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February 19, 1976  Williamsburg, Virginia

Williams: You are the first person that I've talked to who came to William and Mary in World War II not as a student, not as a faculty member; you came with the A.S.T.P. unit that was here. How was this group received into the college?

Brooks: The unit got here (the men and the officers, too) in August of 1943 and there were no students on campus then. In September when the students came back they (that is, the army) were very well received by the students. One of the clubs that I mentioned earlier -- I'm not sure it still exists -- the German Club (social club) arranged for a dance for these men so they could be able to meet some of the people here living on campus. It was the first of many successful social ventures.

Well, this unit was a very select group of army personnel and ranged in age roughly from 18 to 44. All enlisted men, many of whom had had one or maybe two years of college.

It was the most talented group of men -- there were 500 of them -- that I think I've ever been associated with. It made little or no difference what activity one wished to promote; there were people there able to do it. For example, we wanted to have a marching band, so I put a notice out on the board: "Those persons interested in being in a marching band please meet such-and-such a place." The room
was flooded with people who were able musicians. So from that we formed a dance orchestra as well as a marching band. Then they wanted some people to play football for William and Mary. We put up another notice; they played football for William and Mary. Did the same thing in basketball. Had a chorus. No matter what the activity was you had people there who were able and interested in performing or participating as the case might be. So it was a rather unusual group. It was a pre-engineering program in which the men were initially housed under the stadium and then when college opened up -- or roughly around that time, perhaps a little later -- Blow Gymnasium became the headquarters of the unit, and the larger gymnasium became the bedroom. It was filled with double-decker bunks. That's where they stayed most of the time, for a long period of time, when they were finally moved somewhere else -- I've forgotten -- and the gymnasium was used for basketball in the winter. But this very talented group of men had a really rough schedule, I thought. They took six subjects a day: English, geography, mathematics, physics, chemistry, and history, plus their military training, which they had to keep up with.

Williams: You had special military instructors -- did they take these courses or were they all faculty?

Brooks: No, these were all college persons. In fact, Chuck Marsh was one of the instructors, as I recall, in economics and...
Dr. Jess Jackson, the former head of the department, who's no longer with us but his wife still is, taught English. Interestingly enough, one of Sigmund Freud's sons was teaching first physics, I believe it was, and then mathematics. He was not a regular member of the faculty but had been brought in because those kinds of persons were very scarce during the war to get as teachers. Every evening—except one, maybe two nights—they had required study hall in the library (where the law school is now) and it was the duty of one of us officers to go over there at least once and sometimes twice during an evening to make sure they were studying and not visiting with some coed or doing something else. And since the course work was very demanding they usually were studying because the penalties for not doing well were pretty severe: you were removed from the unit and put in the infantry and sent overseas, and not many of them wanted that to happen, of course. They'd all hoped to either continue on and get a degree in some form of engineering or be transferred to another unit of a similar type but with a different goal in mind, such as medicine. There were two or three of them that wanted to transfer (and did) to units preparing doctors. The unit—and when I speak of the unit I mean the 500 men—finally broke up, I believe in March of 1944, and most of them were put into the infantry and fought in the Battle of the Bulge over in the European Theater. A number of them became lost in that battle.
I don't know how many, but I knew a few at the time. Then those of us officers who were not sent overseas -- some of them were, some of them weren't -- were sent to various parts within the states. But it was a very fine group of men to deal with and be associated with, and they I think thoroughly enjoyed being stationed here at William and Mary.

Williamsburg was then a pretty much of a military town because Camp Peary over here had a lot of seabees that were in town quite a bit, and then we were close to the military installations in the lower part of the Peninsula and to the navy over in Hampton. Most of the military installations would have buses running to Williamsburg when men had time off so that they could come up here and see the place. We had two or three real good conferences here (that is the college did) in which some of the top men of World War II were here; I've forgotten exactly, but I remember the security was very tight and most people around. So as I say, they were a great group of people.

Williams: Were there special activities in town for them?
Brooks: No. There were so many military people of one kind or another that there were no regular activities. Everything took place on the campus. They didn't have a great deal to do with in the town except they had to go down and get haircuts frequently because the army required short hair in those days, and there was a U.S.O. building (or at least place) where Binn's is now. None of us really had any association
with downtown except the officers. Now the army and the navy or the military had taken over the Williamsburg Inn and some of those men that I showed you and I used to go down there on Saturday nights for dinner, and there was always a dance there. We never did any dancing; we didn't have any dates but we would buy a bottle of beer and nurse it along all night long watching these other people dance and it was a lot of fun. The Williamsburg Lodge, which had quite a different set-up in those days as far as the eating part is concerned. We would go down there to eat once in a while, but most of the time we had our meals in the college dining room. Yet Kent was the manager of it. We had one tragedy that they tried to blame onto the dining hall. One of the soldiers died as a result of, I can remember, perforated intestines (and I'm not quite sure what that means but some kind of an infection) and we had food inspectors: federal ones, state ones, local ones, college people here inspecting the dining hall because both the chaplain's school and the army ate there as well as civilian students, so you had a representative from each group trying to find out if there was anything wrong and there wasn't. The young man had pitched, as I recall, in a softball game down at Fort Eustis a day or two before, and they felt that he may have done something, but I don't know how that could have yielded perforated intestines. But anyway, that caused
a little black cloud for awhile. I used to feel sorry for Yel Kent because his kitchen was always being inspected by someone. He might satisfy navy, but he might not be able to satisfy the army and vice versa. We enjoyed it... there and we ate with the civilians although sometimes we were apart, usually because it was different eating hours, but the soldiers with the students, both boys and girls.

Williams: How did the students react when they came back and here the army had taken over the campus almost?

