miller, there began to be much closer supervision from both branches, both divisions.

Dean Fowler: You mentioned Dr. Bryan's entertaining. Did you ever go to his
Christmas parties?

Dean Fowler: Oh yes, indeed. Yes, we had these terrific Christmas parties
in old Phi Beta Kappa Hall, which is now Ewell Hall. They were terrific. We had a faculty committee, and the student committe would be involved—perhaps 50 or 100 people. It was really an elaborate business. That place was just jammed. We used to be terrified of the floor falling through or fire breaking out or something. It was a fire trap. It was spectacular, really. And there used to be a kind of floor show. President Bryan, in the role of Lord of the Manor, and his party would sit up on the stage, and people would walk up in the center of Phi Beta to be presented to him.

We took out all the seats so that it could be a dance floor and a place to mill around. It was elaborate. I remember one year I was in charge of the committee on favors. Everybody had hats and horns and all that stuff. And somebody had the idea—I don't know if I did or not—that we would get a whole mess of balloons and get them up on top of the ceiling, up in the attic there, and at the proper time let them loose down through the ceiling. So I had to supervise this thing. I remember crawling up there in the attic, and we built a great big funnel-shaped sort of funnel-shaped to hold these balloons and then have them come drifting down. I got up there—I don't know if it was the day of the party or the day before—and you couldn't do much more than a cat walk up there. And the ceiling of old Phi Beta, you couldn't walk on the ceiling itself, really.

I remember getting up there and getting dizzy, and it was all I could do to get down from that place up there. Then in connection with the big party over there, there were faculty and I'm sure student parties
before this whole thing started. Then it became traditional for certain people on the faculty to have intermission parties. In some cases, people went to these intermission parties and went back to the big show afterward. But by that time the students had taken over and most of those who had been involved in the preparations and the planning of the thing were so worn out, and so most of us didn't go back after the first year or two.

Then they had those very elaborate June balls which were magnificent. That was the award for Leslie Cheek, who came here in 1935 to really create our fine arts department, to put together some of these things that were being offered in music and theater and so forth. You had painting courses given when I came here, but it developed into a real fine arts department. Leslie Cheek's field was architecture, and he brought in a man in painting, a man in sculpture, and some people in the theater to help Miss Hunt. He had the notion of this elaborate commencement ball, of which much of the expense came out of John Stewart Bryan's pocket. And that was a beautiful affair, really. We set up a dance floor down in the sunken garden, and the upper level toward the Wren Building there would be tables, and there were magnolias all over the place and the best dance bands from the United States—Glen Miller and all the rest.

Evelyn: Where is Leslie Cheek now?

Dean Fowler: He is spending most of his time in Richmond. His last major job was director of the Virginia Museum of Art. But in the meantime he has been the head of the Baltimore Museum. He's been in New York on an architectural forum which is the magazine of its kind in the country. He married Douglas Freeman's daughter. Incidentally, Mrs. Freeman just died last week.)
So Lesley and his wife, Mary Tyler Freeman, have lived in Richmond for years. When he retired from the Virginia Art Museum they bought a place up near Monterey in Virginia and he was going into the nursery game.

I haven't seen them in over a year. But they have been spending most of their time in an apartment in Richmond. They gave up their home in Richmond.

**Edith:** Was it President Bryan's health that forced him to resign in the '40's?

**Dean Fowler:** Mr. Bryan's health was frail even before he had agreed to become President. I believe I'm correct in saying that he had a couple of bouts with pneumonia. His family didn't want him to take this job, largely for reasons of health. When he took it, it was clearly understood that it would be for a period of limited time. It was a strain on him, of course, because he remained as publisher of the newspapers, He was contemplating retirement for health reasons for sometime. Then I think it's also true to say in fact I think you can find this in his own words that by 1941, he felt he had accomplished his mission at the college. I forget offhand when he announced his retirement to the Board. I think it was '41 and it would become effective in '42. The search for a successor went on during the second semester during the spring of '42 and that's when John Pomfret was appointed. And as soon as they found a successor, Mr. Bryan retired and he died two years later in 1944.

**Edith:** You've done a great deal of work on Mr. Bryan. What would you say was his greatest contribution to William and Mary?

**Dean Fowler:** His greatest contribution, I would say, was himself: his personality and the impact of his personality on the whole place. He was a man of tremendous enthusiasm. He was a well-read, scholarly gentleman who has kept high standards for everybody who came in touch with him. He was eager to make it the best liberal arts college in the South and at the same time he was very much concerned, of it being a truly national
institution in terms of its students and the faculty, too. The faculty came from all over the country. Well, I would say he helped to lift it—

from what, as you have said, certainly had been for sometime primarily a teacher's college and one which grew very rapidly under President Chandler. This contribution was as a builder of the physical plan and building up the number of students, admittedly on his part at first without too much selectivity, but any institution goes through this kind of period. So Mr. Bryan could build on what President Chandler had done. The physical plant was adequate then. We were beginning to get a better student body drawn from all over the United States. Not many from the deep south—we've never drawn many from the deep south. He was able to attract, at a time when the job market was still not too good, some fine faculty who shared his point of view. There was always so much enthusiasm and life when he was around. He'd walk up and down the campus and stop and talk to the students and they thought he was wonderful. The impact of his personality was just tremendous; it was infectious; you couldn't avoid being affected by it. Everyone just loved the man—it's just that simple.

Emily: Were you still here when Pomfret was elected or had you gone into the navy?

Dean Fowler: No, I was still here. I knew a little bit about the committee toward the end. It was no secret as to who the leading candidates were. He was one of them. He was a graduate dean at Vanderbilt. He had once been an instructor in history at Princeton as an assistant dean there. I knew a number of people in the history department at Princeton because we were at Harvard together. And so—I don't know, this ought to be off the record—but anyway, the chairman of the committee to find Mr. Bryan's successor was Chalmers Hall, a member of the board of visitors, mayor of Williamsburg,
local lawyer whose son practiced law at Annapolis. Even in those days he had a sense of feel about some faculty input into a search for a president— not in the formalized way that one has to do it nowadays. I knew Mr. Hall and quite well by this time. I don't know whether I told him or whether he asked me if I knew anybody in the history department at Princeton well. I said, "Yes indeed." He said that he'd like to have one or two more letters on Pomfret from that period. So I did. So I knew that way—I don't remember when I first learned—that John Pomfret's name was very much in the hat. He came in September of 1942 and I left, well, I guess I actually left early in April of '43. I started several months before. I was going to be drafted. I was the number one married man in Williamsburg on the draft list because we didn't have any children—even though I was 35. So I set out to get a commission. And I got one. I had to work on that for a while. I finally got my orders and was induced. I got out just before Christmas in 1945—a little more than two years and a half.

Emily: But before you left in '43 you were one of the ones to advise students on the draft, is that right?

Dean Fowler: No. What you are thinking of, Emily, is I guess what I did when I came back. I got out of the service in December and Mr. Pomfret and Jim Miller told me to get back here as soon as I could because there would be plenty for me to do. Even though, of course, my replacement in the history department, Evelyn Accu, would go on teaching. She had her contract for the year, you see. She was teaching my courses. They said there would be plenty for you to do in administration. So I went right to work. And what I did was to evaluate all of the college credit for military service for the returning veterans. And at first it came in
by the hundreds. I'll never forget my teaching for that second semester of
1945-'46 was a special class in which I taught the whole of the
European survey in one semester by an intensive business. I did both
semesters in one. And this class was created for returning veterans.
As I recall there were, that semester in my course, 99 or 100 of them.
And some of them were the finest students I have ever had in my life. So
my work, the whole of that second semester, was mostly administrative
plus giving this double course. The following September I went back into
my regular routine. For years I taught the survey and after a while it
grew so big there was no lecture hall in the college that would hold them.
So I used to have to repeat
my lectures, and I always kept two quiz sections myself so that I would
know a little of what was going on. So when things reached that point,
it took six hours of my time just teaching that one course, with four
lectures and two quiz sections a week. I did the
and for years I had done Europe from 1815 to 1914—a whole year. And
then I developed a one-semester course which I called contemporary
Europe, which was really 20th-century Europe. This was all started before
the war. So when I got back into my regular schedule, that's what it was.

So I taught 15 hours the first semester, and I guess I taught 13 the
second semester. I think that's when the contemporary Europe was, one
semester, I picked up a third quiz section; I think. By that time
everybody in the department was taking quiz sections. Everybody in the
department their first year audited the lectures. We used to have weekly
staff meetings. It was a highly organized course. Everybody
knew what was going on: they had been exposed to the lectures
and so forth. We met and all made out common quizzes. For the younger
men as they came in, even if I do say so, it was excellent internship.

They learned a lot. A young man with his Ph.D. had virtually-done no teaching to work with a team—with the whole department—was a worthwhile experience.

Emily: Was it a required profession?

Dean Fowler: No, it wasn't required. But it turned out to be almost that.

I'd say for years, two-thirds to three-quarters of the students who entered William and Mary took the course. What they had to do was they had to have two years of a year of each of two, history, government, and economics. The history course was the only one designed and listed for freshman. So that if a freshman entering here wanted to satisfy part of that requirement—what we call the social science requirement—his first year, he would come into the history. A lot of them satisfied it, took this—and they had to take two out of the three anyway, and we always got a great majority. The usual combination was history and government or economics. That was the common thing. I'll say this, certainly in the case of government and to some extent in economics, they advocated this to the students.

They wanted them to have a year of European history before they took the government or economics. So things reached a point where, I think the record one year, we had 506 students in that course with about 36 quiz sections. We used students as graders of the weekly quizzes. Every instructor graded at least one section every week. We gave a half-hour quiz every week for the first six weeks. Then we threw an hour exam at them. Then for the remainder of the semester we went on to a quiz every other week. The second semester there would be a quiz every two weeks. By that time they were pretty well broken in.
Emily: Is that when your Henry A. Beech lecture became famous?

Dean Fowler: Yes.

Emily: When you came back from the war could you tell any changes that had been at the college?

Dean Fowler: Not really. It was a rough time for William and Mary as it was for many institutions. The male enrollment dropped way off. They did have an Army unit here, which helped. Then they got the Navy Chaplain's school here, which occupied the second and third floors of the Marshall-Wythe House (now the whole school, which occupied the second and third floors of James Blair), where history, government, and economics were. That helped the college to survive without too much tightening. I would say it was essentially everybody picking up where we had left off and continuing the building of the institution—and I don't mean the physical plant. Things went back to normal. Then the college began to grow. When I came here in '34 I think we had about 1250 students, which I thought was ideal. There were 68 to 70 faculty members. Everybody knew everybody else. Then after the war when more and more veterans went to college taking advantage of the G.I. Bill, we began to edge up so that by 1950 I suppose we had 1700 or 1800 something like this. I think that is about the size we were when Pomfret left and Admiral Winfield S. Bull came in. There never went any wild burst of students, which was fortunate. For years—I say for years, but probably three years—we ran a special branch down at Norfolk at an old Navy installation called St. Andrews and we offered the essentially the first two years of our curriculum down there for people who couldn't be accommodated up here or who didn't measure up as well to those we were admitting up here at the
Williamsburg campus. And that place served as a useful purpose. Some of those people came up here and did all right. Some of them, I don't know what happened to them. It took some of the pressure off us. And by this time both Norfolk and Richmond divisions were booming.

**Dean Fowler:** As the veterans started coming back, this brought back something that had been somewhat of a problem apparently before the war and that was the fraternities. The governor had issued an order saying that fraternities could not live separately off campus, taking their meals off campus.

I think you were on that committee.

**Dean Fowler:** Yes, I was chairman of that committee that prepared that report. In the '30's the fraternities had their own houses, and they were independent, most of them in serious financial condition. Two or three pronounced exceptions to that. That was a funny business. We presented our report to the Board of Visitors and at that time Colgate Darden was very much concerned about the fraternity situation at the University of Virginia. He was looking for the information and evidence he could find that the fraternity system in the United States was sick. As fond as I am of Colgate Darden, I and others were very upset. What he did was to take our report and make it to the public and use it. But that was a little bit on the side. The thing here was the building of the fraternity lodges by the college, renting them, allowing no more than three boys to live there. In other words, it was just a social place for them. But the lodge system worked pretty well for a while. It relieved all these houses and...
financial problems, and they had great times there. There were a number of parties down at the lodges when they were new, and the boys and girls seemed to have a great time. Then of course we went to the present system. Meanwhile the sororities remained as they were. The sororities

The college owned those houses, anyway. Therefore, they never had the same difficulties, and they maintained dining facilities for years.

What ruined them was the war, when it was difficult to get cooks and servants, and the rationing and so forth. It was difficult to run that kind of dining facility. So most of the sororities gave up the eating in any formal fashion anyway, and gradually they drifted back into it after the war. But in the '40s the girls had sit-down dinners every night, and it was served by black maids. Very frequently they invited faculty to come for dinner, which was a nice arrangement.

There were 16, 18 or 20 - that was the maximum who could live in the house. There was no more space than that. So normally that would be the number of girls who would be there for dinner. I guess in some cases girls who didn't live in the house could have at least an evening meal there, if they wanted to, depending on how much demand there were for them. It was very pleasant. The girls were dressed up in pretty fashion. They would invite one or perhaps two faculty couples to come over for supper. They talked to them before and afterward. They were all so much closer in those days. It was easier to do things.

Emily: What did you know about the controversy that went on about the lodges?

Dean Fowler: You mean on the construction of them?

Emily: Yes.

Dean Fowler: I knew a fair amount. There wasn't any question that those lodges cost a fair amount. I don't know really who was to blame. I
know of no conclusive evidence of any hanky-panky that went on, but there were ugly stories about Charlie Duke, who was then bursar of the college, and Jack Saunders, who was superintendent of building. When the cost of the individual units became known there was a good deal of raising of the eyebrows. This meant that the rental charges to the fraternities were higher than what they had anticipated. In two or three cases difficulties developed about the building. I remember one of the lodges the whole corner washed out from underneath it. There were stories about insecure construction and this kind of thing. But this upset the students, and complaining about the cost persisted. But I don't know how profitable this was to the college. Of course, it was an open secret that the sororities were a great financial benefit to the college. Those houses were very cheaply constructed, and the college charged the girls over there the top going room rental for the college. And so if you packed twenty girls (in some cases) into those houses, then you've got about two or three hundred dollars a year. That was a right good income from the initial investment. Some of those houses didn't cost more than $10 thousand to build and they were taking in better than $4 thousand dollars a year. Now the college supplied all the utilities, heat, light, etc., but it was a financial success in that respect. The sorority houses were all going strong when I came. That was the doing of President Chandler. I don't see how it could have been done that the college's investment in the fraternity lodges could have produced anything like the return from the sorority houses.

Emily: I want to learn more about Dr. Pomfret, and we haven't even gotten to [A.D.] Chandler. I think we had better save that for another day. Do you want to come back?

Dean Fowler: Sure.
Another Interview

Emily: One of the things that I did want to ask you about Dr. Pomfret was how you would evaluate his administration in terms of what he did for William and Mary.

Dean Fowler: Well, I'd say it was given the unusual circumstances, particularly of his first four years (mainly wartime) that he was a very significant administration in the history of the college. He made a real contribution, being himself an academic and historian. We all knew that as he could find time he continued to do some scholarly work. This made a favorable impression on those who knew what was going on. I suppose most people would describe Jack Pomfret as a lazy administrator—maybe somebody else has used that adjective. He didn't like to get overwhelmed with the detail routine of administration. He was a kind of man who had confidence—and in some cases, too much confidence—in his subordinates. As long as things appeared to be going all right, he tended to let them alone. He did have weekly staff meetings, which as I recall was an innovation (maybe it wasn't). When I say staff meetings I mean the primarily the business and maintenance and grounds and dining hall and laundry—these operations of the college. He had a weekly staff meeting of all those people. I looked in on them and knew they were going on. He had some tendency to let sleeping dogs lie. He didn't go around looking for trouble. I think that some would say that he tended to kick some things under the rug. He was not a political animal in the sense that he always wanted to be running up to Richmond and maintaining or creating political contacts up there. He was largely content to...
to leave that area to Charlie Duke, the bursar, who had these connections and who loved all this business, up there and who was a political animal. There were those who thought Jack Pomfret was not aggressive enough in seeking money from the state. Virtually no building occurred during his administration. I don't think it was really needed. I would say our great need in terms of physical plant then was in terms of a library. We already began to over-flow it. The reading rooms were nowhere long enough to accommodate those who wanted to use them. Again, let's take a personal example: We assigned quite a lot of library readings even in that day to freshman 101 and 102 and had purchased duplicate copies. That lobby we could only seat about 500 people over there. So that was becoming a rather critical need in terms of space and facility. But otherwise, we had enough room. There was enough physical plant for what we were doing for the enrollment as it was at that time. Therefore, Pomfret was modest in his requests to the legislature. I think a lot of people thought he should be asking for more. His difficulties were the bill of visitors. It began rather early, soon after the war was over.

There was a strong difference in opinion, and Lord knows this had a familiar ring—there was a strong difference in opinion on athletic policy. He formulated a statement (which I think I saw once somewhere) which really did not have the approval of the board. They wanted much more emphasis on athletics. There was clearly a difference of opinion there. Then in 1947 his nominee for the deanship—and at this time we only had one academic dean, (At one time he was known as the dean of the college, and at another time the title was changed to the dean of the faculty)—Dean Miller gave up the deanship in 1947 and President Pomfret nominated—this became public knowledge—Harold Phalin, who lives right next door.
who was in mathematics who had come to us some years before from Bard College up on the Hudson, which is now part of Columbia, I guess. He had some administrative experience up there. Harold had pretty wide support. Anyway, Pomfret nominated him to the Board and the Board turned it down. And he took it. Some people thought he should have thrown his resignation on the table. But he didn't. Charlie Umbeck who was then in sociology and who had held one or more administrative offices during the war while a lot of people were away, was made dean. None of us thought this was a major defeat for Pomfret in his relation to the Board. That he submitted to this setback. Umbeck had already, or soon developed, his own contacts with certain Board members. This tied in with the football crowd. Umbeck was tennis coach and this was the time when we built up the national champions. So he had in his hands an unusual and unfortunate collection of responsibilities. He was dean, he was coach of tennis, he was chairman of the committee on athletics. He was also involved in scholarships and financial aid, a very unusual combination of responsibilities. This caused comment. Meanwhile, of course, the emphasis on football grew. There were wide differences of opinion between Pomfret and members of the Board on this. Then the whole thing blew up in 1951. I think I should say that in the meantime, Mr. Pomfret, who was a rather easy-going person in nature—-not to repeat the word lazy as some people said—he was the kind of man who was perhaps too trustful of others. He was the kind of man who would believe the best of somebody unless he learned something unfortunate to the contrary. And when these irregularities began to be uncovered initially by Mr. Lambert, who was then registrar—by that time Nelson Marshall was dean,
and he began to get his teeth into this, and Mr. Pomfret just couldn't believe that McCrady, who was football coach, would do this kind of thing. So he took some convincing. You have probably learned that a faculty committee was appointed, and they worked closely with Nelson Marshall. Only they, in the end, were able to convince Mr. Pomfret that something was really wrong and required a full investigation. And in the meantime, to the dismay of many people, he had recommended McCrady for promotion. Then they began to get the convincing evidence. Much of it came at first from one of the secretaries over in the athletic department who made some interesting disclosures about the typing of high school transcripts. It began to be clear that perhaps the man directly responsible, though probably working with McCrady's instruction, was Barnie Wilson, who was the basketball coach. Then one of our great football players in the days when we were really big time learned somehow that his name had gotten involved in this. Some made disclosures to the press and others, so the whole thing came out in the paper. The Board of Visitors held formal hearings in Richmond. McCrady had counsel Hoffman, who later became federal judge down in Norfolk. Many people had the feeling that the whole thing was rigged in order to destroy Pomfret to blacken him, and to whitewash McCrady and other people. Well, as it turned out later, though we didn't know it at the time—(it was a well-kept secret) while this all developed in the summer of '51, Pomfret had been under discussion for the directorship of Huntington Library since early that year. I got some of this personally from Pomfret later on.
He talked with or at least he communicated with and I think he talked with Herbert Hoover, who was one of the directors of the Huntington. He had the recommendation, he told me later on, of Senator Harry Byrd.

Even when this football thing began to develop, as I recall, Pomfret told me afterwards that Harry Byrd gave him a very fine recommendation; and as far as he knew, Pomfret's hands were absolutely clean on this football thing. The thing blew up in August and I was up in Maine.
December 9, 1974

Emily: I wanted to ask you today when was it that you first found out that there was something wrong in the athletic department? We had been talking about the late '40s. When did you, yourself, first know of anything wrong?

Fowler: As I remember, Mr. Lambert told me some things in confidence about two or three transcripts which I recall were from Hampton High School, and that ended it so far as my having any direct part in it because I knew he was going to... I guess the only reason he told me was because I was on the admissions committee then. But after that I wasn't involved except I had a little information of what Dean Marshall was doing. Of course, the appointment of the faculty committee was public information. But again as I recall I was not directly involved; I was never directly involved until the whole thing was public, and as I think I told you, until I came back from vacation in September. Meanwhile a group of faculty had already started work on some kind of faculty statement which eventually resulted in the "Manifesto," as it's called. My involvement from then on was as a member of that committee and as one of the draftsmen of the Manifesto. There were several who had a hand in it and then as secretary of the faculty.