Brooks: Well, there were not very many male civilian students. I think the girls were pleased. It gave them some companionship that they might not have had otherwise, and since we ran these dances periodically it was quite a good time. Let me just relate one anecdote which I thought to be so amusing. Here was this group of very selected, talented men, as I said earlier, from ages roughly from 18 to 45, and we decided to have a big dance for some reason at one time, and we had some money in our treasury, so a couple of us thought it'd be a nice thing for the soldiers to give each one of their dates a corsage. So we arranged for the florist downtown -- it might have been Schmidt's -- to make up a number of gardenia corsages. I just put a notice up on the bulletin board -- I was kind of a go-between between the college and the military because of what I was doing -- I just put a notice that you could
obtain your corsages at such-and-such a place the night of the dance, and a couple of enlisted men came in to me and said, "What's that word cor-something mean? What are you talking about?" And so I explained to them. Well, they didn't know what it was or anything about it! So I called a meeting one night of all these men in the Blow Gym. I got a corsage box and a corsage in it from the florist, took it there and put it on the table in front of me and I showed them what it was and said, "A corsage is a flower, and this is what the girl wears. And there's a big long pin in here" and I showed them. I said, "Now you just give the girl the box. Don't you try to stick the flower on with that pin because you might stab her." So after they found out what it was—those who hadn't known—then they thought this was great, and of course the girls were pleased, and it turned very nicely. But somehow or other it never occurred to me that men that old and with the experiences they'd had would not have known what a corsage was. But they didn't.

Williams: And from what you've said and the pictures you've showed me it seems the college authorities were genuinely glad to have this group on campus.

Brooks: I think they were. They certainly went out of their way to be pleasant. Dr. Pomfret would have meetings in his office every once in a while, and the commanding officer of the unit, Major George McGinn, and I would go over there together sometimes, and I was always impressed by Major McGinn's attitude. Then he walked into the president's office
he saluted just as he were saluting somebody who was superior to him and he considered him to be superior.

And we had very fine relations with President Pomfret and Mr. Duke, the bursar at that time, and Dr. Armacost, who was I think the dean of men -- I had some dealings with him. One of the troubles we had initially with the faculty -- and when I say trouble I don't mean caused any trouble, but it was a concern to both of us -- was over the honor system. I can remember going to a meeting with the William and Mary faculty over in Rogers Hall in that large lecture hall and representing the army's point of view. The William and Mary faculty wanted the students to be under the honor system and I took the opposite point of view for this reason: these men had all been in the army at least a year and some of them several years, and they'd been taught to violate every code of ethics that they had been brought up by. I mean, they were being taught to kill before they came here, and it didn't make any difference by what means as long as you were successful in eliminating the enemy. Now we were going to turn around and go by the honor system when the cost of their failure at William and Mary was very high. (As I said earlier, it meant that they would be put in an infantry outfit and sent overseas.) So the upshot of it was that we did not agree to go on the honor system and didn't. In subsequent events we had some very unhappy dealings with soldiers who
were caught cheating, as some of them were, at the time we had final examinations. And then it became my job when this happened to do something about it, so I called the men in, asked them individually if they had cheated and they always admitted that they had and I told them that the penalty was to be shipped out of the outfit and that really broke some of them up pretty badly. But I would then write to our headquarters, which was in Baltimore, recommending that these men be assigned somewhere else. Then in a day they were gone. But it was rather tragic because some of those men got pretty well acquainted with some of the college girls, and when they were shipped it was kind of heartbreaking for both of them. And it was kind of rough on the faculty, too. I had two or three faculty members come over and complain to me because I had shipped out people and I just told them that we weren't going to permit any of these well, they weren't unhappy about the boys that cheated but when I say I "shipped out them out" -- and I made the recommendations to someone else to cut the orders. Boys who didn't keep up in their grades -- and you know how it is so often among students that some students are more apt verbally and some more apt quantitatively and some more apt in both ways and some more apt in neither and as a consequence we would have some boys who would perhaps B+ or better students in math, physics, and chemistry but would be failing English, history, geography, so we
would send them out or the other way around. They'd doing well in English, history, and geography but failing the sciences, and we would ship them out, too. Well, people representing the sciences or the humanities would come and complain because we were taking away their good students.

I had to point out to them that they had to do well in everything in order to stay in the unit. But we had a fine time; I certainly enjoyed my stay here as an officer. I was a 2nd lieutenant, and I said often since then that I had more power as a 2nd lieutenant at William and Mary in 1943 than I ever did as a dean in 1968.

We lived in the upper part of old Phi Beta Kappa Hall where those Phi Beta Kappa and development offices were; (I don't know who's up there now). The enlisted men lived in the gymnasium. Later on they moved to one of the dormitories; Brown Dormitory became a residence hall. We were treated well, and Williamsburg was a nice place to be in. The only thing about Williamsburg, I think -- as a town, I'm not talking about the college -- which was disturbing was that most of the military people and/or their dependents who were spending their time here felt that it was not a good, warm soldiers' or military town and that they were taking economic advantage of these people's hardships had to undergo. And this was unlike some of the other places they had been in where the people bent over backwards to do things for them. I don't know to what extent
that was true among the naval chaplains who were here, but I know among the army people felt this was true. We had very little to do with the chaplain's school. They did put on some very fine entertainment weekends in old Phi Beta Hall because they had a section of their school devoted to music, and there were some exceptionally able musicians that were here then, and they were fun to listen to. The army boys would put on a show periodically, but it would be largely a kind of vaudeville-slapstick thing. It was fun, but it didn't have as broad appeal as the navy's did.

Williamsburg was a nice place to be, and I thought it was because no tourists. When we walked around Williamsburg we did at nighttime, I can remember on Thanksgiving and Christmas it was beautiful, and we just appreciated being here because we could have been a lot of other places (and were later on) that weren't quite so attractive.

Williams: You did then return then in 1947, not in a military capacity but as a professor of psychology. What influenced you in that?