Emily: Did you know--was it obvious--that the athletic program was what was later accused of being a "college-sponsored racket" and "commercial enterprise"? Was this pretty common knowledge, or was it a total revelation?

Fowler: If I understand you, we didn't know there was anything wrong.
Emily: I wanted to ask you today, when was it that you first found out that there was something wrong in the athletic department? We had been talking about the late '40s. When did you, yourself, first know of anything wrong?

Dean Fowler: As I remember, Mr. Lambert told me some things in confidence about two or three transcripts which I recall were from Hampton High School and that ended it, so far as far as my having any direct part in it because I knew he was going to... I guess the only reason he told me was because I was on the admissions committee then. But after that I wasn't involved except I had a little information of what Dean Marshall was doing.

Of course the appointment of the faculty committee which was public but again as I recall was not directly involved in information. I was never directly involved until the whole thing was published and as I think I told you until I came back from vacation.

Then this group had already started work on some kind of faculty statement which eventually resulted in the Manifesto as it's called—until that thing was underway. Then my involvement from then on was as a member of that committee and one of the draftsmen of the manifesto, and then as secretary of the faculty.

Emily: Did you know then that it was obvious that the athletic program was what was later charged as being a "college-sponsored racket" and "commercial enterprise"? Was this pretty common knowledge? Was it a total revelation?

Dean Fowler: As I understand you, we didn't know there was anything wrong. We knew it was fairly high-powered and recruiting was going on, but I don't think anybody had any suspicion that records and transcripts were being tampered with until it all came out in the summer of '51. No, I don't remember any allegations or fears or suspicions before then.
Emily: Did Dean Lambert then go to Dr. Pomfret when he found this out originally? Do you know?

Dean Fowler: I'm not sure. I think you had better ask him that as to whether he first went to Dean Marshall or whether he went directly to President Pomfret. I do not know.

Emily: You said it seemed to have been difficult to convince President Pomfret that there was trouble.

Dean Fowler: Yes, they found it very difficult. And I think in the judgment of his friends, he dragged his feet on it and did not act as quickly and as precisely as he might have. Why? I'm not sure. My only suggestions would be that first this was, I would say, part of his nature in that he tended to trust people and he had confidence. He found it very hard to believe that McCray had been responsible for this.

As a matter of fact, he thought the other man was more a culprit than McCray was. And then, also, as we learned later, these negotiations between Mr. Pomfret and the trustees were already underway—trustees for the library. This was a frame of mind where he would tend to let things lie under the rug in what might very well be his last months of office...

I'm guessing; I'm surmising. The committee had to push him, as did Dean Marshall, who in the meantime, of course, was conducting his own investigation.

To what extent he was doing this under the President's instructions or directions, I'm not sure. Marshall wasn't about to let go of it. Then Marshall in turn was then pushed on by Alf Vandeweghe, about whom there were allegations. As I recall he had been a sports writer down in Newport News. Vandeweghe knew of this thing, then he went to bat to see to it that his reputation was protected. So there were a number of things that converged which led to action. I suppose the decisive step was when Pomfret pressed asked for
McCray's resignation, and then the case went to the Board.

Emily: Then it was after Dr. Pomfret resigned, what was the faculty's feeling at that time when they found out about his resignation?

Dean Fowler: About whose resignation?

Emily: About Dr. Pomfret's resignation.

Dean Fowler: There was great shock and dismay, and a very strong effort to make him stay. The hearings which the Board conducted in Richmond and some of the work that went on appeared in the press, it became obvious to some of us certainly that the Board was trying to put the back on this on the President for not being sufficiently alert, having a better grasp of the whole situation and on top of things. Clearly they tried to blacken his reputation and this, of course, tended to rally the faculty behind him because of the respect of the man and the feeling that he couldn't be responsible other than these one or two strange things that all of us found very difficult to accept. Namely the way he had dragged his feet in terms of investigation, and secondly his promotion of McCray even after the first evidence was presented, and we found this very difficult to understand. Nevertheless, those things seemed less important that rallying to his defense and hoping that a man like him could be kept here as President.

Emily: In the events of that whole fall, would you say that a true statement that the relations between the faculty and the Board were at an all-time low?

Dean Fowler: Yes. That's right. I think that would be a correct statement.
There was great bitterness and disillusion and lack of respect for the board, some of the other characters were on the board then.

Emily: One of the first jobs after Dr. Pomfret had resigned was to find an acting president. You were telling me last time I was here about how the acting president came to be appointed.

Dean Fowler: What it boils down to is that when Jim Miller became acting acting president and served for just about a month, I guess. We had any number of special faculty meetings; it seems to me that we met three days in a row on one occasion. All of this came out in the press and we were communicating to Shymake and the board and the actions of the faculty and so forth.

Emily: Did the press help or hinder (because this was splashed all over the papers) the faculty's relations with the board?

Dean Fowler: I would say that the fact that all this became public—that is, the faculty action and so forth—through the press made the board very angry and increased their hostility toward the faculty. Some of the press were considerate. Some of them were told things in confidence and they respected that confidence; others did not. I remember very well a personal note: I was having to do a great deal of the dealing with the press, communications with the press. They were pestering me and the phone was ringing here at home and one of my good friends at that time was Beaver Norton who was vice-president in charge of public relations for Colonial Williamsburg. He called me one day and said, "Jimmy, if I were you, I wouldn't give any more information from now on. I'd just say 'no comment.'" And I took that advice and was happy to have it. As I recall I communicated this to the other major parties involved. So after the first few days things calmed down and the press
found it much more difficult to discover what was going on. We had members of the press out in the hallways while we were having faculty meetings.

Emily: How was it that Dr. Miller was then selected to be acting president?

Dean Fowler: Because he had been Dean from 1938 to '47 and then he served as Dean again. When did Nelson Marshall resign?

Emily: He didn't resign until Chandler was sworn in.

Dean Fowler: That's right. Then Miller had already served his presidency.

I'm trying to remember. Did Miller then go back as Dean for a while?

Emily: He was Dean until Dr. Marsh was appointed that winter.

Dean Fowler: Right. I remember the time very well. So because he had been Dean for a number of years and one of the most highly respected members of the faculty, he was certainly one of the most obvious choices for acting president. And certainly he was first choice of that small group of us who went to Shumake's house to get together. The other more obvious alternative at the time was Marsh. He was one of the most senior members of the faculty.

Emily: Was he in the group who went to Shumake's?

Dean Fowler: Yes.

Emily: But he, like you, turned it down?

Dean Fowler: Yes, everybody did the first go-round.

Emily: Including Miller, too?

Dean Fowler: Sure. Oh, yes. He said he wouldn't tough it. Then after a night's meditation he changed his mind. So I backed out and got in touch with Shumake, and his appointment was announced. Mine never was. So nobody except the handful of us who went up there (our wives, I suppose) knew that part of the story. It's sort of amusing as you look back on it.
Emily: And it was just a few days later that the faculty ...

Dean Fowler: One of the problems in this business was that Shuman could not make any commitment as to how long an acting appointment would be continued. An acting appointment is not very attractive in the first place because all you are doing is keeping the chair warm for somebody. We were certain that we would have no voice in the atmosphere. We would have no voice in the choice and of course, we did not have. And I forget—this may be hindsight—I forget whether we had some inkling that the Board had already taken steps to find a replacement for Pomfret before he actually resigned. Of course, this did come out after. This did happen. I can't remember whether we had any inkling of this at the time that the acting appointment was made. But certainly there was a lack of trust with regard to how the Board was proceeding.

Emily: This was after the athletic scandal broke but before his resignation they were planning to replace him?

Dean Fowler: That's right.

Emily: If he did not resign.

Dean Fowler: That's right. Now of course, we couldn't substantiate any of this until after Chandler was appointed. But then it was known who the new president was and he had been an admiral in the Navy. The first conclusion we draw is that you can't get out of the Navy that fast. So something must have started earlier. Then some things began to come to light. There was a man around here—Incidentally I guess he was Marshall, too? And he went to work digging out what information he could in Washington in the Department of the Navy in
the office of the Navy Personnel to see when the first moves were made by Handler to get out of the Navy. We had another newsman here in town at the time who assumed a somewhat similar investigation.

It was in this way that the confidence that Chandler had actually been offered the job in August became almost common knowledge. Then as I think I told you, because of the general attitude in Washington on the part of Congress at that time about so many high-ranking relatively young officers in the service—not merely Navy—were trying to get out, my understanding is, and I think this could be demonstrated is that the story about Harry Byrd actually going to President Truman to get Chandler out of the Navy is probably correct. So it was a very bad time. Almost immediately some of the good young people began to talk about getting out. They didn't want to go on under these circumstances—board and president.

Emily: There were resignations, especially in the administration.

Dean Fowler: There were a few—that's right. Now, I'm sure it could be argued, and I'm confident President Chandler would argue this way that in some cases this wasn't a big factor at all. In fact, a relatively minor one, in most cases those who left went to bigger and better things: he went to the Library of Congress, but he wouldn't quit. Now, John Hocutt, on the other hand, within a couple of years he got a fine offer from the University of Delaware, and a much higher salary than what he was getting here. I know what the salary was. Furthermore, at that time, Dean Lambert, very much his senior, he couldn't see where he was going here and so forth. So Hocutt would be the first to tell you that the Chandler presidency was not a major factor in
in his decision. That doesn't mean to say that he loved the man. Then there was Miss Roberts, Assistant Dean of Women. She couldn't get along with him and the new Dean of Women. She had an opportunity to go elsewhere. She had spent her whole life in Williamsburg. Then later on, of course, when there were controversies and disputes between Chandler and the faculty, members of the faculty left when opportunity presented itself.

Emily: When was it that you first learned that Chandler had been selected as President?

Dean Fowler:

Emily: He was selected some days before it became public.

Dean Fowler: Well, I believe I told you. We had been at this special faculty meeting presided over by Miller and the faculty meeting ended just about six o'clock. The appointment of President Chandler was announced on the six o'clock news radio from Richmond. My wife knew it when I walked in the door. Mrs. Miller knew it when her husband got home. That's the way we learned--including the acting President. That, of course, made the whole thing even more shocking.

Emily: I think you said something last time something about the reaction that night there were a lot of meetings.

Dean Fowler: Well, the press went wild. This was one of the gathering places of the faculty, some I didn't even know well. What is the faculty going to do in the face of this decision and procedure, the way it had been done? What we eventually did was the next day to send a telegram.
Perhaps we had another faculty meeting in which we passed a resolution very carefully worded upon which we condemned the action of the Board but at the same time stated in the telegram that this was not intended to be a reflection of the man himself (Chandler). We knew nothing about him except that he had been in the Navy and he was the son of the former President Chandler. We were very careful not to attack him personally.

Then he came aboard and was inaugurated and installed in the President's office. The Press was there and a handful of people he could crowd into the President's office. I don't know if you have ever been in there, but it's the office that the Vice-President, Mr. Carter, has the business office in. And you can't get but so many people in there.

Emily: I think you mentioned last time that the faculty was taking donations to print up a faculty statement.

Dean Fowler: Oh, yes. We had already done that. That appeared well before Chandler ever made President. We had already got the faculty contributions and I think I finished the money-raising campaign because we only needed $70. As I recall the whole thing cost $670 or something like this. Something better than $500 was collected within the college. We collected over one hundred or so from friends in the community who of course were in sympathy with what we had done.

Emily: Coming into the situation, what was the Admiral's view of athletic policy? You had a committee who made a report on it shortly thereafter.

Dean Fowler: I'm not sure it can be said that he had a clear-cut policy. I think he was honest and sincere in wanting this study to go on and see what recommendations were forthcoming. As I recall he made no public
statements or statements to the faculty, other than let's examine this whole thing and see where we are going and so forth. But it was soon clear that his views with regard to athletic policy were essentially those of the Board. And they were enthusiasts about the football program. So as I recall the committee soon became aware of where he basically stood without any formal communication or statement on his part. Then later on Chandler made the statement that he was responsible for the athletic policy. And of course this is true. We have had a recent example of that in which the Board and the President determined the athletic policy. The faculty committees on athletic policy over the years have simply been advisory. This is not to say that in particularly in recent years that they haven't exerted some influence, because they have. In terms of standards and more money for minor sports, this kind of thing, the faculty committees on athletics have a fair amount of influence.

Emily: One of the original September faculty statements that drew a great deal of comment was that the faculty should control athletics.

Dean Fowler: Yes, and this became the real issue between the faculty and the Board, and likely so from the position of the Board. We were really challenging the authority of the Board. They, of course, resented this and openly criticized this. As a matter of fact, they tried to turn the thing around and say these things we had said had been going on and so forth and that the faculty were in part responsible for not having done anything about it. We tried to do anything about it we would have been slapped down by the Board. The Board has the authority, and there wasn't any question about that. We knew it. And we weren't about to pull any
punches. They did their best to use the manifesto to indict the faculty.

The relations between faculty and the Board remained difficult for years. In those days, thought representatives or committees from the faculty should appear before the Board, but this was unheard of. However, the deep wounds didn't heal for a long time. Meanwhile, over the years the composition of the Board changed, as did the composition of the faculty. With the growth of the faculty in the '50s and '60s, the great majority of the faculty had no knowledge of the '51 mess.

Emily: Dr. Jones told me the other day that the majority of the faculty has been here for less than five years, something like this.

Dean Fowler: Well, I think that's an exaggeration. The number who have been here ten years or less is very high. And then until very recently there were quite a number who went all the way back to the '30s and '40s, you see. That generation is dying out or retiring. What happened was that a good many of those appointed in the decade of the '50s and very early '60s didn't stay with us; they left. So we had these disproportionate age groups and there was a fair number of old-timers, shall I say, and a large number of men and women with much less service in common. Then, of course, during the so-called "plush days" of the '60s, we expanded a good deal. So it is, with a few obvious exceptions, a remarkably young faculty.

Emily: Do you believe the problem in the '50s and '60s was because of the salaries?

Dean Fowler: Yes, and we had a lot of good people. We became vulnerable. We were highlighted by other institutions. Certainly money was a major
major consideration. But there was also unhappiness with some of the things that went on around here. Now we suffered some major losses; at the same time we lost some people that I'd say candidly we weren't too much upset about. We were all right, but we figured we could do as well or better. But there were some critical losses, all right.

Emily: In the Admiral's relations with the faculty, how would you rate the faculty morale, given the adverse circumstances of his arrival at William and Mary?

Dean Fowler: So far as the faculty's attitude toward him was concerned, it was very strongly influenced initially by those circumstances and it continued to be. Then the way he dealt with people offended a great many. He was very arbitrary. He ran a tight ship, as we used to say. Heads of departments had difficult times with him. He really had no understanding or no acceptance of the proper role of a faculty in the governance of an institution. He deliberately tried to destroy the organization of the faculty. He was a navy man—that was his background. The same problems arose in his dealings with the students. They were concerned with internal, local issues, not with national issues then in the '60s. It was very definitely an internal thing. He was strict, rigid, and he didn't want any concessions from the students—no changes in the social regulations and this kind of thing. The editors of the Flat Hat had a terrible time with him.

Emily: I gathered they must have.

Dean Fowler: One after the other, almost every issue there would be someone laid on in his office, lay down the carpet. He couldn't wait for that Flat Hat to come out on Friday night. Then he would stew over it the whole weekend. Of course, they were cruel. They let him have it. It was a
battle royal. But there were major issues involved, such as freedom of speech and freedom of the press, faculty participation. It wasn't just personal. Now he won the support of some faculty members, of course, who and they felt that he was very hard-working and there wasn't any question about that. He gave his total life to the institution. He was confident that he was doing what was best, and he was almost killing himself. Not only was he hard-working, I must say, I remember that he said something to me about this, very early in his presidency, that the first few months he was here he sat down and he was determined to master the budget. The whole state budgetary procedure. He did. So he was hard-working, and in some ways he was an efficient administrator.
He went to work to get more money from the state for capital outlay, for buildings. Some of this bore fruit while he was still president; more of it came subsequently. He pushed hard in Richmond for more adequate physical plant. Now what was, during his time, of course, was the new Phi Beta Kappa Hall, the Campus Center, and Landrum Hall.

Emily: He was the one to map out the first plans for the new campus, is that right?

Dean Fowler: This certainly happened under his administration, yes. Some of the things accomplished under Paschall's regime, the foundations of many of which were firm and established under Chandler. He was antisocial as far as the faculty was concerned or as the townspeople were concerned.

After the first year or so there were never any entertainments or receptions. Never one big party they gave for the faculty. I remember something. They served liquor. President Chandler told me about this: Some of the people in town got on the telephone to him the next day about throwing these parties in the President's house and so forth, and he succumbed to criticism and that kind of pressure instead of telling them to mind their own business.

So the atmosphere with regard to the President's House was totally changed from the Pomfret and Bryan regime; it was a home and a normal place for social life. There were receptions for the students and this kind of thing. That all ceased. He and his wife, whom many of us felt sorry for, were socially cut off—at least from the college community.

Emily: With this building program was very reminiscent of his father, to what extent?

Dean Fowler: Oh, I think it was deliberate.

Emily: Do you think so?
Yes

Dean Fowler: No question about this, not just in building, but in the concept of the branch colleges, Christopher Newport, and Richard Bland. This fell in with his father's Norfolk Division and R.P.I. in Richmond. He was gung-ho on extension work and the college performing this kind of service for the state. It's a state institution. Oh, yes, this was all part of his father's tradition.

A basic policy, always deliberate imitation and adaptation.

Emily: In this something to strengthen what later became the colleges of William and Mary, do you think that this served the purpose of serving Tidewater's educational needs? Or did it weaken the prestige of the college of William and Mary?

This seems to always have been a consideration.

Dean Fowler: I suppose the question of what we mean by the prestige or image of the college in terms of Richmond and state authority, what Chandler did I think impressed them in that William and Mary was performing a greater service to the area. But there is the other side of the coin. What this did to the image of the college academically is something else again. Certainly that was very much a concern here at the college in Williamsburg. We just knew the standards of those places and the standards in extension work and they just couldn't compare. But certainly there were many people in this area and the state authorities were considerably impressed by this. Now whether you call that prestige or not.... Certainly within a limited geographical area as opposed to a national area I think it probably did improve the public image of the College in the eyes of the department. And of course, you must remember that all this was done before the community college stuff started.
And to that extent I would say to some degree the establishment of Christopher Newport did fill a need down there. And fortunately it's becoming a reasonably respectable place. So again, generally I would say, the image of the Chandler presidency and the image of Chandler himself outside of Williamsburg was fairly very good. But when I say outside Williamsburg I mean outside Williamsburg, because I think whatever support he enjoyed in the community at one time diminished over the years. I would be fair to say that the college's relations with Colonial Williamsburg were not as good in 1960 as they had been. He was a very difficult man to deal with. And he was the kind of man, and perhaps this is something to be said for him, who never made any move to gain popularity. He maintained he didn't care what people thought. He was convinced he was right and doing what he wanted to. He could be at least on the surface courteous impervious to the public. He would show violent temper. I remember one time the poor man wasn't very well. He had this strain, I suppose. But he sure was no popularity seeker.

Emily: Why was it that he had the faculty advisory council dissolved?

Dean Fowler: I forget the circumstances, whether there were particular issues at the moment, but it was all part of the really set out to destroy the faculty organization and the faculty instruments, some of which went back to the 1938 laws of 1938 when we had our first laws of 1938 and then what had evolved from and then added to those laws as we went along. He never liked that faculty advisory council.

Emily: ... which had been an outgrowth of your committee's work when he came in.

Fowler: That's right. I must say I can't remember the particular issue or issues, but because it was a very bad time when it happened.

Emily: That was in '59 but I couldn't find anything that would indicate...
The minutes for December 8, 1939, contain the amendment to the bylaws changing the advisory council to the advisory committee. It is apparent from the minutes that there was considerable discussion on the matter, but the reasons behind it are not spelled out. Werner Moss wasn't overly specific either.

FROM:
Earl Gregg Swem Library
COLLEGE OF WILLIAM & MARY
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA 23185
Dean Fowler: It's all spelled out in the faculty minutes; it should be.

Emily: It should be. I'll go back and check them.

Dean Fowler: Have you interviewed yet?

Emily: No. He thinks it best for me to wait until after I talk.

Dean Fowler: He could tell you a good deal about that. I suspect his memory of it is better than mine. It was part of a total policy. And in the end it did not succeed. It did not succeed in destroying the organization of the faculty; it deprived us of some of our instruments. Then we revised. We had new Bylaws in 1962. I was chairman of that. Our conclusions were very much influenced by what happened in the '50s. For example, to related to a contemporary issue, the committee—I think there were seven of us—seriously considered at that time the establishment of some kind of faculty senate. We agreed unanimously that this would be unwise in view of the recent experience in the Chandler régime. In other words, we did not want to write a set of Bylaws or set up an organization which would give the impression of being undemocratic. What we wanted to do was to try to rebuild morale and make sure of as wide faculty involvement in the faculty government as we could. So we deliberately rejected that thought because of the experience in the recent past, and I think we were right. We did set up another active advisory committee which was known as the Faculty Affairs Committee.