Brooks: Well, when the war was over, when I was discharged it was 1946 I had intended to go back to the University of Pennsylvania and finish my doctorate in psychology. I was discharged at Fort Dix in New Jersey, and when I left there I went over to Philadelphia on my way to meet my wife, who was in Florida. I spent a day at the university trying to find out what would happen to me and then went to Florida.
and spent six weeks -- my wife and I -- on the Gulf beaches, and then came back to Philadelphia, stopped at the university for three or four days -- had some friends of mine who had come back from the service -- and we'd made all the arrangements to go back to the university; we'd even rented a house and then went to my home, which was in New England -- my friends had moved from Springfield, Massachusetts, to Wethersfield, Connecticut, during the war years -- and I had a job for the summer and so did my wife in a boys' camp up in Maine, one that I had worked in before the war.

So we stopped off for a few days with my folks and then went up to Waterville, Maine, and in the meantime the placement office at the University of Pennsylvania had been sending me notices of vacancies, even when I was over in Okinawa and Korea I was getting long before I came home, because college teachers were at a premium then because the G.I.s were all going back to college. I got one notice of a job at Colby College up in Waterville, Maine, right where I was doing my camp work, and so I decided that instead of going back to the university I would teach for awhile so I took a job at Colby College for one year and then my wife and I adopted nephews of my wife's -- my brother's family had broken up -- and we couldn't find an adequate place to live in Waterville, so I decided to move and I'd gotten an opportunity to apply for a position in the Veterans Administration as a
clinical psychologist, which was I had been trained to do.

I wrote to Dr. Miller using him as a reference, and then he wrote that there was this vacancy at the college as director of counseling. And I had a phone call from the man who was then dean, Sharvy Umbeck, to make a long story short, for an interview and took the job when it was offered to me. And then there was no room at all. They had promised me -- well, I don't know promise is the word; I thought it was a promise. I was told, let me put that way -- that there would be housing available for me. Well, I had gone back to camp that summer again, the summer of '47, and after camp I was in Long Island with my college roommate and his wife and my wife before we came down here, and I called up and asked where I should have what little baggage I had sent. Where was this house I was going to get? Well, it turned out there wasn't a house; I could have one room in the Brafferton. So my wife went to her home in Florida, and I went to the third floor in the Brafferton and then in the second semester they gave me another room up there so we'd have two rooms in Brafferton with a connecting door, so I went down and picked up my wife and one of these boys and brought them back with me until summer, I guess. We used to go to the movies at night because it was air conditioned and see the same movie two or three times. It got pretty warm up in Brafferton; in those days it wasn't air conditioned. Anyway, I came back as
director of counseling and assistant professor of psychology. The counseling office was in Washington Hall in 213. I had taken the place of a man by the name of Royall Embree who had come from University of Minnesota and his major advisor and man who helped set up the counseling office was Gilbert Renn, who was a pioneer in American counselor education. (He left Wisconsin, I think, perhaps back when he was getting close to retirement and went to one of the Arizona universities, but in the literature you'll see his name a lot.) I had an assistant, a woman named Dr. McGee; I've forgotten her first name. She was a native of Lynchburg and she stayed here for a year and then left, and then I got a male assistant by the name of Mr. Edward Dernal, who stayed for a year or two and then he left. I didn't have an assistant after that, except the student assistants. The counseling office was partitioned into three parts — I mean that room, 213, was when it was the counseling office — and I had a room with an IBM test scoring machine in it and another room with a calculator to do statistical work and a large sort of reception room and a library on occupations there. In those days, that was before the college required the College Entrance Examination Board, and I used to give the psychological examinations, Scholastic Aptitude Test to all freshmen after they were admitted.
and a reading test, and then I would work up the results and have them and score them and encourage them to come in and talk about their test results. I did that all the time I was here. It was after I left, I guess, that the college boards -- I don't remember when they were being required -- but I was doing that all the time I was here.

And then the college had a branch down in Norfolk called St. Helena's, and I went down there once or twice to give tests to their students when that broke up one of their men came up and shared my office -- John Bright, who's on the campus now. He was director of placement in those days, was the first one they had, and so for a year we shared the same office. I taught usually a couple of courses each semester, sometimes one or two in the summer. All of my courses were in the applied field. I taught courses in testing, courses in educational psychology, and industrial psychology.

Williams: Did you have a lot of veterans both in your classes and to counsel?