Emily: How did the faculty react when the word came that Chandler was going to become chancellor and Pascal would become president? (Those two did not come at the very same time.)

Dean Fowler: There was enthusiasm; the feeling was that almost anything could be better. Pascal began his régime with a great deal
Dean of good will just because of change and because obviously he was a totally different personality. But unfortunately as the years went by he squandered most of that good will he had when he came in, though for different reasons. We weren't excited about having a public school man—he was superintendent of public instruction. Some of us who knew Pascal; he was an alumnus; as Superintendent of Public Instruction he was a member of the Board of Visitors, ex-officio, in those days. So he used to attend all the board meetings—and he was down here for public events. Some of us knew him as a warm, friendly man and were ready to take him on his personality, though we had concerns about the fact that he had spent his whole life in public education and not in college or university work.

Emily: Did that handicap him as President?

Dean Fowler: Oh, yes. I think anyone as President who hasn't had some academic background is handicapped by this.

Emily: Then Chandler then stayed on as chancellor for what was called the Greater Colleges of William and Mary for two years.

Dean Fowler: Two years; that's right. And it was a very hard time for Mr. Pascal, and we felt sorry for him because Chandler still had a great deal of something. He was constantly looking over Pascal's shoulder. Again there was support and pleasure when Pascal was relieved of all this in 1962. It is rather interesting that some of the people who were partly responsible behind the scenes for gradually moving Chandler out of the picture had in his earlier days been his strongest supporters. I guess when we last talked I told you about Russell Carnell who had been a delegate to the legislature. Of course, the thing had to be changed by statute;
And he was responsible for introducing the statute in the House of Delegates. And when he introduced it he had already seventy signatures on it. In other words, the outcome of the foregone conclusion. Chandler never forgave Russ. Two or three former members of the Board and two or three current members of the Board were parties to this transformation. So they had to play the game very carefully. I don't think I had better identify any.

Emily: Was Carnell reacting to pressures from within his college constituents?

Dean Fowler: Most of the time he knew what was going on. I don't think he had any personal animus against Chandler. He was just aware of the situation of the college and community, and all kinds of people were talking to him. He became disfavored and this was the thing to do. He didn't do it on his own, not by any means. He was just the agent.

Emily: And there seems to have been a great deal of pressure from Norfolk that they wanted to be separate.

Dean Fowler: Oh yes. There were all these political considerations too. R.P.I. had ambitions too. And these political pressures of course were very evident in the assembly. I daresay every delegate from Norfolk signed Russ Carnell's proposal, or were sponsors of it.

Emily: How would you evaluate Chandler's tenure at William and Mary?

Dean Fowler: In the long run, wholly apart from the building of which we needed, I'd say the consequences were very damaging to the college. Let's take one aspect of it. We got stuck with some people in the administrative offices and positions that we just couldn't get rid of. It takes years to get over this kind of business.
Now I don't think the institution was hurt in any sense academically. Chandler never monkeyed with standards of admission for retention of students or academic standards. No. So in that sense the college didn't suffer, but in the policies were introduced and some of the personnel in important positions the college isn't over it yet. It takes a long time. And I think it can be said while I have been giving credit to the building program all the way through, I think this would have come under any energetic president because it was time. We hadn't had any building and we needed it. So that in that respect while he gets credit for some of it because it occurred during the period when he was in command, I daresay that another president who pushed hard would have gotten the same results in Richmond in terms of appropriations and so forth because the needs could be readily demonstrated. Everybody knew about the library. We hadn't had a new classroom built in the present since, present. James Blair was opened in 1935. That's when I moved in there. So this had to come. And now, of course in the past few years William and Mary, like any other state institution, has been accused of overbuilding. That's the way the cycle goes. Overbuilding in terms of classroom space. It's not just space. The chemistry building, how long can this once good science building, how long can it be useful and serviceable? They wear out. And of course the college had grown tremendously since then. The wiring and plumbing over there in Rogers Hall is notoriously known for something. The history department, chemistry department was totally housed on the ground floor of that building. When we went into the computer business
we had to have this. The administration expanded—some people would say exploded—that meant that more and more the administration became scattered in several buildings. This is one of the unfortunate things that happened. I would maintain that it is most unfortunate that the President is housed in one place and the Vice-President in another, for Academic Affairs in another place. And so it goes. More and more of James Blair was taken over by administrative offices and student personnel officials as well as academic. So gradually the social sciences were crowded out of there. We had one whole work—That's what it was when it was built. Administration was on the first floor; history, sociology, government, economics, and law were on the second and third floors. In 1935 we thought that was heaven—and it was. The history department—when I came here in 1934, I had one office in Rogers. We were even in the chemistry building on the second floor. Dr. Morton, and Stubbs and I occupied a single office. We never heard of any such thing as a secretary. So what was then the Marshall-Wythe building was (open in '35) was heaven. I'd much rather continue to teach in the room that I used rather than one of the new ones down in Morton Hall.

Emily: I can't picture you in Morton Hall.

Dean Fowler: Those were fine rooms. They are a little run-down. They could be in a little better shape, but they were fine, spacious classrooms when they were first built.

Emily: This may not be a good question, but aside from the buildings, how would the college have been different had Dr. Pomfret not had the chance to go to Huntington—had he stayed at William and Mary through the '50's?
Dean Fowler: That's a hard one. The college would have been under increasing pressure to grow and to grow significantly. Pomfret would not have found that attractive. He certainly would not have been a leader or pusher for the growth. This is not to say that he would have thought he could very well have come to the conclusion that there had to be a certain amount of this growth. But Pomfret—I would say, would have preferred that William and Mary of certainly no more than 2,500 students. He would have put the brakes on graduate work, the Ph.D. program. But the outcome would have been, I don't know, because there certainly isn't any question that the pressures are still there. There would have been overwhelming pressure from the state for growth.

Emily: In the late '30s it was suggested that William and Mary might be a private college. What if this might have happened?

Dean Fowler: I would say now, with the great benefit of hindsight, it would not have been good because whatever amount of money might have been involved initially would not have been enough as years went by. How well William and Mary could have succeeded in getting increasing private funds (which would have had to have been done) I don't know. Pomfret fully grasped this. He was engaged in a modest money-raising program here. He was very modest. I remember his telling the faculty that my goal is to get at least one hundred thousand dollars in new money each year. He wasn't talking about annual alumni giving, he was talking about endowment and so forth. And he accomplished that. He had pretty good connections with the foundations and so forth. He was working on some wealthy individuals, also. The whole point of view of Chandler
and Paschall was to reverse all that and to rely almost totally on the state. I don't know how much money William and Mary could have attracted. I think probably there was great potential there because we would have really become a national institution. We would have been totally free on out-of-state students as opposed to in-state students, and this kind of thing. There would have been none of those political considerations involved. This would strike them as William and Mary's national image and national connections. The national image is still very good. But how much of that green stuff this would have brought in, I don't know. Even the love for the private institution were having a bad time as are state institutions. I just got one of the periodic news letters from Dartmouth in today's mail. They closed their books last July 1st and they showed a deficit of 800 and some thousand dollars. While Dartmouth is not the richest in the college, it has done right well. 

Discussion of the financial situation, and information concerning Dartmouth.

Emily: Was it this realization that it would take a great deal of money that kept--I don't know if there was ever an offer made to Dr. Bryan--kept William and Mary from going private?

Dean Fowler: Well, certainly there must have been a concern for this. I wasn't in on this, but you heard a little bit about what was going on. I don't know what kind of money they were talking. I know I had some ideas and so did some of my friends down in Colonial Williamsburg as to how much money it would take to do this. And there was a disparity in the figures as to what some people thought it would take. Some people thought you could do this for twenty million dollars. If anything had
Interview: Harold L. Fowler
Date of interview: November 21, 1973
Place: 140 Chandler Court, Williamsburg
Interviewer: Emily Williams
Session number: 4
Length of tape: 44 mins.

**Contents:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Approximate time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appointment as dean of faculty (1961)</td>
<td>4 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughts on becoming administrator</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative reorganization in '63</td>
<td>7 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own appointment (cont'd), adjustments</td>
<td>19 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of creation of schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of business administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(School of education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With control of degrees</td>
<td>6 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of schools on faculty of arts sciences</td>
<td>5 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of growth of physics dept.</td>
<td>10 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History graduate program</td>
<td>12 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of graduate programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-campus programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See back of sheet for names and places mentioned in interview.
Session 4

November 21, 1975

Williams: My first question is about how you were to the deanship. In 1964 the self-study, which you were chairman of, recommended that the dean of the faculty be re-created. Why was this recommended?

Fowler: You mean the change of title?

Williams: Right. Mel Jones had been dean of the college . . .

Fowler: The title had changed several times over the years. When I first came here it was dean of the college. I mean when Jim Miller was appointed was when it first became dean of the faculty. Am I right?

Williams: I think you are right, yes.

Fowler: Which I guess was 1938, and as I recall the title remained dean of the faculty until '64. I'm trying to remember: Dean Jones was dean of the college under Chandler and early Paschall.

Williams: I think you're right, and it was decided he would become dean of the college, and dean of the faculty would be made a separate office.

Fowler: That's right, and then eventually with the reorganization of the school it became dean of the faculty of arts and sciences. I don't remember that there was any significant feeling of change about the title other than what was the product of the reorganization.

Fowler: I know my personal preference, if that had been a decisive factor, was dean of the faculty title. As I remember on the night when President Paschall and Mel Jones
asked me if I would take the job, I emphasized to Paschall that I had been a faculty man all my life, and I was sure I was going to continue to be, and he better know that. In other words, you know, my whole background and tradition and experience was as a faculty member, you know a position I cherished, and even if I'd wanted to I don't think I could have changed my thinking on lots of things in terms of the faculty and administration. It didn't mean that I was thinking of any adversary position between faculty and administration—because I never did—and of course, this is one thing I learned more of with experience: that the dean of the faculty really has two masters. He's responsible to two parties, shall we say. One of the main jobs in that situation is to hopefully retain the confidence of both parties without avoiding issues or differences, because the dean of the faculty, his office can't operate successfully unless he has the confidence of these elements. I think some of this came out when I was approaching retirement, and there was discussion on the faculty as to whether there should be a limited term for the new dean. Certainly some of the discussion on the floor of the faculty emphasized that the dean was responsible to the faculty as their leader and spokesman, and at the same time he was responsible to the administration. Any thought of limiting or fixing a term was a matter of as much or more concern of the administration as it was to the faculty. It was emphasized, I thought properly, that if the dean lost the confidence of either one, he was done.
and he'd be the first to know it... I remember saying this. Therefore I think it was pretty well concluded that the idea of a limited term therefore was unsound. If difficulties arose, the situation would take care of itself and if it became obvious that the dean had lost the confidence of the faculty or he'd lost the confidence of the administration, he couldn't do his job properly. This would become known to everybody concerned. Therefore there was no need to have a fixed term. Now that, of course, was not to oppose the notion that all administrative offices, as is now the case, should go through periodic review and evaluation, and this was the position of the administration at the time, but introducing this new system of evaluation which would apply to all administrative offices and no exceptions. No different procedure should be followed with regard to the dean of the faculty because he will be going through this periodic review just like the other administrative offices. That was particularly President Graves's position. He didn't want the dean of the faculty in any other position in this arrangement than his other administrative assistants. The title itself to go back to your original question -- I can't remember that the title was any great issue.

Williams: I wondered if it had any significance; that's why I asked.

Fowler: I suppose there were a far number of faculty who preferred the faculty title rather than the college. It seemed to bring
the faculty more front and center, shall we say, in the scheme of things. I'm not sure that had any concrete results, but I think some people felt that way; it's "our dean." But well, as the administration expanded and the place was reorganized, it certainly made sense (by change of title and other means) to make the position of the dean of the faculty clearer in relation both to his superiors and to you know, the deans themselves. It was inevitable with the growth and reorganization and more elaborate administrative structure that the title and position and responsibilities of the dean of the faculty would become more defined.

Williams: When you first took the job, let me put it that way; how was your position defined relative to Mel Jones's?

Fowler: Well, it was spelled out in a document, as I recall. Was it in the Board of Visitors bylaws?

Williams: I think so.

Fowler: You know, it states in general terms responsibilities of the various administrative offices to their superiors and Dean Jones was the (he became Vice-president Jones) channel we all worked through or went to rather than directly to the president. One or more of the deans tended to disregard this and do more trying to go directly to the president. This was not true in my case. For instance, Mel Jones and I were old friends; I was perfectly happy to work under him. That doesn't mean we always agreed by any means, but I had no concern whatsoever. It seemed to me the proper and reasonable way to operate.
Williams: This was the first time that a person who was head of the faculty, whatever his title, whether dean of the college or dean of the faculty, did not report directly to the president. Put another layer in between the faculty and the president, theoretically. Did this work out in practice as a problem?

Fowler: Well, I'd have to say yes in that for a variety of reasons Dean Jones's office (and then as vice-president) became a bottleneck. Things would be delayed; it'd be difficult to get decisions. This was very disturbing to some of us who were immediately involved in the situation. It was also disturbing, I think, to the faculty. There was a pretty general feeling that that office had become a bottleneck and that many decisions could have been made and should have been made promptly were not, and some of this certainly has been true under George Healy. So much of that depends on personalities, how individuals operate. But the one main serious difficulties or concerns are on my part about this because even if I do say so I think I was able to make things move pretty well as far as my responsibilities were concerned because I could be totally outspoken. Both Jones and Paschall were just made that way and having known Jones for so many years, I wouldn't have had the same restraints, shall I say, if I assumed this position under people I didn't already know.

Williams: When his title was made vice-president was this merely a titular change or did this have any greater significance than that?
Fowler: Well, it had greater significance than that since it clearly put that office above all deans, whereas the common title of dean inevitably suggested perhaps a greater degree of equality or similar level. I think making it the vice-presidency quite properly made it clear both within the college and to people outside that here was the top academic man under the president, and the rest of us worked through him and with him in that way. I think that had to come whether you call him vice-president or whether you call him provost. I think that elevated title was essential and useful instructive.

Williams: Going back to 1964 when you became dean... How was it that you were chosen for this office?

Fowler: Well, as you know, this reorganization developed late summer, when many people were off campus, as was I. I read about it some of it, what had been accomplished, would be accomplished. The first announcement, of course, was that Jones was going to be dean of the college and top academic administrative officer under the president, and that also somebody would be appointed for part-time as graduate dean of arts and sciences. As I recall, I knew all that before I got back here in September. I did not know and I wasn't particularly concerned about who was going to replace Jones as dean of the faculty. When I did get back I learned that President Paschall had asked the faculty affairs committee -- I guess that was its name then -- to make recommendations. They made recommendations. I have no idea who
the others were, don't want to know. As I recall, they presented three names, and mine was among them.

**Williams:** To the faculty or to the president?

**Fowler:** To the president, the faculty affairs committee acting in the name of the faculty and the next thing—and I remember the dates— I got a telephone call asking me if I would meet with the president and Dean Jones that evening in Dean Jones's house. I went out there, and by this time I surmised at least my name was in the hat, and they informed me of the situation, and we talked, and they proceeded to ask me if I would do it. We talked about general relationships, as I recall, and the position of the dean of the faculty in the general scheme of things. We did not get, however, very specific. I think I'm correct in saying that I made no attempt to establish any terms, and I finally said I would do it, and as I recall, it was only then that the president discussed briefly what this would mean in terms of salary and (a twelve-month employment contract as opposed to ten) and emphasizing that he could do very, very little at the moment—the year was under way and the budget was all set and so forth—and I didn't argue about this. So really there was no significant change in my salary position until the following July. Of course, one of the main things then was that I began to feel the effect of the twelve-month employment as opposed to the ten, and also, in July as opposed to the faculty, I got a new contract for the next twelve months. And incidentally...
I remained on the July-to-July schedule for salary as long as I remained dean. I can remember (I guess it was a year or so later) since virtually all administrative offices and twelve-month people were on the 1 September to August schedule it was suggested to me that I should go on that schedule, and I remember raising the question, "Now what happens in this transition period? I'll lose a little money on this deal unless the new contract is handled accordingly. So they didn't push it, and I remained on the 1 July business. They didn't want me losing money, but on the other hand they didn't want to jump me an extra amount. I don't suppose there are any very few college administrators take the job on account of salary. You know I know from what I learned about the salaries and my handling of them and so forth even when I was being paid on a twelve-month basis I was getting less than certain full professors would have if one had taken their base pay for ten months and prorated it for twelve. I didn't scream about that. So the appointment was made on the basis of nominations by the responsible body of the faculty one of whose basic responsibilities was to do this kind of thing when occasion arose and you know this is good for the faculty in that the president had done what he said he would do, and the faculty through its duly elected representatives, the faculty affairs committee, had a real voice in what happened. I believe this was the first time this had happened in the choice of a dean—I think so.

Williams: You mentioned this issue a few minutes ago: you had been on the
faculty by this time for thirty years. What adjustments did you have to become not only a faculty member but an administra-
tor?

Fowler: You mean in my thinking and in the operation of...

Williams: Right. You talked about this "serving two masters" problem.

Fowler: Well as I think back on it I can't recall any positive or conscious effort to make an adjustment. I'd had more experience of one kind at one time or another with the administration than cer-
tainly the great majority of the faculty members. I think I always had a feeling; understanding -- in fact, I was involved in some things which you knew, led me to understand and to accept that faculty and administration aren't always going to agree, that administrators have to take into account broader range of considerations in reaching decisions. It's much easier for the faculty to take a position, particularly when they don't have to, you know, deal with the consequences. I don't say that in criticism of the faculty; it's just the way the animal works. I believe anyway that I was conscious of all this and that there was no knee-jerking or positive change in point of view on my part. I think I was pretty clear in my own mind on what kinds of basic issues affected faculty-administra-
tive relationships. I believe I was pretty clear as to where I would find myself on those issues when the chips were down. To give an example of major issues that have arisen: you know, on all matters of personnel or things like tenure and promotion and academic freedom, I didn't have any doubt where I would stand on those things if a real issue arose as one did. As I recall very clearly it was resolved in
on basic educational policy where the faculty of arts and sciences stood in relation to the other units or divisions of the college, never for one moment did it ever enter my head that the faculty of arts and sciences would be anywhere but right in the center. The president knew this and my feelings on this, and of course in all statements and announcements he totally subscribed to this. There would be moments, of course, when any president is accused of departing from keeping the center of the importance on the arts and sciences in the kind of institution that William and Mary is. It should be right there, front and center. Sometimes we have to compromise, squeeze, turn under public pressures. But, you know, I think I had these feelings and convictions and (to a certain extent) knowledge of how things had to operate before I ever took the job. So I don't think there was any wrenching or turning or changing of basic principles or points of view.

Williams: This is a follow-up, and it's bias-laden, but I want your reaction to it: is it a temptation after a number of years in an administration to start thinking like an administrator and less like a faculty member?

Fowler: I would say there's clearly some temptation. A dean can get irritated quietly when his judgment, you know, the faculty pushes you hard for something and the practical consequences and considerations just can't be managed, at least at the moment. I dare say this temptation to go over to the side of the administration and on certain things stand with them,
But I think the temptation is sort of transitory or fleeting. It arises more in connection with individual issues and problems (at least I think this is true in my experience) than in your total point of view or philosophy. On a given question you may find yourself, for reasons which are convincing to you, to take a stand on one side or the other—sometimes it’s the administration and sometimes it’s the faculty.

Williams: Could you give an example of where this was a problem for you?

Fowler: Well, I’d say this came up several times in connection with the school, particularly with the school of business administration, the school which probably could have more affect on the undergraduate program than the others, certainly the law school. I’d say the faculty of arts and sciences, or many of them at one time, were uncompromising on any concessions to the business school in terms of more control over degrees, distribution of requirements, grading when the faculty proposed changes in the grading system—and because the administration had given business administration a certain side—not my doing—business certain assurances or implied assurances. I came to the conclusion that some kind of practical compromise had to be worked out, and so I was involved with Dean Quittmeyer, Vice-president Jones, and others in trying to work out something as far as I was concerned, that the ultimate authority over such matters, as mentioned, rested with the faculty of arts and sciences, who controlled the degrees. You see, business administration
had the same undergraduate degree as William and Mary, and I was determined this would happen but you can't make compromises in terms of what their concentration requirements would be, as influenced in considerable part by their accrediting agencies. Well, the upshot of all this which led to the statement of policy which still underlies the definition of the authority of the professional schools as far as the undergraduate program is concerned. That's all spelled out. There haven't been any major problems since and this statement of policy was ultimately by the Board of Visitors and I and one or two others met with a committee of the board on this. I had private conversations with two or three members of the board who were very reluctant to do anything about the William and Mary degree, to add any other undergraduate degrees. We were in complete agreement on this and their attitude was, 'can't we work out something which we can all live with.' So this is what finally came out, and I think it's worked pretty successfully. But then when the faculty changed the grading system and by this time Vice-president Healy was here -- the school of business administration took the position they would not abandon the 'D' grade after the faculty had already voted it. Well, I asked them by Vice-President Healy to conform to the grading policy as determined by the faculty of arts and sciences. I wasn't there. George Healy kept me fully informed. At this kind of rump meeting without really any study beforehand, the resolution
The business school faculty was presented to the business school faculty without having the opportunity to study it before hand and so forth. At that meeting the business school faculty voted that they would not abandon the "D" grade. They were going to have the right to determine to turn in their own grades for their concentrators. We eventually told them in no uncertain terms that there was going to be one grading system for all undergraduates and that they would have to conform. So far as the general status of the business school is concerned after great reluctance and following as I had permitted business administration to seek assurances which should not have been made in advance, I saw no choice really but to try to work out some kind of practical arrangements. Some members of the faculty were highly critical of me, but I made a deal behind their backs or something. I think eventually I convinced them this was not the case, that this was a problem that had to be resolved and I as their spokesman was the one who had to do it, at least inside negotiations. The faculty can't negotiate with individuals or even groups in that sense. I mean work with a smaller group. And I think without it ever becoming a basis of real conflict that I was able, as again I thought it had to be done in some form, I was able to improve considerably the relations between the faculty of arts and sciences and the school of education. Certainly by the time I retired, they were much better than they had been earlier. Now education didn't get all they wanted, you know. They wanted a specific point. You know we had a limitation as to how many hours a student can take.
in education toward a degree. The education people wanted this changed. They wanted concentration requirements for education put on the same basis as the arts and sciences departments; in other words, a minimum of thirty -- you could go to forty-two. The faculty would do it on the basis that this was vocational stuff and education gave in. They weren't very happy about it, but again Dean Brooks and I never had any difficulty with them getting along. And one thing that did occur, for example, much closer relationship between the school of education and individual departments of arts and sciences. We got the arts and sciences departments to appoint liaison people, one person from each department, to communicate with and deal with the school of education in such things as you know, practice teaching, scheduling (this happened when education went into this block system, you know). There was a great deal of opposition to that but it was worked out. As far as I could see it was not by any means an insoluble problem. Some of the departments would have to give a little bit and see that more courses were given late afternoon for these expectant prospective teachers were engaged in practice teaching under block scheduling could have the opportunity to take that one or sometimes two courses in other fields -- in their of concentration particularly -- in order to complete their degree in reasonable time. Well, it was worked out.

Williams: Am I correct in surmising from what you're saying that the relations between arts and sciences and education were con-
siderably less strained than those between arts and sciences and business administration?

Fowler: Partly because personalities, partly because business administration was insisting—and for much of this they had no choice in terms of their accreditation—that they commanded much more of the undergraduates' time, particularly in the junior and senior year. Business administration had more impact on the undergraduate program. They soon had many more undergraduate concentrators than did education because, for example, at the same time, under Dean Brooks's leadership the school of education was almost abandoning concentration in secondary education. They definitely discouraged this, and I can remember one time there were only four or five students concentrating in secondary education. So, their philosophy wasn't as far removed on such matters and then there was more pressure from business. Business administration had more support on the Board of Visitors, among the public and so forth, so that plus the personalities involved, so that and so forth made the question of relations with business administration much more difficult than those with education. So I say in the minds of most faculty, in a sense the school of business replaced the school of education as constituting a threat to the undergraduate program. For awhile (for years) the only professional school we had outside of law was education. Therefore, concern about professional and vocational work and concern about the standards of the school of education was prominent. And then along comes the business school demanding, really, much
more authority and control and being much more aggressive about it. The school of business administration, as I said, sort of replaced education as constituting a threat to the undergraduate program and the authority of arts and sciences, and so as time went by there was much more willingness to try to work out things with education, much more inclination to meet each other half way. I'm not sure this would have happened if it hadn't been for business administration. To a certain extent on some things I saw this happening with committees. Education and arts and sciences were driven together (a little bit) in common concern about business administration. I mean in meetings of the deans (the advisory committee of deans to the vice-president), again and again education would go right down the line with those speaking for arts and sciences. As we got into more elaborate policies of evaluations in regard to tenure and promotion and so forth, much more readiness on the part of the spokesman of education to be in agreement with me and John Selby, for example, who's in the group. Certainly the relations between education and arts and sciences improved considerably in that decade. I don't know whether part of this was due to Dean Brooks and he had some opposition to his views within his own faculty. Now whether this is continued under Dean Yankovich, I have no idea.

Williams: The gist of what you had been saying was that business administration took the place of school of education as a threat to the arts and sciences faculty.

* Because of a scratchy noise on the tape, the cassette was changed and the preceding discussion summarized.
Fowler: I don't want to emphasize the threat.

Williams: Don't let me put words in your mouth, in that case.

Fowler: But I did use the word threat—yes, indeed—and it was so regarded by some, but it no longer loomed as large in the eyes of the faculty as it once did with the emergence of business administration.

Williams: What adverse effects did you fear when the problem of degree control and autonomy for the business school became issues?

Fowler: Well, my first fear was that there would be a separate degree. Secondly, there was good evidence to think that if they had their way they would change some of the basic degree requirements, such as foreign language requirements. Would they have a degrees committee and an academic committee which would have authority to decide whether a given student had satisfactorily completed all the degree requirements? Would they have the same standards for retention in college?

These were all concerns of mine and, I'm sure, of the faculty.

So what was worked out, you know, and this I think is the essential feature: as you probably know, a student who declares a concentration in business administration is officially admitted to the school of business administration at that time, in other words, at the end of his sophomore year. However, the way the policy is stated, that admission to the school of business administration remains provisional until that student has completed all basic requirements for the degree from the College of William and Mary. Now this means in
practice that we have a number of students concentrating in business administration who do not complete these basic requirements -- and it's usually foreign language -- until the time of their graduation. Therefore, that means throughout that whole period they're under the authority of the degrees committee of arts and sciences, not their own degrees committee.

This is one of the most protective devices in the whole thing and this was one of the things that persuaded certain reluctant people in the Board of Visitors to go along with this scheme. In other words, it was a guarantee in the policy that the faculty of arts and sciences would keep control of these people until they had completed all of the requirements for a degree of William and Mary and also there was the provision that students are not admitted to the School of Business until they had completed at least sixty hours. So this, really, while it sounds very simple, this assured ultimate control. We weren't concerned so much about the concentration requirement. Philosophically, some of us didn't like the idea and still don't like the idea of some of these people, you know, taking up to sixty hours in business. But, of course, they had sort of a foot in the door on this business. For years -- and this goes back to 1930s -- the faculty had actually had authorized or permitted accounting students preparing for their C.P.A. exams and so forth, permitting them to take more hours in accounting than we would permit in any other field of concentration or in any other discipline. So, when the school of business administration was set up and wanted to permit (not actually require) all of their
concentrators to take much more work in their field. This didn't create any more resistance or excitement, I would say, than the feeling that some of our own departments were in one way or another getting their students to take much more work in their field than what was then the forty-two hours, simply by encouraging them. So that wasn't as disturbing, I would say, as long as we controlled the whole business of admission, basic degree requirements, and satisfaction of degree requirements so that people ultimately going in business administration would be treated the same as any other undergraduate and that way the William and Mary degree basically would not be changed or weakened because those were the vital matters and of course those were the powers delegated to the faculty by the Board of Visitors in their by-laws and our by-laws. So nobody was prepared to give an inch on the basic control. Well, we've been talking a lot about business administration. I don't want to make it appear that that was, you know, the great issue, but it is an example -- I think the best example -- of the broad problem of the powers of the faculty of arts and sciences and hence the whole problem of relations between that faculty and the other schools and these are problems that arose out of expansion of the college in this area, administrative reorganization which followed as a result of this or went along hand-in-hand. These things created some of the worst headaches, I would say, for my office while I was dean.

Williams: Did the creation of the schools serve to weaken the voice of the
faculty (if that can be capitalized or put in quotes) in relation to the board or the president?

Fowler: I'm there are those that would say so in that they're no longer a single unit dealing with these bodies or individuals that you mentioned and I'm sure there was the feeling that simply by dividing the faculties, in giving them each more recognition with their deans and so forth -- yes, I'm sure there was a feeling these people carried more clout or carried as much clout as we do in the president's office or with the Board of Visitors. Yes, this was a matter of concern. And, of course, that problem has never been resolved. This raises the whole question of representation of the various faculties, both in the composition of all committees and, of course, very obviously in the proposed faculty senate and to this day, so far as I know, the president and the board have never been willing to say that representation on these bodies is going to be in proportion to numbers. Again and again, you know, on these committees law has one, business administration has one, education has one, and sometimes arts and sciences was lucky to have two, at most three. The faculty do not like this. They want proportional representation. So this has been an issue which comes up again and again, sometimes in the most unexpected ways (or did) and the faculty feels if they're not being outvoted that certainly they're being under-represented in these bodies and one of the great concerns with the faculty senate was this was the crux of the matter -- that and the feeling of many faculty members that there should
be much more specific definition of the responsibilities and
authorities of the people in authority in the proposed senate felt
was altogether too vague. They wanted a more elaborate
constitution rather than - you know, we'd agree on some general
principles and then work out, say, the constitution in terms
of by-laws after the thing had got going. But the representation
is the crux of the matter.

Williams: I assume that it's the other schools that are not in favor of
proportional representation.

Fowler: Right. And at present that's the way it operates. On a number of
the more important all-college committees, representatives
of arts and sciences could conceivably be outvoted. Now on
the other side, the chances of the representatives of the pro-
fessional schools always voting as a unit are by no means
guaranteed (we've already seen that operate in practice) but
certainly the possibility is there. On the other hand it should
be made clear, I think, that this present administration has
made it clear on more than one occasion that in the situation
whereby the faculties appear to be divided on these issues, the
administration is never going to approve an important policy
for this college which does not have the support of the majority
of the faculty of arts and sciences. That's happened a number
of times. When we've had to vote on things as separate units
and when the students have been involved in a vote, President
Graves has made it clear, always, that no such program or policy
will be put into effect unless the faculty of arts and sciences
agree. Now, this is one of the clearest ways, it seems to me, that on broad policies the administration really believes that arts and sciences is at the heart of the institution.

Williams: Did President Paschall operate on this belief, too? You spoke of in his public pronouncements he seemed to, but . . .

Fowler: I believe yes. It has to be said when situation is crucial, I can't remember a significant occasion when he failed to. That is not to say it didn't happen. I can't remember.

It seems to me these issues with the creation of more and more all-faculty committees, with the attempt to create the faculty senate under President Graves, this problem is, I would say, much more prominent.

Williams: Say in the case of the creation of the business school was the faculty of arts and sciences consulted beforehand? I haven't found any evidence of it.

Fowler: I think it would be correct to say because of the negotiations that had to go on. I think it would be correct to say that while the faculty was fairly well informed of what was going on -- partly by what I told you -- no, they did not formally approve the establishment of the school of business administration. That's not their authority; this is clearly the board's authority. Therefore, as I recall, there was no, you know, formal expression of opinion on this by the faculty. There was no vote or attempt to reach a consensus or accord.

Williams: Which is probably why I wouldn't have found it.

Fowler: That's the business of the board. The faculty knew this. They
didn't necessarily like it but . . . . And this was one of the things, of course, which created some of the difficulties and some of the criticism of me that I referred to earlier in this connection because somebody had to speak and work for the arts and sciences in agreeing with these arrangements, and I say I think certainly the great majority of the faculty were confident that I would never betray their interests. While they may not have been too fond of what came out of this stuff I'm confident that a majority felt that I'd probably done the best in their behalf. No, there was no formal vote for the reason I've stated.

Williams: Getting into another area that was a concern while you were dean and that was the growth of the graduate program. The college had had a graduate program before 1960, but it'd never been a very large one, and the first department to really take off and grow was physics. What effect did this growth of the physics department have on the balance of the faculty?

Fowler: Well, it had a very pronounced effect on you know, where physics loomed in the general scheme of things, and the feeling that physics has been allowed to run hogwild, partly because they'd been able to get so much money and as time went on and through the state, we get involved in all this business of teacher-student ratios, and the effect of that on the number of faculty we could have, created a great deal of undercurrent bitterness on the part of other disciplines against physics, a feeling that they were favored, a feeling that they were on a different
salary scale which they were not really. It's true that some of their younger people would appear to be on a different scale. For example, other members of the faculty didn't realize until I pointed out to them individually that the majority of the young people appointed in the physics department had already had experience elsewhere, if only as post-doctoral appointments, which of course don't carry faculty rank and therefore wouldn't appear on the published records of a faculty member wouldn't appear in the catalogue. Inevitably this pushed up their starting salary.

Furthermore, of course, the salaries of physicists were influenced by the state of the market. Furthermore, for a while and we managed to reduce this — I was amazed for a while we had six or eight people down in the physics department who were on twelve-months appointment. The rest of the faculty couldn't understand why, of course, what they knew particularly was that they had some knowledge of what these people's salaries were. Being on the twelve-month appointment would seem to put them out of relationship with the rest of the faculty. We did this was done because the physics department had sold the administration and the federal government in some respects in getting money if they were going to have a good department there had to be provision and pay for time for research. In other words, some of these people had to be covered in the summer. They couldn't get all through grant money. Therefore, the college and the state should chip in by putting some of these people on twelve-months
appointments. Well, a number of those have been reduced because before I retired and there was an opportunity for a replacement or two, it was worked out in an agreement with the physics department that the person on twelve-month appointment was leaving, we would replace him with a ten-month appointment. I don't know how many there are now, Emily, but the number has been reduced. But these are all things which put physics out of line. Then of course, they reached a point where they had twenty-three, twenty-four members in the department with a handful of students. Part of this was due to the big federal grant they got. You know, to get over $600,000 in one whack, as I remember, and one of the provisions in the grant was, of course, that the college and the state would agree in a matching arrangement to adding so many positions to the physics department. We were committed at one time to adding six members to the department in a period of three years. Well, some of those were added, but not all of them. Things began to get tighter, and there was this growing criticism among the faculty of which the physics department was quite aware and some were concerned about it. And so -- one thing we did was to extend the time schedule of the grant was extended over the years. Therefore, Washington agreed -- and these things had to be negotiated -- that we could spread out the appointments and then eventually two appointments were never made. So the size of the department was in fact reduced from its all-time high, in other words, as the general consciousness
of this problem emerged we began to do things about it. Now those were some of the practical problems that were created in the relations between the physics department and the rest of the college. It was that kind of specific issue which aroused a great deal of difficulty. \textcolor{red}{\textit{Now, of course, there was this other aspect of it, certainly (not necessarily the only one) but a great concern on a good many people as to how far we should get involved in this graduate program in physics. I do believe that through all of this the majority of the faculty -- the more knowledgeable ones, the more thoughtful ones -- had respect for the quality of the physics department, I know there was some back-fighting and so forth. I think that helped to take a little of the curse off it, shall we say, but I don’t think there was any widespread feeling that physics in any way was running a cheap operation and that their personnel were very good and that they themselves ran a good department in terms of personnel and how they were treated. And they physics department was doing excellent job of evaluation before the present elaborate system was ever introduced. They’d send me all kinds of information on these people, and they’d been through committees and decisions and they were being evaluated year after year. They did it a good job and a well-documented job and they had the courage of their convictions, so that, you know, at least two pretty good people in physics were denied tenure by the department; There was no issue between the administration and the department;}}
because while the physics department said "these are very respectable men, but we think we can do better." So that was respect.

They ran a good show. Now, of course, it took a lot of money:

They got a great deal through grants, through the connection

with VARC, which is now a great burden on the college, but

going back -- there was a good deal of opposition to the inauguration

of the Ph.D., or any Ph.D. for that matter.

Williams: That was my next question. Was a predominantly undergraduate

faculty constantly being asked to and in almost every case

approving graduate work in so many disciplines?

Fowler: Well, that is true with some of the programs. Other programs,

when this thing began to gain momentum, were self-initiated

and self-propelled. In many examples, I think it can be

said, where the administration was responsible for the basic
decisions and pushing this stuff, say forcing graduate programs

on departments. Now, a fair amount of this in history, of course,

and I knew all about that from way back and, of course, the his-
tory department deliberately dragged its feet -- I was one of

them. We made it clear we didn't think the college had the

resources or would have the resources to run first-rate graduate

programs, that they were very expensive. As far as history

was concerned it meant great expenditure for the library. Well,

eventually this was worked out, with the department dragging its

feet all the way through and insisting, you know, that if we

are going to go through with this thing there's got to be a

clear commitment on certain areas of support. To the best of
my knowledge all of those commitmments have been met in terms of extra money for the library acquisitions, improvements in salaries, in terms of this policy of one member of the department being on research leave each semester -- that was written into the conditions under which the department was willing to do this. But you know other departments wanted to get on the bandwagon. They could see certain practical advantages, namely: in every instance there had to be a reduction of teaching load, and in the meantime the college in general just sort of gradually moved into a nine-hour teaching load rather than a twelve with the understanding if somebody was teaching graduate work this might be reduced to six, at least for a semester in a given year. Other departments saw the advantage of that as well as this would involve additional staff, of course, if teaching load was reduced and I think several departments proposed masters' programs to get on the bandwagon. Now, at the same time, of course, there isn't any question in my mind that the existence of graduate programs helps to attract some members to your department. Not all by any means but with all the expansion of graduate work in the country say in the last half of the sixties and so forth — those were very lush days. Any number of the people who either wanted to become members of the faculty of the College of William and Mary or did so were influenced by the existence of graduate work, the desire to work with graduate students, as well as the other benefits (like the teaching load) which resulted from the
existence of graduate programs. The whole business sort of snowballed. We've had two examples on the Ph.D. level: psychology has been kicking around a Ph.D. program for years. For a while they couldn't make up their minds as to the kind of program they wanted, and they still continue to change as far as I can gather, and they were very demanding -- perhaps rightfully so -- but very demanding as to the financial support as to what this would require in the way of equipment and facilities down there, money for graduate assistants, all this business. They really presented us with a bill. This slowed it down, plus the very real concern on the part of some of us that psychology wasn't up to this. That's been on the books and then the most recent thing as far as I was concerned was the computer science Ph.D., which to me had a good deal of merit. It is true that the University of Virginia had introduced a Ph.D. in computer science, and V.P.I. either had or was getting ready to. Nevertheless, there was a real market for these people. (one could say a need) and our location here was very well suited to this program, specifically because of the magnificent computer equipment down at Langley Field which -- it was all ready agreed with the authorities down there of course, we were all ready working with them and so forth -- it was all ready, you know, we'd be able to take full advantage of this stuff. So if it had not been for the whole change in the economy and the status of higher education, and particularly with regard to Virginia, just at this time they reached
a point, you know, where they weren't going to approve any new graduate programs. The computer program might have gone through if we were back, say, in 1967 or '68 instead of in the early '70s when it came time for a decision. Now the math and computer science people wanted this and the urging came from them.

Most of the graduate programs have emerged from the departments and from the faculty, whether they were really justified or not. I think the graduate program has had some good effects on the college; I think it's had some deleterious effects. Because—then you get down to basic arguments: Is the Commonwealth of Virginia going to support another first-rate university? Are they going to be willing to put in the money it takes? Secondly, and this is an argument which Professor Richard Brown has been involved and he, you know, wrote that section on the graduate study in the self-study. If you've read that, he's absolutely convinced that it is entirely possible for an institution to run a small graduate program and make it good. Now there are others that disagree. I think the majority of the opinion of the faculty of arts and sciences (unless it's changed) do not want to see the graduate program growing, particularly under the present circumstances where resources have become so tight. I suspect some of them feel whatever advantages there may be in terms of attracting, retaining, paying a faculty, the conditions under which they work so far as teaching load is concerned have in a sense been achieved and that all proliferation or expansion as to add to the burdens, detract more from the undergraduate program.
without really improving the general situation within the institution. Certainly that would be my feeling. I could still go along with the computer science thing; I'd never approve the psychology. I would recommend that certain masters' programs should have been abolished long ago, never should have been launched. They're just limping along, but they have brought to those departments some of the same kinds of advantages as the departments running fairly good graduate programs.

Williams: What effect did expansion program have on your office?

Fowler: Well, it certainly affected the whole recruiting process in terms of the kind of people who were under consideration and who were being attracted by the college, and I would say the number of interviews increased for a given appointment so that it added a good deal of work to my office in that respect as well as to the departments, but as far as administration of it was concerned, essentially it added nothing except, I suppose we should say, as time went on we developed closer communication with Dean Selby's office. His position and responsibilities became clearer. We hadn't bothered to formalize things. Now, that is in the sense of making available to him the papers, the dossiers of prospective appointees to the college, when they were brought down here to be interviewed and so forth. We this we developed, and it got to the point where Dean Selby would interview every candidate for an appointment in a department that offered graduate work. We this created more
paper work, but that was all right; it was formalizing things, and I think the consequences have been good. You know our relationship was so close that we didn't have any trouble working together informally on this business, but it became clear that both his best interests and the best interests of the graduate program that more of this should be formalized. Well, that meant more paper work for my secretary and so forth, but essentially the only extra work for me was that Dean Selby was in my office more frequently than in the past, not necessarily on graduate work per se as on the various committees and studies in which we were both involved. He would come in, you know, and talk about these things, not necessarily as I say with what should we do about this or that in the graduate program? So it took more time in this respect, but otherwise you know . . . I guess that situation has now been formalized to the point where, you probably could tell me, the graduate dean of arts and sciences is no longer under the dean of the faculty in terms of organizational charts and so forth?