Brooks: Yes. There were a lot of them here, and some of them were very difficult counseling cases or one was in particular. I remember I finally had to refer him to Tucker's Hospital up in Richmond. But there were a lot and there were a lot of people who were trying to find out what to do with themselves. These men coming back from the service had a different motivation than they'd had before they went in.
they wanted to point their college education to something specific. Many of them were married. So I did a lot of individual testing with them using vocational aptitude tests, vocational interest tests, personality tests, and then we tried to pull all this data together and in a number of interviews and conferences with them see what it led to and then encourage them to go into business or law or medicine or whatever it might be. I had some rather interesting feedback from some of those cases. In that kind of work you don't know whether you're doing well or not until years afterwards when someone tells you what you did for them or to them but I still get letters from a number of persons that I worked with in those days and particularly from the ones that worked with me (student assistants I had to score papers and do various things). I always look forward to them when they come back for their reunions; I see them and it's quite pleasant. You see, in those days the psychology department was brand new. It had just been formed as a separate entity from the department of philosophy and psychology, of which Jim Miller was the chairman. Dr. Edgar Foltin was the head when I came back in '47, it was. Then I think the following year Stanley Williams was brought in to become chairman, and it continued to grow in numbers. I was also at that time chairman of the scholarship committee and that was a real interesting task and we had a good committee, I thought.
representatives from all of the different units of the college, for example, from the law school, the business department, and arts and sciences. At that time I also had to sign the grant's name to the athletes, and we had a provision in the catalog, as I recall, whereby the man -- and it would have been a man; there were no women getting grants-in-aid then -- who got the grant-in-aid had to maintain a higher academic average to be eligible to return to the college the following year than the regular student. There wasn't a great deal of difference, but there was a difference, and I was always pleased with that. I thought that was making relatively sure that the persons who were receiving the financial help or aid were able to do the work as students in addition to their prowess on the athletic field or whatever. As I say, that was a good committee. I think it was the first time that we started using those confidential parent forms from the college board people to try to get information as to whether a student was really eligible for that money on the basis of need. And that came about because of anonymous letters that we would get periodically from people saying, "So-and-so is applying for financial aid, and I know her father is getting approximately this much of an income because he owns these properties," and then we would use the better business bureau in that area to check on the person, and since we had a tax expert on the committee, Tom Atkeson,
we would require or there was a requirement on this form that the parents list the tax money they paid the federal government (since they came from all over the country), and he could tell by looking at the amount of money they had to pay and the number of dependents what income approximately was and this was very helpful to us. There were only a few cases where this happened; people were apparently applying for scholarships when they shouldn't have been. But it happened every year, and it wasn't fair to those who applied that really needed money. So, actually that was a rather interesting committee. That was a very enjoyable ten-year period except for the blow-up in 1950 or '49 or whenever it was over the athletic situation and the manipulation of transcripts because that kind of disrupted the faculty, and I can remember going to one of the men who was a good friend of mine -- and still is -- and I said, "Well, if you're leaving now, I'll walk home with you." He said, "I don't know what side of the fence you're on. I don't think I want to walk home with you until I know how you feel about this."

Williams: Was that disruptive? too?

Brooks: Yes, and for a while and then, of course, it simmered down, but it was a very tense period then, and faculty were very much upset and had every right to be. That plus the way in which Admiral Chandler became the president. The situation under which he came in was very
unfortuante, I thought. But as I say, it was a very interesting period and I enjoyed it. My wife and I along with several other people lived in the old Cheatham House there on Richmond Road, which, had been, I guess, a fraternity house at one time. And Wayne Kerndle, who just got the Jefferson Award, was one of the tenants. "Pappy" Fehr, the choir director, was another. Ervin Farmer, the director, was a fourth, and Billy Gooch, who was the director of athletics at that time, lived there also, so we had a nice group over there.

Williams: That whole time you were in the psychology department, you did not have anything to do with education?

Brooks: Sometimes in the summer I taught a course for education. I didn't always teach a course for the psychology department. I taught a course in psychology, but sometimes I was asked to by George Oliver, who was then head of the education department, instead of Stan Williams, who was head of the psych department, and I kept the counseling office open during the summers, so part of my summer school salary was paid for having the counseling office open and then part came either from teaching for education or psychology, whichever it happened to be. The first summer I was here we worked under a grant from the Veterans' Administration. They had a counseling office in that little cottage the college owns near the Presbyterian church on Armistead Avenue.
Do you know that little cottage down on the end there right behind the stucco house? Well, that was used as an office by the Veterans Administration for a year or so, and there were a couple of men stationed in there and the college was contracted for to provide counseling services for veterans that did need it or want it and so all in that first year I was here I'd go over there periodically to talk to someone, and then during the summer I was under contract fulltime, I think it was to work with the veterans in that office. That was summer of '48. During that calendar year of '48, I think, that office was dissolved. But initially the veterans who wanted to go back to college had to have an educational and/or vocational objective, and this had to be determined on the basis of testing and talks and it had to be one that the Veterans Administration would agree to before they would give the veteran any money to go back to school. And that was kind of interesting because I was dealing with the men similar to the ones I had been with the last four years. I thought the counseling office was successful. My annual reports that I used to write to the president, as I recall them (and that was a long time ago), each year there were more and more people coming to it, so that I would see, as I remember it, towards the end something like 700 or 800 people a year and some of them were for multiple visits; they weren't for just one. It was very interesting. Then I had the opportunity—
I finally went back to school; I finished my doctorate and went to the University of Virginia and went to the school of education instead of the graduate school proper because I wanted my degree in counseling or what we then called student personnel work, which is a broader interest than counseling and educational psychology, and these were both offered in the school of education, not in the college as a whole. I took off one semester and a summer session in spring of '53 and summer of '53 for my residency and then I had so much work to transfer in from the University of Pennsylvania that I just had a minimal amount of course work to take in order to meet whatever their requirements were; I took some of it in extension and some of it on campus. I finally got my doctor of education degree in 1959 while at Longwood College.

Two of the men that I had had teach me at the University of Virginia went to Longwood: one was the president, and one was the dean. The man who went there as dean wrote me in '57, I guess it was, asking me if I wanted to come over there and teach psychology. I wanted a change from the counseling work and enjoyed what experience I had had in teaching teachers in the summertime and sometimes working in their school systems during the winter with them over something. So I decided after my wife and I went over there for an interview to go over there, and we did in 1957. I stayed here long enough in the beginning of '57—
'58 to run the orientation program, which was my responsibility. That's when I did the testing and some of the other things we were doing then. Incidentally, I should have mentioned this earlier, that orientation program for freshmen, which I was directing, but did it with the help of people from Colonial Williamsburg and the college itself. I thought was one of the nicest achievements that I had while I was here because I worked so closely with Colonial Williamsburg, of course, the number of students coming in then was smaller than now, but Colonial Williamsburg would give them a party sort of. It wasn't exactly a party but a reception down at the capitol -- provided the buses to take them down there, and they would have a string orchestra playing and they'd have all the brass of Colonial Williamsburg to meet them and the students would be introduced to Colonial Williamsburg as a living museum as well as meeting these people and it was a dress-up affair. The students always appreciated it, and I know the Restoration people thought it was worthwhile. I worked it out through a man named Ran Ruffin, who is retired and lives in town and he used to have offices down in the Goodwin Building. But that week of orientation was a very intensive week. We had the students busy all the time doing something. It ended up finally with a dance on Saturday night, I believe, just before the upperclassmen came back. And it was always amusing to me because football players were back here
for practice and the night of the dance they would be over in front of one of the girls' dormitories looking over the freshmen girls to see which ones looked the most attractive to them, I guess, and they were always there in full swing when the dance went on. We had trouble with the freshmen boys. They were bashful and shy, and they didn't get together with the freshmen girls, so we would have to kind of direct their efforts a little bit until they -- move them around.