Williams: I think in terms of the organizational chart, no, he isn't.

Fowler: That's changed. But at the beginning, in terms of chain of command and so forth the graduate dean was supposed to be under my office. We always operated this way. Well, I suppose this was true even with Dean Siegel. I didn't see Dean Siegel as much or, I guess, when Willis was acting dean. I didn't see as much of them on these matters as I saw of John Selby. Of course, by this time his office was doing more, being defined, and more formalized.
with more records and all this kind of stuff, so there was more business to transact or talk about. But I would say when I was dean, my office really exercised little authority over the graduate program. Now I assume that the authority for a while was there if you had wanted to use it. Of course, I had little interest in it, except insofar as it affected general faculty-personnel matters, then it had to be of concern. I don't think it's done any damage to William and Mary. As I've suggested, I think there are some M.A. programs that don't do us any good in terms of public image, academic standing, and so forth, but I'm confident that with what we're up against now (and the picture gets darker and darker) we'd be almost insane to expand our graduate work. Now what affect this would have on Richmond it's difficult to say. One can argue that we have received some of the things we've gotten in the past simply because we are giving graduate work. If we were to cut back, would the state reduce its support somewhat? I don't think so because there's very little they give specifically for the graduate program. They don't give five cents any more for research, you know. But those who say that this has created a certain image with the authorities and I suppose with some of the Virginia taxpayers, and if we started to retrench, it is said, this could have a bad effect. I doubt it. I think this feeling has some support in the Board of Visitors, for example.

Williams: Similarly, how involved was your office in the questions of off-campus
work, the Langley Field Residential Center or VARC and that
the faculty was very much concerned that perhaps the quality
of off-campus offerings would not be up to the Williamsburg
campus.

Fowler: I was very much involved personally as dean in protecting the
validity of the William and Mary degree and strongly opposed
these developments. Now, as the contest went on, I would say,
in all-college committees. They had a bad time and one special
committee that was set up and a couple of our representatives
on the committee were close friends and they would keep me
informed of everything that was going on and they were fighting
the good fight so that I don't suppose you would say that I
really got involved until the proposals were made to the faculty,
and then, of course, I took a strong position against any credit
for a degree at William and Mary being earned off-campus, recog-
nizing then by government decree VARC was officially part of
the William and Mary campus but this took care of Langley and
Eustis. These outfits. Some are related to this. Again, it
wasn't my baby. I strongly approved some years ago William and
Mary getting out of the extension business. That became Vice-
president's Healy's responsibility. Poor man. The first
year he was here when he was getting his feet wet he had to spend
much of his time that first year dealing with extension and the
divisions of Richard Bland and Christopher Newport and he even-
tually wrote that great report. I thought, which was presented
to the board. I guess the next fall. I knew what was going on,
and so forth, and he knew how I stood on this and how other people stood on it, but I didn't have to fight the fight, so to speak. I thoroughly approved of getting out of extension service and I might add the committee I chaired about eight years ago, now I guess, recommended that we drop Richard Bland way back there. Eight years ago. Our report was filed in the wastebasket. No, I've always wanted William and Mary to be right here as a residential institution. That is not to say I criticize the establishment of Christopher Newport and Richard Bland. I think at the outset they served a good purpose, and I guess Christopher Newport is doing fairly well, but Richard Bland is sunk all the way through.

Williams: What responsibilities do these various off-campus centers -- ?

Fowler: Occasionally, I'd get involved in special committee reports and so forth or have to attend meetings of representatives of the college and branches and so forth but no real responsibility in my office, praise the Lord. I wouldn't have done it. I did think for a time that -- and I think it's still probably a good idea -- that the summer school should have come under the office of the dean of faculty, but I wasn't eager to take it on. There were many problems about it that concerned me and others, but the solution of that problem I always felt depended
so much on what the college was going to do about its academic calendar. How was it going to use the summer, its facilities — separate summer sessions or would the college become a year-round operation, and therefore the administrative organization and control would cover the summer as well as the rest of the year, and what went on in the summer would be part of the regular year program. Every time that revision of the calendar came up that issue was ducked. That's one reason why we still have the two-semester system, this year for the first time, the first semester ending by Christmas, which I didn't approve.
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Williams: The first thing I did want to ask you about, Dean Fowler, was the new curriculum that was instituted in the early '70s. Now there's not been a new curriculum since 1935. Why was it then in '70 a new curriculum was instituted? Why was it done then?

Fowler: Well, as you know, there'd been no basic change in the curriculum since 1935. That is not to say that some things had not been done. For example, in 1956 the then curriculum committee, which is now the educational policy committee, did a thorough survey of this. I was on the curriculum committee at the time, and we believed that the basic philosophy behind the '35 curriculum was sound; you know, basic distribution requirements with some choice as to how these were satisfied (but limited choice) plus the concentration. I won't go into the '56 proposals -- as a matter of fact, I'm not sure I could remember them all -- but we came up with a number of proposals which were presented to the faculty, most of them approved by the faculty, leaving the basic structure as it was, but as a specific example, bringing in psychology to satisfy a basic requirement. Well, very few of these recommendations went into effect because, well, I guess for a variety of reasons but the administration didn't like some of them. The change regarding psychology, for example, would involve or could involve the need for considerably more lab facilities -- this kind of thing.
and we just didn't have the space or the projected space to handle this. Very little change came out of the '56 proposals.

Well, there continued to be some dissatisfaction with that situation and there continued to be talk over the years. Meanwhile, of course, nationally all kinds of changes had been made in college curriculums: Some places had abolished the foreign language requirement, many of them had got away entirely from basic distribution requirements, many more opportunities for electives. Desire to improve the quality of the freshman year because of improvements in secondary schools. So there was the definite feeling by the late '60s, rightly or wrongly, we were behind the times. There was a good deal of student pressure to give them more options, some pressure to do away or at least modify the foreign language requirement, more opportunity for interdisciplinary work. So we went at it this time, of course, I was dean and had to exert some initiative and leadership and the first recommendation I came up with and the faculty definitely approved that we appoint a special committee to do this, that the curriculum committee was already overburdened with routine stuff and that this study would be done in the summer and we would pay people for doing it, including students. So this was done.

Meanwhile, to get things going and to have something in rough draft form that the committee could go to work on, I had drawn up with advice and consultation of others two alternative proposals--A and B I think I called them—and these served
though by no means did this preclude the committee from departing totally from these draft proposals, but this served as a kick-off point. Well, the committee worked all summer and came up with an elaborate report that ran as I remember sixty pages or more. Then the next step was to decide on the procedure: how these proposals would be presented to the faculty and acted on. And it was agreed first that we would have a number of informal discussion meetings with the faculty and action would be taken but the opportunity just to kick these issues around, get people thinking about it, and of course, with the committee there the faculty would get more educated on what was involved in these things. I forget how many meetings we had, but it seemed to me that at one time we were meeting all the time. These meetings were pretty well attended, inevitably to a great extent by the same people who were very much interested. Then we went into special faculty meetings in which we acted point by point on the many proposals, most of which were accepted as prepared by the committee, others amended, one or two major ones defeated. Most of the amendments came from the regular educational policy committee as it was then. They had gone over these proposals very carefully, and in almost every instance they took a position, either for the proposal, against it, or modification. So we had two documents to work on, and gradually we hammered it out. It was a long, wearing process because we had to do this entirely in special meetings which were on top of our regular monthly meetings and the essence
of the proposed new curriculum was adopted. I'd say the primary change was the issue as to whether or not we would go on a four-course load and that of course inevitably affected other features. Well, finally -- and this was debated at great length -- the faculty passed the four-course load proposal by a rather narrow margin. (I used to have the vote imprinted in my head.) There were practical difficulties in this so far as the personnel office in Richmond was concerned and the budget office and I and Jack Willis, who was one of the people who'd been on the committee, and I guess Carter Lowance on one occasion, went up and talked to the personnel office, Mr. Garber, who was the director of the personnel division for the commonwealth, and then he arranged a meeting with officials of the budget office and they, of course, did not tell us we couldn't do this if we really wanted to because that's not their business. But what was clear was that they were suspicious about a four-course load with the interim term which was tied up with this. You know, they wanted to know what what faculty and students were going to be doing in January. I think there was some feeling, you know, that half the faculty would be down in Florida sitting in the sun. Then this also complicated this academic arithmetic, as to calculating teacher loads by credit hours, this kind of thing. So, there were those difficulties, though they were not insuperable, but it was conceivable that if the four-course load with the January term, which in our plan was to be
compulsory at least three years out of the four. There was concern that this might affect our budget unfavorably, but this was not the primary obstacle. The thing that worried me and others was that there was not enough support in the faculty for the January term, which inevitably was tied up with the four-course business to make a go of it because we were requiring it, you see, for virtually all of our student body. It was not voluntary like the summer term was and is in a great many institutions. That may have been a mistake on our part.

Well, I came to the conclusion that we needed—we needed it out, we would need something like 220 members of the arts and science faculty each January to make a go of this and of course, this involved imagination and creativity on their part in creating these courses, and I was forced to the conclusion that there was just not enough support in the faculty, not enough enthusiasm to make a go of it. And so when the chips were down it was my responsibility to make a recommendation to the vice-president and the president, which in turn would go to the Board of Visitors and finally, after a great deal of torture, I felt compelled to recommend against the January term and therefore the four-course business. My recommendation was accepted by the administration and hence by the board. This was very disappointing, of course, to members of the faculty who were enthusiastic about this and this. I prepared a little speech to try to defend my recommendation, and it had entirely adequate faculty support, but there was disappointment on the part of the enthusiasts.
I was disappointed myself. I liked the idea, but I just couldn't see it succeeding under the circumstances. So those features were dropped out, but virtually everything adopted, and it went into effect the fall of '73. Is that correct?

Williams: I think so, yes.

Fowler: And I think it began to be clear within the first year that in most respects it's a great success. It added all kinds of extra work for my office, not to mention the registrar's office, because for two years we had to operate the two curricula. Also, there were some procedures and practices of implementation that we had not thoroughly worked through in every detail. Some little problems just hadn't occurred to us. Some of the language of the requirements was not as precise as it should have been so far as the students were concerned and the faculty. So, the first year and to a considerable extent the second year the work load of the degrees was tremendously increased. The work-load in the registrar's office was, and the relationship between that office and my office. Another thing had to be done: I had to rewrite -- again with a little help -- the whole chapter on degree requirements in the catalog because of the new curriculum, and for a while we had to have both of them in the catalog. But most of this was anticipated, but I would say, basically, it's been a great improvement. The students are much happier with it. We did hang on to a foreign language requirement, which pleased me and others, though we modified it, as you know. If a student comes to William and Mary now with four high school
credits in a single language they don't have to take any in college. Well, many of the people in the modern language department were frightened by this prospect thinking, you know, their enrollment would go to pieces. Well, even though there are a good many of our entering students now who can satisfy the language requirement that way, one of the things that's happened is that a considerable number of those people either continue with their language or start another one, which is all to the good. So, with the exception of the diehards (students and some faculty who would do away with any language requirement) that's worked out well. So, I would say it's been a real success, and it's brought us up to date with other institutions. Some mistakes have been made not only by us but by others in introducing too much permissiveness in the curriculum. For example, a number of institutions that adopted a very generous pass/fail feature have retreated. We adopted a very modified, controlled, limited pass/fail system, which in no sense has been abused, at least not by the time I retired; so that has worked out.

Williams: Was there any specific quarter from which the opposition to the 4-1-4 came?

Fowler: No. I would say no immediately. Some of it was identifiable as to location and source, but nothing really significant in terms of the opposition being concentrated in special areas. No, I don't remember anything significant.

Williams: I asked this because I went to a school where this was adopted
over the strong opposition of the sciences; I wondered if this had been the case at William and Mary as well.

Fowler: I suppose the most enthusiastic supporter of this here was the physics department. There were those who thought there might be a little self-interest involved in the physics department because they were ready to introduce immediately a number of these January term courses and they had concrete proposals as to the courses they would offer. Of course, the other faculty said, "Well, the physics department can do this. They don't have much to do anyway. They don't have any heavy student load. We can't." But other than that I don't remember that there was any special concentration of support for or against it.

Williams: This was right around the time when the college was involved with problems with federal funding from H.E.W. because of integration (lack of efforts towards). Was there any thought given to a black studies course? This was very much the thing in the early '70s.

Fowler: My memory is that was never really a serious part of the curriculum proposals. Naturally the subject came up. I think it can be said that neither then nor to my knowledge since -- now I could be wrong on recent developments -- there is ever any really strong support here for a black studies program. There was concern about the problem. There was the desire to offer courses which would appeal to them, but no great support for setting up a special program designed entirely for them which in some way
might modify basic degree requirements, no because by that
time some of us knew that these black studies in some institu-
tions had been failures, had unfortunate effects. I, for
example, through reading some of the literature knew very
well what had happened at Harvard where even black members of
the faculty up there felt the program had been a mistake and
that if anything it had contributed to segregation rather than
integration because it put the blacks off (many of them)
into their own program. Personally, I never had any enthusiasm
for any such program. Now I'm perfectly willing and this has
been done and I and others explained this to the faculty: that
with the development of these new courses, plus existing courses
which were clearly relevant to this situation, it was en-
tirely possible for a black student to come here and with the
proper advice put together a very respectable group of courses
which while wouldn't be set apart with a label, could constitute
considerable experience for the blacks in the various aspects of
their own culture and I think that's still true. As I recall,
it's entirely possible now for a student to choose an interdisci-
plinary concentration and put these courses together in a package.
The fundamental idea behind our interdisciplinary concentration --
and I think it's very sound -- is that such programs are devised
by student and advisor to meet the needs and interests of that
student. You don't start out with setting up a title and a
list of courses in the catalog under a fancy label, whether it's
"East Asian Studies" or "Black Studies," and say to the student ,
"That's it and for this program you have to take those courses, if not all of them certainly most of them." No, that's contrary to our idea, which was incorporated into the new curriculum, that the interdisciplinary was to be a personally devised program between the student and the advisor, and I think it's been very successful in that respect. If somebody wants to put together such a package, it's perfectly easy to do in the interdisciplinary concentration.

Williams: You have been involved, haven't you, in the 1935 curriculum change?

Fowler: No. That was my first year here; it went into effect for my second year, in fall of '35, and that's when we devised History 101-102 as the basic history course which would satisfy distribution requirements and that's, you probably know, Dean Miller came in the fall of '35 and he created Philosophy 201-202 for the same purpose in a different distribution area and it became a very famous course. I had nothing to do with the formulation of the '35 curriculum; course, I was in on the debates and the discussion. I knew the thinking in the history department. Dr. Morton was on the committee that did this, and he and others very much took the point of view that the basic introductory history course was going to satisfy the distribution requirement for the whole student body (or a good portion thereof) that it should be European history, not American. So I was in on that kind of thing, but I didn't have to push it (though I was the only
European historian in the department at the time). However, Dr. Morton always stood by the position, as did the American historians, that the basic introductory course for students who probably wouldn't take any more history positively should be the European rather than the American, and of course this was the view of the faculty, too.

Williams: Was the procedure for change in 1935 less involved than that you've described in '71?

Fowler: You mean the transition from one curriculum to the other?

Williams: No. Was the adoption smoother within the faculty meetings than it was in '71?

Fowler: Oh, it was much less difficult or extended. No, there were some arguments, of course. In any situation like this you have the problem of entrenched self-interest. This is no criticism then; it would happen in any institution in the country. There was some of that. There couldn't have been the same problem because it was all accomplished within one year, where in this other instance it took us two full years and a summer, first to set up the proposals and then to debate and adopt them. It was a full two years and a half before they went into effect. And, of course, the present curriculum has more interesting small things in it which were not in the other one, and it's this kind of thing, you know, that took as much debate as some of the more basic issues, and this increased the problem of implementation after adoption. Some of the students and faculty still don't know what a sequence is.
I'm told. We knew, at least we thought we did.

Williams: At about the same time the grading system was changed{ the "D" was dropped. In reading over the faculty minutes I found almost from the very time it was dropped there was dissatisfaction with this and talk began to crop up about reinstating the "D" which is still going on. Why, then, was the "D" dropped in the first place?

Fowler: I'll have to try to see if I can recall the thinking of those who were for it{ I was against it{. One basic thing certainly was and always is in debate on the grading system is: does it make sense to have a passing grade like "D" which carries no quality credit? This always bothers people{ In other words, the four-point system as opposed to a three and there are great variations throughout the United States. That's always been a problem. Then, of course, the pass/fail issue complicated this. Well{"C" is defined as "satisfactory" in any grading system that I know of. Then you run up against a pass/fail scheme whereby if the student passes they may have recorded in the registrar's office any grade from "D" to "A" -- they don't know. So it was conceivable that students were getting credit on a pass/fail basis for what amounted to "D" work where they wouldn't if the "D" grade was dropped generally, unless there was some exclusion of the pass/fail formula as a result of this. Then another thing that influenced it, I suppose, was the fact that grade averages throughout the country were going up{ the "F's" were blemishes on a student's record, the feeling that some
students were getting "D" when they really should have got "P" because some faculty might be inclined to give the "D" if it didn't carry any quality point. Well, can you think of other arguments? You've read the notes, the minutes.

Williams: The arguments aren't recorded who spoke, or so-and-so, the following spoke in favor or the following spoke against.

Fowler: Personally I always thought the "D" was a useful grade, not that I was happy giving out "D" any more than I was ever happy at giving out "P" but I always gave them out. To me a "D" was a useful grade, particularly in the instance of youngsters -- and it could happen so much with freshmen, particularly, say, the first semester -- who'd done satisfactory work right up to the final examination and then bang! When they were hit a real rough three-hour examination they could flunk it badly. Now we had the definite policy in History 101-102 for years that the final examination counted 40 per cent but we had all kinds of quiz grades and an hour exam on the record, as well. So again and again the student would bust the final examination and the result would be that his total average was pulled down in many cases, you know, right on the line and in other times just so far down you couldn't do anything about it. I found the "D" grade very useful there up to the final examination the student had done, not distinguished but, say, low "C" work and if the "D" grade wasn't there we would have had many more "P". And I've had the same experience in advanced courses. Never bothered me that a "D" carried no quality points.
We never had any difficulty (and I certainly didn't personally) in figuring out the numerical values of the letter grades. We kept all our records in numerical grades and then transformed them into the appropriate letter grade. I never saw this as a problem in grading, some faculty do. I gather that the last debates when they reinstated the "D" grade, some members of the faculty got up and were very perplexed about "what numerical grade do I give now in my own record keeping?" I've always felt that any faculty member that couldn't adjust to a changed grading system, there was something wrong with him. But some of them seemed to have great difficulty.

You can use any grading system. When I came here I was amazed: the grading system, "passing was 75" — it was all numerical — "passing." A quality was 83, and for an "A" you got way up in the 90s. Well, I thought this was ridiculous. I'd never known such a system since secondary school. Fortunately we went into the letter grade system with I guess, the curriculum of '35 (I'm almost certain we did) and there was no trouble in adjusting that I could see. There is no faculty in the world that's satisfied with their own grading system; the year I was at Cal Tech ('56-'57), they only had two or three faculty meetings a year out there, so I decided upon invitation from some of my colleagues in the humanities to go to the fall faculty meeting out of curiosity to see what went on. (I had a vote if I wanted to and you know what they spent practically the whole meeting on? The grading system. I got giggly. That's where I came in almost thirty years
ago in this college business. No faculty is ever totally satisfied with the grading system. Of course, there are some who wish we didn't have to have one. We've had some consideration here, you know, doing away with the grading system, go into pass, honors, high-pass, or various schemes of this kind, but we've never done it. It didn't surprise me at all when the faculty reinstituted the "D" grade this year; I couldn't care less, really. Then, of course, we went through the business for a while and it was quickly adopted, you know, for a while we had the "NC" grade instead of the "F" largely because of the argument that an "F" did some permanent injury to a student, that there was a stigma that students carried for the rest of their days.

Williams: That "NC" allegedly did not carry?

Fowler: That's right. Well, that didn't last very long, but we wrestled with that change, and this was all going on while we were moving from the old curriculum to the new, and that just added to all the trouble in the registrar's office and my office. The grading systems never worried me very much in terms of looking upon them as a major issue. My only concern has been with standards, namely, if a student deserves an "F", give him an "F"; if he deserves an "A", give him an "A" but don't throw those "As" around loosely.

Williams: We've touched this morning on some questions on which we talked about faculty participation, and I wanted to ask you some questions about the way the faculty has participated.
Now, while you were dean and since you've been retired there have been debates over the faculty senate idea. First, I wanted to ask: whose idea was this originally? Was it Dr. Graves's or did it just come up about the time he came?