We had for a series of maybe three or four years, back in the early '50s a program in the spring called "Orientation to College" which was a three- or four-day sort of institute kind of thing in which we encouraged high school seniors who were planning to go to college in September or even better, juniors who were going to use their senior year to select a college and be selected by them, to come here, and we would provide them with all kinds of procedures to find out where they were strong and where they were weak academically and have them meet with counselors, both high school and college counselors, and with some of the men of the faculty representing different departments. If they were interested in mathematics we would take them to somebody in the math department. And we charged them, I think, thirty dollars, and they stayed here about three or four days, lived in dormitories, ate in the cafeteria. We were able to get very able people as
counselors. I had counselors coming in from Washington and Lee, from the Richmond public schools, from Virginia Beach public schools, from some of the other colleges, and from the State Department of Education. We never had a great many people here—maybe thirty to forty—and usually there were more girls than boys. Their parents would write back later they were very pleased and the students seemed to be while they were here. We would have these day-long sessions initially of testing and then day-long sessions of interviews with various kinds of subject-matter people, and then we would have times for recreation, such as tennis. We always used the swimming pools and had one or two attractive male William and Mary graduates as lifeguards—-that always added to the joy of the girls, I guess; it seemed to. But it seemed, for a time anyway, to meet a need that these people had because they were uncertain as to what they should major in when they got to college after they'd been there awhile. They didn't know what their interests were or where their strengths and weaknesses were academically, and we were then able to give them a written report at the end with all this material outlined for them; I think it gave them something to build on. But that was an aspect of the counseling program that I had forgotten about.

We also had a very active faculty counseling group—which faculty men and women who volunteered to do counseling work.
Mel Jones. I remember, was one of them, and I think Al Haak was one. I can't remember -- we had about thirty of them, and we put them through real training sessions. We used to have meetings over in the old -- where that "Hoi Polloi" room is now or whatever you call that room.

Williams: Trinkle Hall?

Brooks: Yes, in the old cafeteria on an afternoon, like a Thursday, at 4:00. We served coffee and had these meetings. They were like seminars. Gordon Keppel, as I started to say, would talk to them about the kinds of physical and psychological problems that young people would have, particularly homesickness, that many people pooh-poohed but what was as just as real an illness as anything else is. And then we would have the dean of students, who was then Dean Lambert, come in and tell them something about the organization of the college as a whole and what they as advisors and counselors were supposed to do to help these people plan their programs. We had representatives from the dean of women's office speak to them. We spent one session with the dean of the college going over the college catalog because so many of the college faculty members couldn't tell you what was in their own department, let alone what was in the whole school (and that's probably true now). So that these people would have spent somewhere between ten to twelve hours of this, and we had a similar training program for our sponsors. These were student helpers that
were selected by the dean of women's office to work with the girls, and there wasn't a comparable group, as I seem to recall, or not as active a group of men as there were women. But the women sponsors would have training sessions also, which I would participate in, so that there was counseling done at all kinds of levels and this was the way I thought it should be. You don't have to have an office in which to do counseling work; you can do it over a Coca-Cola or a cup of coffee just as well as you can do it in the privacy of some fancy office, although our offices were not very fancy. The interesting thing was that when I came back in 1968, I was right back in the same room, Washington 213—hadn't made any progress at all, so to speak, and we used that same room for the offices for the school of education, the dean's office, the associate dean's, and we had an extra office that the faculty could use pretty often.

Williams: What factors did influence you to come back as dean of the school of education in '68?