Fowler: Certainly the immediate proposal when it was brought up was his idea. In other words, he had become convinced we had to have something like this to meet the needs of the present size and organization of the college. However, of course, neither he nor any other individual invented the idea of a faculty senate. We kicked this around back in -- we revised the by-laws considerably -- I think it was in '63, before I became dean, but I was chairman of the committee that did it -- and we gave some serious consideration at that time to a faculty senate or assembly, whatever it might have been called -- and this is, I think maybe I referred to this in one of our earlier conversations in connection with the transition from the Chandler to the Paschall regime; we came to the conclusion in the committee that this was the wrong time to adopt something that might appear to reduce faculty participation and faculty democracy in view of the recent experience when the president had clearly set out to destroy the faculty organization. Obviously, we didn't want to do anything to reduce, if possible, total faculty participation but because the idea remained alive, and as the organization of the college became more complicated, as the two schools, education and business, became almost autonomous, we faced very serious practical problems in getting action on
issues which were of general college significance and importance. It was that particular aspect that moved President Graves to appoint a committee to come up with a proposal, and he gave them some thoughts on it. Well, what they came up with first, as I remember, was an assembly, a kind of discussion forum which would include students. This didn't go across. Then they came up with the plan for this senate, which would include specified representation from the schools and from the faculty of arts and sciences. The basic problem as far as the senate was concerned, and the assembly if the schools were to be represented, was inability to agree on a representation formula, the faculty of arts and sciences insisting on what you might call proportional representation. The schools -- and this has been done on a number of all-college committees -- insisting on equal representation, and the faculty of arts and sciences balked at regularly fought this. I remember telling President Graves when we got into this thing, "There are two things you've got to decide in advance. You've got to hand down definite instructions on this, directives: one, the system of representation, and secondly, the powers that this body would have as opposed to the delegated powers of the faculties of the various units as found in their by-laws and approved by the Board of Visitors." And I think I'm correct in saying that when the proposal came up, though I guess I'd already retired when neither of those two points were really settled in advance, and I can understand why President Graves was very reluctant to do
this, yes. I believe there should be some top body of that nature where at least there could be discussion and in some cases decision on matters that affected all of us the College of William and Mary without having to go through all the difficulties of when something was proposed and adopted and might have to go back down to the different faculties. Well, again and again we were faced with the proposition of adopting something without the power of amendment. I believe they'll come to something sooner or later. I forget, is there a new scheme under debate now?

Williams: No, I think it's the same one. Yes, that was one of the questions I was going to ask you: do you think it will eventually be adopted?

Fowler: Well, there's one recent development that makes me perhaps reconsider what I might say to that question, and that is it seems clear from what I know and of course I haven't seen any of the documents that the law school as a result of the American Bar Association problems with the A.B.A. is going to become much more autonomous than it has been and that the dean of the law school will deal directly with the president, not with the academic vice president. Now I'm talking off-the-cuff on this, I suppose, but if and when the Board of Visitors -- and they're supposed to do it in their January meeting -- does this in order to clearly establish the position and prerogatives of Dean Spong, Dean Quittmeyer and the business school are going to be right over at that door the next day asking for the same thing for business
administration and if that happens I would think the school of education might follow suit. Now if that happens -- we won't worry about what the details might be -- if that happens it seems to me that the need for or the desirability of an overall institutional senate is gone and that what might come out of any such situation is that the faculty of arts and sciences might create its own senate because of the problem of attendance at faculty meetings and all this. So I may be all wrong, but I would think that the future of the concept of an institutional senate with some real powers could be drastically affected by what emerges in terms of the academic organization of the college in the next few months. Now I may be reading too much into this, but I just have to believe if the law school gets what it wants and what the A.B.A. wants it to have (direct access to the top authorities and, of course, this is true; this is the way it operates in major universities) that the other schools are going to fall in line, try to get essentially the same thing. I don't think -- though I have no knowledge on this -- but my guess is that the accreditation agencies of business administration and education may not be so demanding in this respect as the lawyers are. I'm not suggesting that if this type of organizational development occurs that this would adversely affect the position of the faculty of arts and sciences in the whole scheme of things here. I'm not worried about that. Anything more on that one?

Williams: Well, going back to something you spoke of just a minute ago:
attendance at faculty meetings. I know for a number of years there's been some question of reducing the level needed for a quorum. Why has this problem, would you say, come up recently?

Fowler: Attendance by faculty at their own meetings has dropped way off all over the country, and we've seen that happen here. Years ago virtually the whole faculty attended faculty meetings. Well, the place has grown, and we get more and more faculty who aren't interested in this aspect of academic life; attendance has dropped off. We've tried all kinds of devices. We've asked the department chairman to work on it; you know, every time there's a faculty meeting, remind the staff that there is a meeting, not require them to come, but call it to their attention and urge them and let them think participation is part of their general responsibilities and should be a part of their interest. Well, in the revision of the bylaws we played around with the quorum thing. At one time we got all the way down in our bylaws where a quorum of the faculty could be sixty and then President Graves was concerned about attendance, particularly, you know, when stories would come out in the papers that relatively few members of the faculty had made major decisions, and so we went back to 50 percent of the voting members of the faculty and I can remember working it out— I eliminated certain part-time people— so that this meant that 290 to 294 members of the faculty of arts and sciences had voting rights and that therefore the quorum would have to be 145 to 147. So, I and the secretary would have to
stand there at the beginning of a meeting and count noses until we had that many, and sometimes it was touch-and-go. Then on one occasion I announced, "The quorum is not present, and therefore the faculty would not meet. We are adjourned." Well, I'd threatened I would do this but I had to. Some members of the faculty argued, you know, that in Robert's Rules of Order you don't have to worry about a quorum unless somebody raises the question. On another occasion when we were there for a special meeting to deal with business we had not been able to handle at the regular meeting, we were slightly short of a quorum, I announced it, but I said, "We're going on." Well, this upset some people the other way, you know, that I'd broken the rules. So next time I declared there wasn't a quorum present, and we walked out. Well, now they've changed it again. It's no more than 100. That's been changed several times. It's a great problem. Of course, that's one of the advantages of having a faculty senate. What I'm thinking of is a senate of the faculty of arts and sciences where you would have a limited body that would all be elected and therefore conceivably could be counted upon to attend regularly and this body then could transact a good bit of the business of the faculty without having to worry about the problem of a generous quorum. But it's not a problem limited to William and Mary.

Williams: Some people, I suppose, would say, "Why worry about the quorum
at all?"

Fowler: Well, the legality of what you do can be challenged unless in your bylaws you provide there is no required quorum and even so you could have one-fourth of the faculty in attendance and in a close vote you could have forty people, say, making the decision. And the newspapers love this, particularly when arts and sciences faculty, as usually happens, takes a strong stand on some issue of rather broad implications. They're always happy to be able to point out that only so many people were present and voting and that this was the vote and that this handful of people so to speak, is speaking for the institution. (This just happened recently in connection with the resolution which was adopted by the faculty of arts and sciences at the University of Virginia with regard to President Hereford and his membership in the Farmington Country Club. Two days later the Times-Dispatch had an editorial in which they sighted figures as to how many were present and voting with the same arguments I've just discussed. Well, to the best of my knowledge, their figures were quite wrong. But again, it made it look as if something less than 150 members of the faculty up there had taken this action, whereas I'm told by people who were there and very much involved in the resolution that just over 250 voted in favor of it. Now, how there's this discrepancy I don't know; that's a sidelight.) But the press and the public love to seize upon what appears to be a minority accomplishing something that is of broad interest and significance. That's one of
the problems if one's going to worry about public reaction. Of course, most faculty couldn't care less if they're convinced this is the right thing to do.

Williams: Publicity brings up another question: you have always been in favor of the faculty meetings being closed meetings. Would you like to state why?

Fowler: Well, to me a faculty meeting is a deliberative assembly; it's a legislature. I don't think anybody should be there except by invitation other than those who are defined in the bylaws as voting, or as members of the faculty, and that's carefully defined in the bylaws. I have opposed student attendance in the faculty meetings, though I supported student membership on a number of committees. I don't think the press has any business there, and in this freedom of information statute, they have no right to be there; he can have the closed meetings. I was told just Friday night there was an incident just last week at the last faculty meeting; they were there in session, debate was going on. In came a photographer, walked around, took several pictures, went out. Not a word was said. Debate went right on. The reason I was told was that the person said, "You wouldn't have let that happen, would you?" He said, "You would have challenged that man." I said, "I certainly would." But he wasn't challenged. He wasn't saying this in criticism of Dean Edwards; he was just sort of reminding my feelings about it and how I used to conduct the meetings. I think the attendance of outsiders
tends to limit and restrict debate on the part of some people who are hesitant to say what they might otherwise say. This is not true of everybody by any means, but in reverse I can see individuals, not just in the faculty but another assembly, some of them tending to speak to the people who are there. I always felt a faculty meeting was a very serious, deliberative assembly. It should be run strictly in accordance with parliamentary rules. It should be as close to a legislative assembly as one can make it. Now this led to a certain formalism in the faculty meetings which I'm sure some people didn't like, but to me it was part of the whole atmosphere. I insisted if anybody wanted to speak they got to their feet; they addressed the chair, and that if an argument started back and forth between two members of the faculty, as sometimes happens while they're still in their seats, I would make them get up and be recognized. But it kept the thing in order and you could transact your business much more effectively, but while people think I'm old-fashioned.

Williams: Moving on then to another area and this was a concern of the faculty while you were dean, that was salary. That wasn't peculiar to your administration by any means. Dr. Paschall was given a great deal of credit for working to build up faculty salaries in the '60s. Does he deserve this credit?

Fowler: He certainly deserves some because he did honestly push for it. He refrained from some unfortunate little practices that had sometimes occurred in the past. He went entirely along with
a merit pay policy as opposed to the automatic step
ness. He deserves credit for supporting everything the faculty asked for in this, and he did his best in Richmond to get it. Now at the same time, I think it has to be recognized that assuming the president of the institution gave appropriate support that this kind of thing would have happened in the decade of the '60s under anybody because that's the way things were moving. There was a lot of money around for higher education. Salaries were zooming in other places; we continued to be behind. Well, the situation demanded aggressive support on the part of the president, and he gave it. It was still behind, greatly improved but for awhile we were getting increases slightly above the national average as determined by the A.A.U.P. and even the last couple years when things got so much tighter the college has done pretty well on salaries relatively. Nevertheless, the basic gap which existed before the push was started, the fact that the base was so low -- has not been significantly closed. The average full professor at the University of Virginia gets one-third more than the average full professor at William and Mary (that was true last year) and we're still in the middle ground as far as the A.A.U.P. is concerned. The full professor thing looks a little better. We're still very low on the assistant professors but all of us pushed it just as hard as we could, with some success but not enough. What will happen this coming year, I don't know. There was a
period when we were making major jumps -- major jumps for us, certainly where some members of the faculty on the basis of merit and partially removing existing inequities got 10,

15 per cent increase in a given year, even though the average didn't work to that. Well, that was slowed down but nevertheless to the best of knowledge, even since things have tightened gradually within the last, I suppose, five years now, the average increase overall in faculty salary average has been right close to 7 per cent and a lot of institutions haven't been able to do this. I suppose what I'm trying to say is that if we hadn't been so far behind years ago, what we have done in the last ten years would have kept us going along very nicely, but we've never closed the gap. And, of course, one problem is that we have such limited private funds. There's no private funds to amount to anything to put into faculty support, though the conversations which are going on in fact planning for a capital fund campaign), this is one of the major items in the plan. You see, the endowment of the University of Virginia is over $100,000,000 which is very impressive for a state university, where ours is $10,000,000 and a fair amount of that is restricted as to how it can be spent.

Williams: Is that the only reason -- lack of private endowment -- why William and Mary can't be on the par with U.Va. or even V.P.I.?

Fowler: Oh, no, but the state, even though it's made the right noises
every so often about peer groups, this kind of thing, they've never come up with the money to do it. No, the basic problem is in the state support because that's where most of the money for Virginia comes from for salaries, but what helps Virginia so much is the endowed chairs which are supported in toto or in part by private funds. Of course there is a device in the state budget policy they call the Eminent Scholars Program, whereby the state will match in a salary supplement any new money raised by an institution for an eminent scholar's salary. We only have two or perhaps three positions in that category. You don't need an awful lot of money for that as far as the state is concerned. I'll take a specific example and you can guess what chair it is. That position originated as a result of private endowment for that purpose; we're talking about the Harrison chair of history. We received $125,000 from the Harrison family, and very conservatively that was figured as an income of 5 percent when we got it. Well, so we were counting on $5,000 a year from that source. The state under the Eminent Scholars Program will match the $5,000 and when you put that on top of the basic position that the state funds (you have to have an established position to do this with). So the state can support this eminent scholar thing with a few thousand dollars in each case and you can create respectable salaries for eminent scholars in the term they use — if you can get new money in the amount for example that was provided for the Harrison
In other words:

chair. Whereas, we don't have the problem that a private institution has or even a public institution that wants to create one of these things out of private funds. Nowadays you're talking about roughly $75,000 to fund an endowed chair in order to get the necessary revenue and in most cases you provide these people with a secretary and this kind of thing. Well, that's real money, but this can be managed as long as the commonwealth of Virginia continues this program.

The creation of these endowed chairs can be accomplished with relatively little endowment involved. So when the development office talks to people they're talking in terms of $100,000 to $150,000 from some donor. Now that assumes the state would provide the salary and authorize the basic position involved (it would have to be an established teaching position) but it can be managed without tremendous amounts of money. Also, William and Mary has reached the point now, I would say, where some of these endowed chairs (several of them) could be created without thereby causing too much of a gap between the salaries that go with the endowed chair as opposed to what you know, the average or higher than average full professor would get. So you wouldn't have the same morale problems. If we could set up several of these chairs with an income pushing $30,000 a year or even more, that wouldn't be so terribly out of line with what certainly our top professors are approaching. The whole thing's out of scale. I don't know whether it's still true or not, but...
two years ago the top salaries and particularly for deans and other people who were on twelve-month appointments were pushing the president's salary. The whole thing has to go up. That's been rectified, I think, to some extent; it certainly should have been.

Williams: I assume that having lower salaries even than some colleges within the state would have caused some problems for you in faculty hiring.

Fowler: Oh, yes! We could do pretty well on the initial base salary; the most discouraging thing to first-rate candidates for appointment was the lack of fringe benefits. That's where we were so vulnerable. Now that's been improved somewhat, but we still have a good way to go. I believe there was one very important compensating factor, Emily, however for that problem: mainly, the attraction of the college and the community itself, our reputation (particularly outside of Virginia) with the best universities; the nature of the Williamsburg community was a definite advantage and (has been) but with the cost of living being what it is and inflation, you know, these things aren't the same as bread and butter. But it's helped us a great deal. We were doing right well for a while in competing for the best candidates in the fields for appointment in a given year. It's always been true (and I think increasingly so) that when a graduate student getting his doctorate or already having it was recommended by his mentor or sponsor from the really top institutions, the advisor or mentor would
exercise some judgment in which of his students for done by the department, which of their students were recommended for these places and which for something else. It's kind of a process of selection that goes on. So I know until things got very tight, say, the best people at Harvard or Chicago or California would not be recommended -- the really top ones -- would not be recommended to us on account of the salaries and so forth. Well, nevertheless, we always had good candidates, sometimes their best ones. The best way to recruit, I'm convinced, is still largely through personnel and departmental contacts. But of course now you have to put it in the newspapers, have an opening you get two hundred applications, many of the applicants not fitting the specific needs of the position. You get flooded with them.

One of the most and important aspects of being dean, at least to me, I'm always very happy when an appointment, particularly one in which I had to be unusually involved, worked out well. I was just thinking the other day that the transformation of the economics department the first major thing I had to do my first year was to find a chairman for the economics department, and since we were going outside I had to do most of it, but it worked out fine. It transformed the economics department to the point where now it's one of the better departments in the college. Then came the creation of the department of religion and while there was a faculty committee that helped me on it, I had to take the whole leadership, do all the paper work, contact
all the people well, that's worked out fine and we have a
very healthy. Then I was very much involved, of course,
in the growth of the department. And then my last year the
appointment of the choral director in the music department
to succeed Mr. Fehr after so many years, a position which I
knew at the time would almost certainly involve the depart-
ment chairmanship very shortly because of the very sad
condition of the then department's health. Well, from all
reports and my own observation, that's been a huge
success. Those are all very gratifying because the results,
you know, are not just that one individual with his own
classes and so forth but he helps determine particularly in
the smaller departments he helps to determine the whole
nature and character of the department. He goes on then when
the opportunity presents itself to recruit good people. So it begins to pervade a relatively wide area. I always en-
joyed recruiting and always felt there was no more important
job that I did. Now I don't want to exaggerate my part in
the many appointments that were made, but I was very much in it
with the departments and particularly in those unusual circum-
stances where you were appointing a really central figure who
then helped to mold the future development of the department.
But, of course, we made some mistakes in the process indeed. You can't do it without making some mistakes.

Williams: A few minutes ago you referred to benefits and sometimes lack
of benefits. Has having the development office, an office
concerned with bringing in money -- has this helped?

Fowler: It's encouraged the faculty. The head of the office of development has met with the faculty affairs committee, for example, several times before I retired and with the vice-president for business affairs and conveyed to them the faculty's concerns about these matters. They've been very sympathetic and so far as the office of development is concerned some of this is being written into the development program. Of course, the college doesn't influence this but the state retirement system has continued to be improved. It's still not as good, particularly for younger men as TIAA-CREF* that we don't have. The state now pays the medical insurance for the individual employee; that's a development of only the last three years, four years. We used to have to pay all of our medical and hospitalization. That's been an improvement. There has been more money for faculty research provided out of almost entirely out of private funds, both for summer research grants and for faculty semester leaves. This has all been very encouraging. It's clear that the college is doing what it can in these areas and it has improved the situation and this has helped faculty morale. But retirement could be better; the coverage for medical insurance could be total rather than partial, and so it goes. We've done better in that respect. But the greatest improvement so far as the retirement is concerned is the result of the improvement in the state policy.
Whether that will continue to improve I sort of doubt. It's been influenced by the frequent improvement in social security because, you know, the Virginia retirement system is called the Virginia Supplementary Retirement System, meaning that it's supplementary to social security. This is arranged by statute and so as social security benefits inched up, inevitably they moved up the supplementary retirement system. I'm not sure the social security benefits are going to improve more. I'm not sure the country can afford it and the state, I don't think, is therefore improve it. But the last change (which some faculty don't even know was been done, you know, they haven't retired or approached retirement) was part of the formula of the state system was they took the average salary of the highest five consecutive years, which was usually your last five but not necessarily, but the highest five consecutive years and then multiply that by a certain fraction, so many years of service, and so forth, and that determined the size of your pension. Well, just before I retired they reduced the five to three, and you'd be surprised what a difference that made. If you'd received decent increases your last five years and then knocked out the two lowest years and then your pension was figured on the three highest consecutive, it made significant improvement in pension without costing the state an awful lot. Of course, the faculty had to contribute 5½ percent of their base salary to the retirement. The state didn't contribute
that much. It comes close to matching it, but it doesn't actually match it, last I knew. That could be improved. And there's another thing. There's no system here for tuition for faculty children, either at William and Mary or elsewhere, in a reciprocal arrangement. This would be a tremendous help for those with children. Some of these fringe benefits inevitably depend on the individual circumstances, one of the small fringe benefits over the years, though it's been under criticism, is mortgage money, you know, for faculty housing. Well, that was of a great advantage to certain people who got in on the thing early but they've got a waiting list now of, I don't know, forty or fifty, and it is argued that the money that the college sets aside for that purpose could be used to a broader advantage for all faculty rather than just those who managed to take advantage of this system. Well, it's just a little thing. There could be more faculty housing owned by the college.

Williams: This has been talked about at various times over the years.

Fowler: Oh, yes, along with apartments for graduate students. They haven't seen fit to do this. One of the problems in this connection which I don't think everybody realizes is that the size of the bonded indebtedness of the college, while not at all serious, has reached the point until certain self-liquidating things, you know, bring in more money where you think twice about going beyond this. So the thought of the college
spending several million dollars for faculty and/or graduate 
student housing brings up this question as to whether the 
college wisely and safely could go that much more in debt 
even though these projects supposedly are self-liquidating. 
The college authorities would tell anybody that asked this question that at this time, at least, the amount 
of money involved is just not available at reasonable 
interest rates and in relation to the total indebtedness.

Williams: When the mandatory retirement age was changed to 65, was 
this a state action? I had the impression it was a 
Board of Visitors' action taken without consultation with 
the faculty. Is this true?

Fowler: I pushed it, and I wrote the draft proposal that was eventually 
adopted by the board. It was an administrative decision 
which met with some criticism on the part of the faculty, and 
of course, the first year it was instituted it was a little 
painful, though we did introduce a kind of "grandfather clause." 
Obviously, I think it served a good policy, and I think there's 
more acceptance of that position. The same thing was true, I-- 
suppose, some years though, of course, this definitely had 
faculty approval, was voted by the faculty. The policy of 
rotating department chairmen was another thing that 
developed and I was all for that. Those are two of 
the major what you might call personnel policies 
during my administration, and then, of course, the much more 
elaborate, formalized system of evaluation for promotion,
retention, and tenure. That's only been in operation three years. The first year of operation was my last.

Williams: Previously had it been the prerogative of the department chairman?

Fowler: No, more the dean's office working with the department. Of course, the dean paid great attention to the department recommendations. In some cases this meant the department chairman; in other cases it meant the chairman working with a department committee. This was one of the problems: there was altogether too much variation in procedure at the departmental levels and then all this came to me and so far as arts and sciences (for the whole faculty at one time, except law) then my recommendations went up to the vice-president and if I may say they were seldom changed. Well, that was the present state of the nation with all the legal action and everything. However well our system may have worked -- and I would defend it and most people defend the way it worked -- nevertheless, we could have been open to serious attack in case, you know, a bad mistake was made. And meanwhile the A.A.U.P. had come up with elaborated provisions for this and our existing system was while it did not violate anything the A.A.U.P. (because our whole promotion and tenure policy had been based on that for years) nevertheless, it didn't begin to have as much tail or as many protective devices, really, as necessary. I'm not sure that under the new system decisions in individual cases will be any
different from what they were or would have been before. But you are protected. You've got all the documentary stuff. It's guaranteed it goes through these procedures. It's surveyed in the case of arts and sciences by a special faculty committee. In the case of departments doing graduate work, the dean of graduate studies makes his recommendations. There's the opportunity for appeal. They just added a new wrinkle this year of the right of a person, if the recommendation at the departmental level or higher is unfavorable, the right of rebuttal, to submit material which would be considered before the final decision is made. I found this is all fine; it involves a lot of work. And when it was first put in and people were denied tenure, you know, almost every case was appealed. Some cases appealed were successful because it was discovered through the appeal process that this or that department had not done its homework as well as they should have and that there were things in favor of the individual which never surfaced. Well, this was partly due to the fact that the new system was just moving and some departments at first (some of those that had little faculty participation in this in the past) they just didn't do enough in the first instance but, oh, the paperwork! The faculty of arts and sciences committee started work just this week on all of this. They're going to have a nice time between now and vacation.

Williams: In general, you would say then, the faculty has supported this peer evaluation?
Fowler: Oh, I think so, yes. Oh, I think it’s much broader participation. None of this can be entirely objective, of course, but is much more objective perhaps than it was. More people have a voice in it. The candidate himself has more recognized opportunity in terms of documentary material in files and this kind of thing. Now this doesn’t mean they’re happy when the decision is unfavorable but I think the faculty as a whole feels much more confident in this. There’s still some human frailty involved, because not just in terms of making mistakes but this may have improved in the last couple years but the first year I had definite impression that one or more departments were happy to pass on the tough decisions to the administrators, you know, with the common attitude: “well, this is what those guys are paid for.” That wasn’t widespread, but I thought I sort of smelled it in one or two instances. But it’s a tremendous problem with the state of the market and the lack of positions. The whole thing is so tight. We timed this thing just about right; it seems to me. If we’d been any later in adopting this elaborate system -- and it took us a long time to do it -- we would have been in increasing trouble because of the job market because the whole thing’s got so tight you better be able to demonstrate that there’s been very careful study and examination of these things and your ducks are in a row and -- so forth because there will continue to be challenges.

Williams: What of student evaluation? This was tried a couple times in
the '60s. Can it ever work?

Fowler: I don't have much confidence in overall student evaluation. I was involved with the students on at least two occasions encouraging them, advising them, and then they went so hog-wild in the stuff that they published that I just washed my hands of it, and I think it can be said they washed their hands of me. That's one kind of evaluation that ends up primarily in a popularity contest. Now student evaluation at the departmental level at the request of and with the cooperation of the department is something else again, and the new evaluation system for the faculty essentially requires that there be some student input. Now it's left pretty much to the departments as to how this is done, but they're doing it pretty well, I think. Yes, there has to be student input. We're very vulnerable if that doesn't happen. But that's different from this overall general student evaluation process by which they come up with a book that is startling or shocking and which they can sell to the public. For one thing, those overall student evaluations usually are a mere sample.

Williams: On the subject of leaves—which you touched on a moment ago—

Fowler: I would say yes so far as the state authorities are concerned, right. You have to work it out some other way and use the appropriate language to justify funds for faculty leaves. In other words, well, I guess it doesn't have to be competitive,
as it is in our case, but it helps to have it competitive.

In other words, the applicants have got to submit projects demonstrating they're going to be involved in research; they're just not getting sabbatical and taking off for Greece. This is the kind of thing that creates sparks in Virginia. So, but we've run into no trouble. Of course, if we had more flexibility in our total faculty of arts and sciences this would be much easier to handle. That is to say, if we could put people on leave without having to fill their places. Now the physics department does this by agreement. You know they became very sensitive to the fact that in the judgment of everybody else they were a great deal overstaffed in terms of the state formulas of student-teacher ratios. So there is a clear understanding now that if a member of the physics department goes on leave, receiving a grant or something like that of his own, he won't have to be replaced. Now, if this kind of thing could operate more generally it would loosen up the whole thing of leaves. Some institutions have a scheme whereby a man is granted leave on his salary or half of it, and members of his department take over his work without any extra money with the understanding their number will come up soon, you see. Well, again, if you've got enough power, enough flexibility in the teaching loads within a department this can be managed. We don't have in many cases, most cases.

We kicked all those different schemes around here at William
and Mary in the last few years just trying to loosen up this business of faculty leave as opposed to sabbaticals. We started very modestly. I guess the first year we only had two of these faculty semester leaves, and now it's six or eight, I think. We've also provided that a faculty member has the opportunity to decide which semester he'll be on leave in a given two-year period, which gives it more flexibility and probably helps the department to plan accordingly in course offerings. So that system's growing. I would say if they could double the number of faculty semester leaves this could go a long way to meeting the needs of those who really want to go on leave and who are doing that kind of research. This would help a great deal. Now this wouldn't count the people who got grants, you know, support from other sources. You'd still have that.
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Williams: The first question I do want to ask you this morning, Dean Fowler, is about students. To what extent was your office involved in student issues? I'm thinking particularly in the late '60s, such as the decision not to suspend classes after Kent State, things of this nature.

Fowler: Well, that was the only sort of occasion when the office was directly involved and, of course, we were in this instance we had special faculty meetings and passed after long debates more resolutions. I would say the attitude of the faculty toward the students under those frightening circumstances was definitely sympathetic in terms (at least of the majority) in terms of understanding why they felt the way they did and to a considerable extent having the same personal reactions to the horrible event. At the same time there was the definite hope that the academic program and schedule would go on as usual. As I recall the only major concession we made in terms of requirements and standards was that under certain circumstances students could complete requirements for courses, provided the instructor agreed, in certain ways. We were rather generous in making arrangements for students submitting late work, this kind of thing. They attempted on one occasion a strike of all classes. The participation was minimal; I suspect 90 percent of the faculty held their classes on that stated day or days, and a great many of the
students showed up. I remember my own case I went ahead with my classes as usual and had normal attendance. We were lucky, of course; throughout all those turbulent times there was virtually no violence on the campus. There were demonstrations in the Sunken Garden elsewhere. We had a sit-down in James Blair to the point where a group moved in mattresses and slept in the hallway of the first floor. I remember arriving at work one morning and seeing them there. It was all sort of polite and controlled. Those of us who had our offices on the first floor of James Blair went about our business without any significant interruptions. We did have an occasion or two where a couple of faculty members participated in these student demonstrations and made speeches and so forth. This helped to create some problems between the then administrators of student affairs and members of the faculty who thought they were all together, the student administrators were all together too conservative and unfeeling, failing really to understand what was going on. I don't know what more I could add on that point in any great significance. And of course, when that was over or about the same time -- I forget the timing on this -- the students were pushing for more voice, more participation in academic and educational policy. There were some concessions. You could probably tell me when students were put on faculty committees. And, you know, they were sort of pushy on grading and some of these things which have continued to be issues, like the
academic calendar, the double major thing attendance at faculty meetings. On some points there were concessions; on others there were not. Compared to so many places in the country, the majority of William and Mary students were pretty conservative. So we were lucky. There were a few bomb scares. I remember getting very angry one day when I had to evacuate my office for an hour or so. I almost refused to leave; the security police told me I had to. I didn't believe there was any bomb in the place. I would say we were fortunate.

Williams: You did not find here that protests interfered with academics, in other words?

Fowler: Very, very little except at the height of it, which was Kent State, Cambodia almost simultaneously, wasn't it?

Williams: Yes, May of '70. Another miscellaneous thing I wanted to ask you about: at one point, I guess it was early '70s, the college as a whole was involved in a suit brought by H.E.W. concerning integration. Had there been an attempt beforehand to hire blacks? This was one of the things H.E.W. wanted to have more black representation on the faculty.

Fowler: The attempts, however unsuccessful, go back a long way. William and Mary did have and I suppose continues to have the image of a white institution and we had a terrible time of those of us who were involved, in trying to overcome this and to attract blacks to the faculty and to admit black students. At one time I had these figures in my head, namely the number of
blacks to whom positions on the faculty had been offered and who turned us down. As far as the departments are concerned, the two leaders in this were physics and English. Course, English always has some turnover with temporary appointments, which gave us more opportunity there; and for a number of years we would interview two, three, four blacks for the English department and end up having perhaps one. I remember one year we offered two positions in the physics department to blacks, and they turned us down. They went elsewhere either because of more attractive offers or because they didn't like the atmosphere down here, didn't want to be alone. I remember one of the best people we interviewed for an appointment in English: He was very frank about this when we talked in my office. He made it clear that he wasn't going to come down here for the purpose of trying to help us solve this problem. He made it clear that if he did come to us he was not going to be a kind of father-confessor to the black students. He just wouldn't allow himself to be that involved because he had serious scholarly interests, and this has been a problem for one or two blacks that we have appointed. This has been and I understand continues to be a problem for a fine person that we have in English, and she has handled this problem very well. She has succeeded in not being too much involved, as I understand it, with black students but at the same time has maintained good rapport. Now as far admission of undergraduates:
I've known something about that because I've always been in rather close touch with the admissions office. I served on the admissions committee for years, and to me it's one of the most important activities of the whole institution so I was kept informed to a certain extent as to how many blacks applied, how many were admitted, and then how many actually matriculated in September.

We were at one time granting admission to over 50 percent of the blacks who applied but when September arrived no where near as many as had been admitted showed up. In the meantime they had decided to go elsewhere, again for a whole variety of reasons. I remember one case -- this is several years ago now -- I happen to remember this one pretty well. There was a bright girl from Norfolk, I believe, who had good scores and a good high school record. We admitted her and offered her you know a small scholarship (one of the Martin Luther King scholarships), plus the opportunity to do other things which would virtually take care of all of her expenses. On the other hand she got a nice $14,000 scholarship from Brandeis so she went. We lost her. So we run into that kind of thing. It's partly that we haven't had enough money for these students. Secondly, it's the image, the atmosphere and the standards of William and Mary. I'm inclined to think that point has been exaggerated. I'm inclined to think that in some of the recruiting of blacks that's gone on there's been too much talk on the part of the recruiters as to William and Mary's standards, how tough it is, and this I don't believe this. I believe it's good, the
standards are fine, but I think this has been overdone to some extent, and there's been a kind of backlash on the part of black youngsters without any intent on the part of the recruiters, who are trying to give the right image of the college. This point, perhaps, was overplayed in the conversations with the students. At the same time—we referred to this elsewhere in our conversations—there was no inclination to set up special programs for them, no easy path to a degree. I don't pretend to know the answers to this integration problem. One thing that's worried me and I've seen it happen or read about it happening in other institutions—that when a predominantly white institution gets a few hundred blacks, then you have problems with that situation. They organize themselves, have their activities, in some cases even their own social groups if they aren't actually fraternities, sort of withdraw from their fellow white students and this can create all kinds of problems within the institution. If you only have a handful of them, that's very bad. If you have several hundred, as I said, other problems arise within the institution. Oh, I always wished we could have up to 10 percent of the faculty of arts and sciences black, and of course, we've come nowhere near that. I don't think the effort in this direction, until perhaps recently, has been sufficiently organized, perhaps not enough pressure from the top in the sense any number of departments who have infrequent openings for faculty are not really going to recruit
blacks. Some, I might add, are not going to recruit unless they are led to. So far as the blacks are concerned, I would say the efforts until certainly the last three years or so was the work of certain individuals who happened to be in positions where they could exert some influence, perhaps get some results, like the chairman of the physics department, chairman of the English department, my office, but that's not a wide-concerted effort. I don't mean to limit it to those three places, but the effort was sort of sporadic, isolated, individual again, finances were a factor in this. Well, in the first place, we were late in getting into the game and some of the best black people had already been secured by other institutions and as we got into recruiting in individual areas we ran into terrific competition. For I would say at least a decade a real good black, male or female, could go almost anywhere they wanted to go. The field there for the good ones. One thing we refused to do at William and Mary on this and this was very definitely my position, we were not going to raid black institutions to steal faculty from them, no. I can think of only two cases where we were very much interested in faculty members from black institutions. In one case, as I recall, the candidate was a volunteer; he presented himself, and in the other case it was a question of a temporary visiting appointment with the possibility of it becoming a permanent one for a well-known and it was he who withdrew from the conversations
and decided to remain where he was. Actually we were wrong in this, though it was a little bit different. We did not turn as we should have to the best graduate schools, like Howard University. Now, it's true the law school tried to recruit there, but I don't recall that we did in arts and sciences. I don't know whether we'll ever solve the problem.

Williams: For the reasons that you've named?

Fowler: I think size and location has something to do with it. Well, first, a large university has more opportunity to do this. They have the chance to bring in more blacks so that they then have some feeling of community and friends and so forth. Also, the location of the institution can be a factor. If blacks come to the College of William and Mary, what is there for them in the community? It's very much a problem. On several occasions when we were recruiting blacks in the English department, people saw to it that those candidates met certain blacks in Williamsburg and had totally open and free talks about what the climate would be like for them and so forth. It was all the difference in the world between blacks coming to William and Mary and thereby residing in Williamsburg or nearby or blacks in an institution in New York City; yes, because even if there are problems within the institution where they work there are all these other opportunities outside of the institution. That's been a handicap to us. I feel certain it has been. Well, you would know as well as I that's it's a very complex problem.
Williams: You brought up another case: that of women, and the efforts also made to recruit women, similar to the ones you've described for blacks.

Fowler: Well, it seems to me there's been great variation from one department to another in their attitude toward having women faculty members. In some departments, no problem whatsoever, assuming that qualifications are relatively equal they'd just as soon have women as men. But there have been some departments where it's been terrible to crack that barrier, and the departments that still don't have a single woman. Some of these are small ones, some of them are in fields where there aren't too many women candidates, but in my time as dean -- course, I was by no means the only one responsible -- but in my time as dean we doubled the number of women on this faculty and in the process improved the position and circumstances of those who were already ready with us and, of course, more recently with the very positive salary adjustment in a number of places the situation has been improved. I might say on that score (and I was very much involved in this -- I guess it was my last year) with one or two exceptions it was my position and I stated this more than once in documents to the vice-president and then to the president that there was no real evidence of discrimination against female members of the William and Mary faculty on the basis of prejudice and some of the charges that were made against us on this score when one put down the facts and pointed out the number of women on William and Mary faculty
who did not have the highest earned degree in their field, for example. This, of course, influenced their advancement in terms of rank and salary. In other words, with one or two exceptions (as I said, I think it could be demonstrated and I thought I had demonstrated because we did some work on this, gathered all the information) that the circumstances of many women members of the faculty could be reasonably explained in terms of academic background and training, years of service, and scholarly productivity. We were judging them on the same bases the men were judged for their salary and rank. But with all the pressures and when it was done it was done.

After I retired my understanding why a special adjustment was made in a given year, and a great many cases and significant raises given -- that doesn't mean I necessarily approve what was done, but I can understand it and go along. On the other hand.

And in the last few years while I was dean it could be demonstrated that in a given year the average percentage of salary increase for women on the faculty was higher than for men. So we were pushing it up, but we were not making in a given year a positive readjustment to satisfy the pressures that were put upon us even though some of them were behind. I found it very difficult to justify virtually an automatic 10 percent increase for all women on the faculty when we weren't doing that for groups of males who were also out of line in some respects, like the assistant professor rank or the
salaries in the associate professor rank. I thought this was a form of discrimination: that you made a special effort for the women but you didn't make any special organized effort for those groups and perhaps in some cases were the victims of inequities. When you appoint somebody, say, to the rank of assistant professor in a given year at what is then your going, starting salary and then within five years the market has gone way up and, say, you appoint an assistant professor at starting a visiting professor $2,000 above where you started that other fellow five years earlier. Again and again as they both move up the gap is never completely closed. This kind of inequity gets built into the system and I used to try to watch this (as did some department chairmen) and make adjustments, but inevitably there were these built-in inequities. And of course it all comes down again to money. If we had plenty of money we could have made all these adjustments, yes; it'd be lovely. And then, of course, in the last years we were limited by state and federal policy as to the average increase in the totals of the faculty that was authorized. We managed to exceed it a little.

Williams: Skipping on to another subject then: how would you assess the role of the A.A.U.P. here at William and Mary in the years that you've been here?

Fowler: You mean the national A.A.U.P.?

Williams: No, the chapter here. Its role and effect on the faculty.

Fowler: The chapter here has not been very effective. At their meetings
they turn out twenty to thirty people; that's all. They've done an earnest job in trying to speak for the faculty and push for all of the benefits and improvements, but their impact, I would say, on both faculty and administration has been limited. Now, the institution ever since I've known it has been greatly influenced by nationally policies; oh yes, indeed, our record on this score is good. The number of problems that we have had with tenure or academic freedom have been minimal; you can count them on the fingers of one hand, and we have followed and written into our own statements the policies of the A.A.U.P. which have become almost universal in the United States, at least in the better institutions. One reason why three or four years ago we rewrote and expanded our policy statements on retention, promotion, tenure, and so forth was because the A.A.U.P. had been developing much more complete and detailed statements on these things and we had fallen behind a little bit. There was nothing wrong with our policy, it just wasn't spelled out as much as it should be under the circumstances of the 1970s, where almost everything you do is open to challenge. But we were always in accord with the spirit and the intent of the basic A.A.U.P. policies. The A.A.U.P. chapter here, you know, has gone through a very interesting transformation over the years. I don't know what has been talked to you about this.

Williams: Somewhat. Particularly about the early years.

Fowler: Right, when it was almost a secret society and didn't even meet
on the campus. I think it was my first year here, '34-'35, when they started to meet on the campus after John Stewart Bryan had become president, and I was taken in to the chapter, I guess, in the fall of '35. In those days it was an honor.
You didn't just volunteer to join the local chapter of the A.A.U.P.—no indeed. You were selected. It was much more scholarly in nature in its meetings than was true later, particularly when you were new; you were definitely expected -- I can't say required -- to read a paper before the chapter and have a discussion. So every meeting we met down in the Brafferton — something like this went on and this way you got to judge your colleagues and much of it was worthwhile; you learned something. Well, then it changed. Quite properly the chapter should have gotten away from that sort of semi-secret, private character it had and open up. Well, they did open up. At one time the meetings would be crowded in terms of the membership and it was very healthy and active. I think almost inevitably it began to lose its appeal to some people because it had ceased to be the kind of body it was; thereby some people lost interest. Another thing that happened: as the chapter certainly doubled or tripled in membership, there were a fair number of the faculty who joined the local chapter but never joined the national. This always got to me. I belonged to the national chapter since 1935, and so when I became dean I had to be changed from a regular member to an associate member.
I'm a member to this day. Any members of the faculty over the years have affiliated with the local chapter but never bothered to join the national or contribute to them. I'm not sure to what extent this point has influenced the impact of the local chapter on the faculty as a whole and, say, the administration. Has the influence of their voice been diminished over there by the fact that they are essentially a local group, committed to the policies of the national A.A.U.P., yes, but not many of them members, thereof?

Williams: Why do you think they're not?

Fowler: Oh, I don't know. It's far removed; it's more money out of your pocket; the dues have gone up over the years. In defense of the local chapter I should say on a number of very important occasions in recent years they have in conjunction with other groups and other faculty committees exerted leadership and good influence, yes. So far as positive influence and leadership on many things that are so important to a faculty and therefore to an administration, it has been bodies like the faculty affairs committee that have exerted more influence in the areas which are of great concern to the A.A.U.P. than (I would say) the local chapter of the A.A.U.P. Now there have been occasions where everything worked hand in hand. Now it is true that on occasion members of the faculty affairs committee have been officers in the local A.A.U.P. This has helped to coordinate
efforts. As you probably know, in Virginia for years -- I suppose it's still true to some extent -- the A.A.U.P. has been looked upon with suspicion, and we've had administrators here who shared that. I guess they realize now that the A.A.U.P. has been a pretty reserved, moderate outfit compared to what many institutions are now facing in teachers' unions, you know. I very seldom go to the meetings any more even my last year as dean I'd go to one or two meetings a year when something special was going on or their agenda was dealing with problems which were of concern to me, or the president or others were there speaking on these things. Well, nationally the A.A.U.P. has been a godsend, I'd say, to the academic world.