Brooks: Well, I had been at Longwood College for ten years and I enjoyed it there very much. (Discussion of Mr. Brooks's career at Longwood College as a teacher of psychology and then chairman of the department of education, psychology, and philosophy. He then became dean of the college, working for Dr. Langford. Description of "Longwood Estate.") Well, the new president after he met me, the first thing he
told me was — not the first thing. We talked all one
morning and after lunch. I had another with him and the
first thing he told me after lunch was that I would have
to move out of that place, that he and his wife wanted
to live there. Well, I didn't think that was a very ap-
propriate way to do it and I'd learned before this hap-
pened to me that he had been advised not to do it, but
he did. This started us off on the wrong foot and then
a number of other things happened which didn't help any,
so I just decided that as much as I liked the place I
wasn't going to stay there too much longer and although
I hadn't begun to look around I got to the point at one
time when I would have gone most anywhere, I guess. And
I happened to be at a Southern Association meeting in 1966,
down in Miami, and the Joneses — Mel and Helen Jones —
were there. Mel and I got talking about it and actually
I guess the year before then I'd met him up in Philadelphia
at some meeting and talked to him a bit about what I was
doing and what I'd like to do. And this went on more in
1965 so that he'd asked me down there in the hotel, I can
remember, what it would take to get me to William and Mary,
dollars-and-cents-wise and I told him something, I guess.
From then on he carried on all of the conversation and the
writing of it and I decided ultimately that I would take it.
Now, I knew Howard Holland, the former dean; he was one of
my very close friends when I was here at the college and I
talked to him about it after I took it, not before because he was out of the country in Beirut. The man I was working for down at Longwood College—I was to come here in August of '67. In June of '67 the Board of Visitors gave him an unasked-for leave of absence that was to be terminal; he was not to come back. The rector of Longwood's Board of Visitors asked President Paschall if I could remain at Longwood for six months until they got another replacement as president and asked me to write a letter to President Paschall on the same thing, which I did. President Paschall said, "yes, he understood the troubles of a sister institution," so I stayed up there until January of '67 and started my duties here on February 1. So one reason was that I was unhappy with what had happened up there in the president's office and then the man who took the presidency, Henry Willett (whose father is a graduate of this place, H.I. Willett, Sr.)—he came in in December and I left the middle of January, so we were together for about six weeks, which helped him a little bit and then he had to get a dean because they needed a president and dean all at once. That was one thing; that was a major factor. Then another factor—almost as major, I guess—was that the school of education had been established at William and Mary while I was up at Longwood, and by that time, being at Longwood, I had become pretty well convinced of some things that I
thought needed to be done in teacher education and I had always been partial to teacher education, and I looked upon this as an opportunity to do some of them where all my interests would be devoted to one area, such as education, rather than being dean of the college and being much more diverse. And so I accepted the offer and came here and never regretted it. It was not the pleasantest or the happiest assignment that I've ever had, but it was one of the most interesting because the school of education was not in very good shape when I came here, or at least I didn't think so, and when I talked to Jimmy Fowler -- he was one of the men that interviewed me before they offered me the position. I had known him from my previous tenure quite well; he used to teach history in Washington 200, just outside of my office. He had told me some things that had gone on which indicated it needed something done to it, so I felt that even though the school was several years old when I came here it really hadn't become established until February of 1968. I used to say this once and awhile and that turned out to be the wrong thing to some people who had been here earlier. I think I should have known better; I didn't mean to hurt their feelings. I also had, and still have, a very firm belief that a school of education and a division or school or arts and sciences should be very close rather than at odds. I think the proper education for a teacher should
be based upon a liberal arts education or whatever one wants to call it, and I felt that at William and Mary this was a distinct possibility, whereas so often in so many other places where there are schools of education, the school of education and the arts and science are not on speaking terms usually, and I must confess that if I had to draw the line between the two, I'd probably take the side of the arts and science division as against many of the schools of education that I have become somewhat familiar with. I thought William and Mary could make a great contribution to education in its broadest sense—in preparation of educational personnel by being a highly selective school of education just as William and Mary itself, the arts and science division, has a highly selective group of students there. And I still think so. I had some battles in the early part of my tenure with the college as dean of the school of education over this, where there were some persons that wanted open admissions and had very little control or didn't want to have much control over who was teaching, what kind of courses were being offered, and I was very fortunate in a way: Dr. Paschall backed my ideas, not so much openly as he did -- or at least I didn't think he did so much openly -- as he did behind the scenes and giving me money to hire new faculty members, for example, because he was in a rather difficult position. Here he'd been the state superintendent
of public instruction, and if he'd shown any real interest in the school of education then the arts and science people would have said, "Aha! He's favoring those people," and they would have crucified him, or tried to. But when I came to William and Mary I think we had six or seven people on the staff of the school of education, and I employed twenty-four. I employed people who were psychologists, members of the American Psychological Association, to teach psychology in school of education, whereas in so many institutions, departments, and schools of education non-psychologists would be teaching psychology, and all they know about it is what they've read in several textbooks, just as the students can find out. I tried to employ people who were specialists in a given area.

Thus I chose teachers of philosophy of education or persons who had been trained at the doctoral level of philosophy. So I felt that the faculty in the school of education was a pretty strong faculty. It was a young faculty, and I purposely chose them from various parts of the country so there'd be a cross-circulation of ideas rather than getting them all from one area, like the University of Virginia, Harvard, or some other place. I think you need a cross fertilization of ideas. Whether or not this will work out I guess the future will tell because most of the men are in their late 30s, 40s perhaps. And of course, if the school of education had to have permission granted to it by the State Council of Education for a doctoral program...
in school administration; nothing had been done about it really. But I formed a committee and got some more faculty members who were in that area into the faculty, and we got a doctoral program not only in school administration but one also in higher education and counseling education. I thought we were going to turn out the first woman doctorate in the history of William and Mary, but we were two months too late. The first woman doctorate, I think, graduated in June of whatever year it was, and our candidate graduated in August at the end of the summer session.

I think the school of education should be and certainly while I was there we were trying for it for it to be a small school with a limited number of offerings and I must admit that my background biased me as to what those offerings should be, and I preferred those that were psychological in nature because I thought we could build upon a good psychology department or draw upon a good psychology department at the college. We had Eastern State Hospital out here and other departments that were allied to it, sociology and some of the work in business and law which was necessary and that now there are any number of large schools of education all over the country and a few in this state, and in my opinion we didn't need any more of that type, but we needed in this area one that was pretty high-powered. I had hopes that the one at William and Mary might become that and perhaps it will; I don't know.
Williams: You had not been in, though, on the setting up of the school?

Brooks: Oh, no, not initially. I think it was started around 1960, but I'm not quite certain.

Williams: You said that Dr. Paschall didn't want to give appearances of oversupport.

Brooks: I just felt that.

Williams: I had wondered because he was a professional educator what his particular role in this was.

Brooks: To illustrate what he did and what he permitted me to do: we had a number of part-time employees when I came here supervising student teaching, about four I think, and he permitted me to change all of those part-time positions into full-time positions so that I could get four full-time faculty members and still cover the student teaching. And he is responsible for the growth of the faculty from what it was (six or seven) up to twenty-eight or twenty-nine.

The budget for the school of education, while it was never gigantic, we got largely because of his help in those days, since I had been in the dean's office at Longwood College and gotten involved in the budget-making and spending there, I knew my way around budget-wise a little more than some of my colleagues in other parts of the campus did, and I took full advantage of it, I must admit. But I knew that in the end of any given fiscal year (by June 30) you have to spend all your money or it reverts back to the
state so I would always order a lot of things in the spring over and beyond my budget, and I always got them. You can't do that now; at least, they put a stop to doing that sort of thing somewhat. I guess you can do it, but it's not as easily done as then. But this was money that would have, as I say, reverted back to the state and knowing how this worked I just, as I say, took advantage of it and got my orders in early and I would frequently -- let's say I had a budget of $30,000, and I'd wind up spending in a fiscal year maybe $45,000 or $40,000, which was very helpful for me and whether it hurt someone else or not I don't know. There were a number of occasions where Dr. Paschall backed me in situations which I needed help. You see, when we first put in the selection at the graduate level we stepped on quite a few toes by the kind of rejections we made. Some of these people who were rejected went to the vice-president or the president, and I was upheld each time by whoever the person was who saw it in case (Vice-president Jones or the president). And this was very helpful because if they had permitted the person whom we had rejected -- I didn't have anything to do with it, the faculty committee rejected -- to enter the school then this would have destroyed the whole effort trying to get a group of people in there who were able. I just surmised that he didn't want to be too obvious in his leanings. He and I had known each other for
a long time. We'd been in graduate school together. It's kind of amusing. We took one semester up at Richmond; I don't remember what it was in. That was when he was in the state department of education and I still remember him because I called it to his attention once in a board meeting when I came back. I can remember him saying to whomever the instructor was, "I have something to say, and I'm sure Brother Brooks won't agree with it, but I'm going to say it anyway," and usually Brother Brooks didn't agree; we were usually arguing back and forth. But I was very pleased at the opportunity to come back. My wife liked Williamsburg; she'd worked for Colonial Williamsburg. Our son liked it; he was in the first graduating class of James Blair High School and we had a lot of friends here, so it was nice to come back.

William: Did the school of education have the support on the Board of Visitors that I surmise the school of business must have had?

Brooks: I assume it did. There was at least one board member who was very critical of what I was doing in one certain area— at least I would hear about him — not from him directly; he never said anything to me directly but through the president and others I heard. But as far as I know I can't think of any instance in which they were not cooperative. I don't think education has the same appeal to board members that business does because most of the men on the board
are businessmen. I was reading a letter last night when I was getting this together from a former member of the board whose opinion, along with others — he's an alumnus of the college, too — had been solicited. Let's say ten years ago. His name is Harold Ramsey; he has received an honorary doctorate from the college and his daughter graduated from William and Mary while I was here the first time (and married a man by the name of Brooks, sp I've always remembered him). Warren Heemann I think had written to him and he'd replied to a questionnaire and

He was unhappy about two things: the kind of information that was being released about athletics, at least up in the Roanoke area because he was from Rocky Mountain and wasn't finding out from the Roanoke papers much of what was going on athletic-wise and he was also unhappy because so few William and Mary products or faculty members were now involved in education statewide, that is, where they would have a name of some kind. I was given a copy of that letter, and so I wrote to him because I knew him and told him of some of our problems and what we were doing and hoped he would let me tell him about it in length another time. It is true that years ago many of the influential positions in education were held by graduates of the College of William and Mary, and I think this was true for several reasons: one was that in the depression years in which men who might have gone into medicine or law or some-
thing else went into education because that was the only kind of job they could get and as a result education profited because they had some top-notch people in this state (and I'm sure others, too) who became school superintendents or worked in the state department. But I took exception to some of the things, too, that this man said because he wasn't aware of what was going on. One of the things, for example, which I started (and I guess this may sound a little immodest, but I don't know how to say it any other way)

There is an association in this country called the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education and it's the organization to which 95 percent of the colleges and universities that prepare teachers belong. This is one of the stipulations that I had for coming back here -- I had several stipulations -- and one of them was that we become a member of that because I was a liaison representative at the time between the state of Virginia and the Washington state. Each state had a liaison representative. And when I gave up that post after three years when someone else was appointed I took the initiative to establish a state chapter of this same organization and we formulated one -- it's still going -- and it was then one of the three states in the nation that had a state chapter. Now I suppose half of them have it. We had representatives from V.C.U., Hampton, Old Dominion, University of Virginia, Eastern Menomnite, V.P.I., Longwood,
Madison, Radford, George Mason and those anyway and most of them were public schools, public-controlled or operated, because the others probably for financial reasons didn't get into it, didn't feel like they could afford the dues. This organization has been rather active since it was initiated and the last official act I did with it was in December of 1974, a couple of months after I retired, when as I was chairman of the committee I made recommendations for the committee regarding certification of secondary school teachers, recommendations which are still being considered but haven't been acted on and they would have far-reaching effects if they ever were adopted. I was in the state department office last week talking to one of the men who was in that same organization, was president when I retired, his name was Dr. Harris from Virginia State College. He has the job of taking the recommendations of the committee I chaired and some other recommendations and pull them together in a meaningful whole. So William and Mary contributed while I was dean, I would say, one of the leaders in the state in professional teacher education; I was one of the most outspoken ones, anyway and I took the initiative to form what we call the Lower Peninsula Association of Teacher Education, or something like that, hoping that the colleges between here and Virginia Beach could get together, particularly with respect to our student teacher assignments because we were beginning to overlap and get into
each other's hair. This got off to a great start. Everyone was enthusiastic about it, and then died and I don't know exactly why it died; I have some suspicions, but they're not part of the history of William and Mary. I think it was unfortunate because we could have among ourselves taken care of a lot of the difficulties that are still existing in respect to the placement of student teachers and everyone would come out in better shape than I think they will trying to do it in autonomous fashion. At any rate, the men in the school of education took part in state evaluation committees for the state of Virginia's schools of education and on Southern Association committees for schools in the southeast, and during my tenure the school of education became accredited by the state department. It's called an approved program for teacher preparation, which means the state has approved the preparation of teachers by the school of education in a variety of areas which are listed in their handbook which they dispense, and this means that the students going through our program automatically are certified in these particular areas like French and physical education or whatever and you have to go through some evaluation and they also became accredited shortly after I left by the National Association for the Accreditation of Colleges of Teacher Education, called NCA, and we did all the work for that. The accreditation the last two years I was there -- we
had two visits from two different committees. The first committee that we had to appear before did it appear, a very poor job, so they had another committee go over us, and our accreditation was backdated to the initial evaluation team's visit. So they're going to have to go through another one very shortly because it's a five-year period, I think. But that was rather an interesting experience, and we had people on our campus from various parts of the country on the national accreditation visit and I think now that the college has gained these two accreditations -- that is, the school of education has -- this means, to me anyway, the basis has been laid now. Everyone knows that they are producing substantial people now. There's only one way to go from there, and that's up. I think it's in pretty good shape, or was anyway, and I'm sure it is now. I don't know whether they've changed it. I hope it remains a small school, a select-type of a school. It's interesting since I've been on both sides of the fence about the same number of years in arts and sciences and education, and I've never taught in the public schools, but I have taught in private schools, but I attended public schools so I'm on both sides of the fence really. The universities that have made the greatest contribution to education, whether it be public or private or higher or whatever it is, in this country are Harvard, Columbia, Stanford, Chicago -- all private institutions -- and Ohio
State ranks number five in the ranking that I referred to. And I think that William and Mary could be right up there; certainly it could be as far as the eastern seaboard is concerned because they don't have any real competition. Now there are a lot of people on the eastern seaboard who wouldn't accept that. But I think the arts and sciences division at William and Mary in the school of education will continue to stay with it instead of breaking off like the law school has and like I guess the school of business would like to. I think it would be to their advantage and to our.