Williams: Has it been a help to the faculty, or has it been just for appearances sake that they've had in recent years regular access to the Board of Visitors, would you say?

Fowler: That the faculty has had ... We're leaving the A.A.U.P.

Williams: Yes.

Fowler: Oh, yes. Over the years the communication between the faculty, the president's office, and the Board of Visitors has greatly improved. It has not been accomplished easily. For a time certainly it was resisted by the Board of Visitors, but the climate has changed greatly so that, as you know, the faculty now have various means of communicating with the board, particularly board committees, and I think there's much more involvement in the president's office. This doesn't always
nation they got results. But it was really in the selection of President Graves and Vice-President Healy that this was really formalized and conducted by the board and everybody else in total good will. It was very heartwarming at the time after some of the experiences we'd had. And, of course, there's been more social contact between faculty and board and president than was true in the past, certainly under the Paschall and Chandler regimes. As one looks back over it and has some knowledge of what has gone on in other institutions, the record of influence and participation in the determination of policy—the record of William and Mary is pretty good. In some areas the faculty has had a very strong voice; in other areas the authorities haven't been as receptive as they might have been, but my judgment looking at it over a period of forty years is that the faculty has been a very powerful influence in the college, at times at great odds.

Williams: At odds with themselves or at odds with others?

Fowler: The odds were against them in terms of the powers that be. There are those that have said William and Mary is what it is today because of the faculty and despite the leadership or lack of it at times. I've never said that openly, but people have and not necessarily members of the faculty. I've heard one or two alumni say this. I'd also have to say at one time I think the faculty vis-a-vis the Board of Visitors were perhaps too aggressive to the point where
relations to the issue of authority. Now, there's no ques-
tion where the legal authority rests in the College of William and Mary; yes, with the Board of Visitors by statute, and on occasion (some would say rightly so) certainly, and I would under certain circumstances concede that the Board of Visitors got their backs up in terms of rather clear challenge of authority rather than communication, cooperation. That has been resolved it seems to me: the board is no longer so jealous of their authority. They're more willing to share and to delegate and this had to happen before we could have the improved circumstances that we have today.

Now we challenged the board at times; I was a party to it. But as you look back on it I suppose you become a little more moderate and perhaps a little wiser in understanding why the board at times reacted as they did. But I'm sure it could be argued the relationship would not be what it is today if the faculty had not been aggressive.

Williams: You think then that improved communications caused this better climate, or were they the end result of it?

Fowler: End result. Inevitably the board, or the majority of the board, are more conservative the governing is more conservative than the faculty. This is still true. There are members of any governing board in the United States that don't believe in tenure and have very limited notions of academic freedom. Fortunately, the number of those with those views has diminished on the William and Mary board.
Williams: We've spoken on a number of other occasions about the role of the faculty vis-a-vis the president in the case of Bryan and Pomfret and Chandler. Now at one time I think President Pomfret conducted faculty meetings himself, didn't he? And Chandler did on occasions, too.

Fowler: And John Stewart Bryan did if he could be there.

Williams: Bryan did if he were here, but by the Paschall administration it was either Mel Jones or you who conducted faculty meetings. Was this merely an outgrowth of the volume of work showing the president's office, or is it more significant than that?

Fowler: Partly, considerably. But also, I think, the president being uncomfortable in this role, and despite the statements to the contrary, the tendency to minimize the role of the faculty in the scheme of things, but under Chandler and on occasion under Paschall the faculty meetings were very tense, sharp conflict on the floor between faculty and the president. I can understand why the president didn't want to expose himself to that, even though he might have been wrong, but it wasn't a very comfortable position. But in all fairness there was also certainly the feeling that the faculty should have their own leadership, presiding officers and so forth. The president could be there and listen but not have to preside. When the presiding officer is personally involved in what's going on on the floor and subject to criticism and having to respond and defend his position, that
puts the presiding officer in a very difficult situation. Now he could always step aside and ask somebody to take
the chair, as was done on occasion, but it was a much more
simplified situation and comfortable situation to have
somebody else preside. Furthermore, my understanding is that
you know, this is what prevails in institutions throughout the country
where there is very lively faculty participation and debate;
that the president does not preside. In many places the
dean doesn't preside; they choose a chairman. There was a
pretty strong move in that direction just before I retired
in the revision of the by-laws for some of the reasons I've
stated: it freed the dean of the necessity to preside, there-
fore removing himself from debate. It sometimes put him in
a position of confrontation with his faculty which, again, is
a little different if you're on the floor as opposed to if
you're presiding. I can understand the reasons and arguments
for this. I opposed it very strongly. I still think the dean
should be up there as presiding officer and leader of
that faculty. If he wants to step aside to get involved in
debate and so forth, he can at any moment. At the same time,
if there's no personal involvement it's perfectly easy for
him to have his views become obvious to the faculty. Well,
anyway that was defeated, and I think wisely so. There were
long arguments on what was the real relationship between the
dean and his faculty and so forth. The feeling that this might
diminish the influence and leadership of the dean. And without
presiding as the way we've operated things would become much more complicated for the dean's office who's responsible for carrying out any number of things that were acted upon, who's responsible for seeing the secretary's minutes are typed up, all this kind of thing. If after a faculty meeting the dean then had to confer with the chairman and the secretary and others who'd participated in order to follow up on the business of the faculty, it would just have been much more time-consuming. I had this experience to a limited degree when they did vote to remove the dean from being chairman of the faculty affairs committee. This didn't create any serious problems by any means but I happened to think this was a mistake too, not on account of myself but just on account of the office and the way things operate. But it is fact that after this happened there would have to be a good deal of communication between the dean's office and the chairman of the faculty affairs committee, which was time-consuming for both of us.

Williams: I gather from what you're saying then that Dr. Paschall did not even come to faculty meetings after a time.

Fowler: After a time he did not appear unless there was some specific reason for his presence, either because he had something to communicate to us or because there was something to be communicated directly to him. So his presence in his later years was very infrequent. Now President Graves never misses -- if he's in town.
Williams: I was going to say, at least in the minutes that I've read, President Graves and Dr. Healy were at almost all of the meetings.

Fowler: That's right. There are always occasions when a person can't be there but I suppose his attendance -- the president's -- is 90 percent at meetings and he rarely ever says anything. He doesn't want to unless there is some occasion where it is important to him to say something but he never, except on an occasion or two, very rarely attempts to influence debate or vote. In fact, most times he doesn't vote; he has the right to. The same is true of Vice-President Healy. He very seldom voted. I assume this is still the situation. Of course, when we were having difficulty sometimes in getting a quorum I always counted them as part of the quorum. Certainly they are full voting members of the faculty.

Williams: Do you think this has been significant of an attitude of the Graves administration: the attendance?

Fowler: Oh, yes. Now, Vice-President Healy attends, I think, all the meetings of the other faculties (schools). President Graves does occasionally. No where as near as he does arts and sciences. But they're both members of all faculties. Well, you know, the president can't be going to five, six, eight faculty meetings a month. The president almost always has something to say at the faculty meetings at the beginning. The first order of business, after the minutes are read and approved, is reports of administrative officers and if he has something to
communicate either from Richmond or the board or something like this, he's the first one and this subjects him, of course, to questions and comments.

Williams: It's been said the Paschall administration was very personally based on the person of Paschall. Did you find this true in your work?

Fowler: I'm not quite sure what you mean.

Williams: That Dr. Paschall himself was the only one who knew everything that was going on, rather than delegating authority.

Fowler: I would say there's a good deal of truth in that in relative terms. The faculty certainly -- and deans -- knew much less about what was going on under Paschall. One person he really confided in in academic matters really was Vice-President Jones. He was in on a lot of secrets. We deans for the most part were in the dark on a great many things. Paschall didn't have personal conferences with his deans; he didn't have staff meetings of this nature. As a matter of fact, President Graves doesn't do this on a regular basis. You get called in on specific matters. You'd be involved with the other deans and other people on certain occasions in group meetings in the president's office, but again, there's no regular consultation in the form of staff meetings between the president and the academic deans. There were times when we were really in the dark as to what was going on. I suppose at one spell -- I could almost say I wasn't in the president's office to talk for two or three years. Now, if there was a
major problem which your office was involved, sure, but this was very occasional. No, he wanted you to occasionally talk with Vice-President Jones, and then Jones would talk with the president, and some of this were very unhappy about this. You know, you like to have the opportunity to speak for yourself, particularly perhaps if you're more positive and outspoken person than the vice-president happens to be. You want to get a chance to give your own message. Now of course if you requested this, sure, it would happen, but it should have occurred in the normal processes. And, of course, in his last years President Paschall was terribly overworked; his health was not good. Some of the situation can be attributed to that, but it was his nature, I would say, to operate in this fashion. At the same time, you know, he could be a very warm, friendly man. I was always fond of him personally, but again and again I would say, "This is no way to run a railroad." But that office is so terribly busy and all kinds of people wander in there and either get appointments or just go over there and are admitted. President Paschall was always available to students dropping in or individual members of the faculty or department chairmen who would bypass my office and Vice-President Jones' office and go right to the president and get a hearing. That wasn't the best procedure for the state of the nation, shall I say. That's very difficult for any administrator to turn somebody away, but some of this could
have been remedied by immediate communication. If some of these individuals, if the president could have said, "Have you talked to Fowler? Have you talked with Jones?" "No." "Well, don't you think you ought to?" At the same time listening to them for awhile but seeing to it that eventually these things went through the proper channels but there wasn't that kind of follow-up. There's much better follow-up -- or there was -- on the part of President Graves on this, but again it came down through Vice-President Healy, not directly to the person, to the administrator most directly concerned usually. It came down that way and sometimes this caused delays.

Williams: What was the affect of Carter Lowance's appointment on this whole process that you're talking about?

Fowler: Well, I would say, certainly that it did not diminish communication or proceeding through proper channels or existing channels. Carter Lowance was an old hand at this thing and a superb little administrator. Excellent presiding officer of the committee in getting things done. I enjoyed greatly working with Carter Lowance. This didn't happen too frequently because, of course, he deliberately stayed out of academic matters as much as he could. Now, you never can separate entirely academic matters, budget, this kind of thing, so he was often involved and then, oh, if there were legal matters or challenges of something President Paschall (at least usually) turned that over to Carter Lowance, and then he dealt with us. I think Carter
Lowance was a great addition to the administration. I know there are those who don't share the view, feeling he was another layer put in there, but he was such a good executive and such a pleasant man to work with, never ruffled. I suppose my major concern was that inevitably, given his background and the workings of his mind and so forth, that virtually every important decision that he was involved in and perhaps was making was influenced to some extent by political considerations. He was always thinking about, "Well, now, how will this or that affect Richmond and Richmond's thinking toward the college?" At times I think this was overdone. At other times, it was a voice and a point of view which was very appropriate in the discussions. He's a very conservative man politically. This perhaps led to some criticism that he did not understand or he misunderstood faculty members or the faculty as a whole in certain situations. He's a fine man, a very efficient little man. Despite the fact that we were poles apart politically we found ourselves agreeing so often on things here at the college. I don't know how they're getting along without somebody in that position. It could be a totally different person, but the workload for the vice-president's office and the president's office has just been increased that much, you know. And, of course, Vice-President Healy doesn't have an assistant any more. We had an assistant vice-president, you know, for several years. Now, the lady who was his secretary was elevated
to the position of administrative assistant, and she can help him without being bogged down with dictation and secretarial work. She can do a lot of the paper work on budgets and other things and is very helpful, but she can't make any decisions. She can't deal with faculty, so that he has to be involved in meetings with faculty committees and faculty-student committees as well as the regular functions of the advisory committee to the vice-president, the advisory committee of deans. So there's a terrific workload over there. He works almost every weekend, all weekend, and the president does some of the same, but he does see to it that he gets some time off. He has to.

Williams: Well, I said I would ask you some questions about the office of the dean of the faculty in general. Now your successor was elected by the faculty is that right; or am I wrong on that?

Fowler: There was a search committee (<a faculty search committee, with a couple of students on it>) and they made their recommendations to the president.

Williams: Would it give the dean more power if he were elected by the faculty, do you think? More of a mandate maybe?

Fowler: It would change to some extent his relation with the faculty, but even if it could be done under Board of Visitors' bylaws, my feeling is it'd be disastrous in his relations with his superiors. The dean of the faculty holds a dual position, yes: he's the dean of the faculty, he's their leader, he's their
spokesman but he's also an important administrative officer under the vice-president and the president. He sits on two stools and this is about the most difficult job that a dean has to handle. He's got to keep the confidence and the respect of the faculty; at the same time he's got to be able to work with the vice-president and the president. He can't sell out to either one; otherwise, the nature of the position is drastically changed.

No, the president has to have authority to appoint the chief administrative officers, but he makes the appointment on the basis of careful selection and nomination. The committee submitted four names to the president for my replacement. The president in his directive to the search committee as I recall had said no fewer than three and no more than five, and the president made his decision. That's the way to proceed.

Williams: Because of the dual nature of this office.

Fowler: If the dean were elected by the faculty -- in a sense, the only way the president could get rid of him is if that dean had enough sense to realize when he didn't have the president's confidence and couldn't work the way he should with the administration and therefore resigned. Election of the dean almost certainly he becomes the faculty's man and that essential dual position, essential to the faculty as much as to the administration. Yes, if he's not an effective spokesman for the faculty to the top administrators this
can be a handicap to the faculty. Playing this dual role can be done, but it's difficult, but you've got to try; otherwise you don't belong in that office, as far as I'm concerned.

Williams: Would the proposal for a term of office -- would this have hampered, do you think, this problem or contributed to the problem of the dual role? Fowler strongly opposed the term of office.

Fowler: I believe it would. You're under approval. It's almost like an elected official who's looking forward to the next election. I think it's much better to let nature take its course so to speak and see how other things work out. It's entirely possible for a faculty to get rid of their dean without putting him on a terminal appointment. Certainly, if the situation gets that serious they can go directly to the president and sure, if it got that serious and the dean didn't have enough sense to withdraw, I don't think it accomplishes anything except to diminish the nature of the office. I don't think it accomplishes anything for the faculty or for the administration. Furthermore, the president had no intention of putting other administrative officials on a terminal appointment. Why should they pick out the dean of arts and sciences just because he happened to be retiring at that time?

You see, at the very time that this was being debated the president was coming up with this plan for the periodic evaluation of all administrative officers, and he didn't want any
administrative officer on a term appointment; treat them all the same and we'll go through this process of periodic evaluation, much of which has been going on. So that was another protection against some of the fears that the advocates of the limited term held; that there would be this periodic evaluation. I have no idea how it's working, but I know it's proceeding because I've been involved. My opinion has been requested in certain cases.

I would think.

Williams: Why then was this proposal for a term of office made, do you think?

Fowler: I'd say it was the product of bad judgment and misguided opinion on the part of some faculty members who didn't really appreciate the nature of the office, the dean's relation vis-a-vis the faculty and vis-a-vis the administration.

I say this because much of this came out in the debate on the issue, and it was really surprising not to say startling at the number of people in the faculty that really had no understanding of what the dean did, what went on, and some members of the faculty undertook to enlighten these individuals, and discussion was very interesting in terms of the nature of the dean's office and his capacity in the scheme of things.

This tone in the discussion certainly influenced the outcome and educated some members of the faculty. They were persuaded this was just unsound procedure and that there were all these other ways by which an impossible dean could be removed
if he didn't have enough sense to get out himself. I have an idea unless a very significant change in faculty personnel that that issue is pretty well dead as the result of the rather high level of the debate on the subject. I may be wrong, but I don't think the proposal to give the dean a limited term would find much support. Now, we can't read the future. It's possible that a disaster of some kind might change things, but it's certainly buried, I think, for some time and rightly so. There was also the argument at the time, you know, when they were interviewing outsiders for my replacement, this point was strongly urged, namely, that having a limited term could dissuade good people, outsiders who weren't too familiar with the situation to say, "No thank you." That was a rather convincing argument to some people. I don't know why they ever thought that. As I recall, one or two of the outside candidates who talked with me inevitably, I wasn't involved in the selection process but these candidates were given the opportunity to talk to me and others about the position and so forth. I guess I saw them all -- and one or more, I think as I recall, had heard of this proposal to limit the term and wanted to know about it, and I could tell, if he was rather guarded, he didn't much of that proposition.

Williams: This question is intended to cover a good bit of the time that you have been at William and Mary. For the time that you've been here, for the time that my project covers there's been
conflict, quiet at times and not so quiet at other times, over what the purpose of the College of William and Mary is. In recent years it's been conflict over, is it a liberal arts college or a small university? You favor the former. Why?

Fowler: Well, for a variety of reasons. First, that was my background. Secondly, it was the kind of institution I knew when I came here. I thought it had possibilities to develop along these lines. I thought it could become almost unique in the state of Virginia and in the South as a first-rate undergraduate, coeducational, residential college of arts and sciences. Otherwise, I felt it would be all too easy for William and Mary to dissipate its limited resources in trying to do too much.

This brings me secondly, I suppose, to thinking about the climate in Virginia for this kind of thing. I've always been convinced the Commonwealth of Virginia is not going to really support more than two major universities, namely the University of Virginia and V.P.I. It is true, of course, that Old Dominion has emerged as a very useful, urban, metropolitan, strongly service institution; the same thing is true of Virginia Commonwealth and the commonwealth has given those two institutions increasing financial support but proportionately nothing like what's been given over the years to University of Virginia and V.P.I. So I never thought there'd be enough money to do it right. But, of course, I always came back to this first point: that this was the kind of institution that I'd
like to be a part of. I'd always hoped that the commonwealth would recognize this was William and Mary's place in the scheme of things and give us adequate support to do the job. There's some prejudice involved, I suppose, in the sense that I've never wanted to be part of an institution that was engaged in community service or extension work, one that was too strongly directed toward teacher education or vocational and professional work. Again, I suppose that's partly background; it's partly the kind of situation in which you yourself are personally happy. Given the fact of the limited resources, given the fact that a high-grade job of education can be done -- personally, philosophically, and I might say practically -- that's the kind of institution I think William and Mary ought to be. Now I haven't been too upset about the graduate work; I think we've gone too far. I think we have some very weak graduate programs that should have been abolished some time ago. Once you get something, how do you get rid of it? I'm delighted that we got out of the extension game. I wish to heaven we could get rid of Richard Bland, but I think there are some things we can do and are doing which are worth while. I wouldn't expand the graduate program unless we cancelled some of what we already had. I could go for a Ph.D. in computer science. Now that may sound in complete conflict with what supposedly is my philosophy, but it's become a very important field; there's a good market for it. We have this
terrific facility down here at Langley that would be available to us, and I think if we don't already have it we've begun to gather a good young staff that could do a respectable job. Furthermore, of course, I think if we expanded the institution by the introduction of new programs this would tend to transform one of the basic features of William and Mary: namely, that it's a residential institution. We could take more students at William and Mary as far as classroom space is concerned by lengthening the calendar of the day, this kind of thing; go back to Saturday morning classes if necessary, but what would this do? Where would we bed them down? And this would just detract from one of our qualities and one of the things that appeals to a great many students. And I should say this: I think something very important to William and Mary is its standing with the academic world outside of Virginia. We still enjoy the image of first-rate undergraduate college. This has opened the doors and will continue to open the doors (unless we become something different) to our graduates to go to the best universities in the United States. We continue to enjoy that reputation in the top institutions in the United States. I think if it appeared that we were becoming more of a university, spreading our efforts, that that national image could be injured. A lot of people forget that this is very much a part of William and Mary's standing in the United States, wholly apart from our place in the scheme of things in Virginia. I think we're doing some respectable graduate
work, yes I do, and I would continue that. It has had, I think, some advantage in getting money from the state. It has had a favorable effect on recruiting and retention of certain faculty. It's had its advantages, but I don't think we can afford to go much further in terms of its effect on the total nature of the institution. Just its mere size would have an unfortunate affect in my view. But don't ask me to try to define the purpose of William and Mary or any other college, really, in terms that would be acceptable to any significant audience or audience of any significant size. I'm inclined to think that's sort of tommyrot anyway. When we did our self-study for the southern association back in '63 we had a terrible time trying to write the statement of the purpose of the institution and the end result was that no statement of purpose was officially adopted by faculty board for the institution and we were taken to task by the visitation team of the southern association for this. Well, I'd listened to all this; I must say I thought it was a lot of rubbish. We knew pretty well what we were doing and wanting to do, and having a neatly written statement, much of it made up of platitudes, would never create any miracle anywhere. I think we had a statement of sorts in the catalog and elsewhere that is acceptable. But I suppose to a lot of people it does indicate that we don't really know what we're doing or where we're going. Well, we've stumbled along in pretty good fashion, I think. There's never been a dull moment.
in forty years. I’m inclined to think institutions thrive on controversy. It’s good; it’s healthy, provided there are constructive results that emerge from controversy.