Williams: What will propel it into that position or what could hold it back -- into this top position that you're talking about on the eastern seaboard?

Brooks: I think it can be on the way at any time and perhaps is. The only things that would hold it back, to me, would be adopting a policy, for example, of open admissions, where everyone and his brother can come in, would be -- now this you don't have to worry about right now -- an expanding of the extension division the way it used to be. I think that the students should come in to the institution for whatever they're going to get; except for those kinds of courses like independent study, where they're working on a project or experiment and would have to be out in the field. And I think it should be more performance-keyed rather than credit-oriented. That's what I was presenting to the state
certification of teachers if we do away with all certification requirements and let the marketplace determine whether a teacher has been prepared to teach English, for example. There would be some limitations: that each prospective teacher would have to have work in how people learn and work in methodology and student teaching, psychological foundations, sociological, methodology of student teaching and whether they take one hours work or twenty-one hours work would be up to the institution but so far as I am aware in the literature there's nothing to indicate that X number of hours in anything produces the kind of person you want, whether it's education or medicine or law or whatnot. So I lean more towards performance requirements where people demonstrate that they can do what they are supposed to do. And I think this is what I hope the college's school of education will move more to; they're doing some of it now. But it's absurd, in my opinion, to say that because a person has taken thirty hours of graduate work in any college -- I don't care whether it's Harvard or Stanford or William and Mary -- by virtue of those thirty hours they are ipso facto of X, Y, or Z. There has to be a performance area in there. I'm afraid that the professional schools -- I'm talking about all of them now, not just the ones we have, but professional schools period -- are so concerned with the dwindling population in many places from which they can select
their student body that they have a tendency to want to: 1) open the gates to everyone and 2) offer almost any kind of a course that will attract the interest of persons and then get that course into the framework of the degree program. To me this is the wrong way to do it. I hope that the professional schools that were initially started on service motifs, like medicine, law, theology, and education, will return more to that than they seem to be doing at the moment and spend less time being materialistically oriented toward credit accumulation.

I must confess that I'm not very sympathetic with or happy about the teachers unions that are prevalent among the public schools and are going to be, I assume, among the colleges because all that I read about them is that they want more money, teach fewer students for fewer hours and I think they are rather than being task-oriented they are sort of money-oriented, I guess. I don't know how to say it properly, but I know when you're teaching someone that you can't say at a certain period, after two hours, why this person has learned all they're going to learn; you never know. I used to be on the Board of Visitors, for example, at a transportation school down here at Fort Eustis, and I would always object to -- at the meetings we had twice a year -- when they would say, "Well, we've just instituted a course, XYZ, which will run for 26°2 hours." "How did you figure out that it's only going to take 26°2 hours for the students to
learn whatever it is they're going to be taught?" Well, they never gave me a satisfactory answer because I don't think they could. I don't think that you can do this teaching in any mechanical sort of a way. When I say task-oriented I think you keep on working with people until they get to a point of proficiency that you want them to be. And there seems to me to be a difference between those kind of teaching activities which I would designate as performance activities like music, art, athletics, industrial arts, home economics as opposed to, let's say, English and history, mathematics, and the sciences. For example, when I taught classes in measurement (because that was the field I was most interested in) I would have prospective students make out an examination and it used to really send me off when students in home economics at Longwood College would write up a true and false test as to whether a person knew how to bake a cake. You can't determine whether a person knows how to bake a cake unless they bake it and give you a piece of it to eat or look at, and this is a performance kind of item. Of course, it's easier in those activities, too, because you can see the student perform and the student also knows immediately whether he's been successful or if he or she is trying to bake a cake and it falls, why she knows it's a failure, or if a man is trying to learn how to catch a football and it slips out of his fingers, he knows it's a failure. Take
music, art -- they're all the same because the student sees and knows what he's supposed to do and can see whether he does it. I think we can do something the same with the others, but it's nearly as easy and so I'm hopeful that a school such as William and Mary with its great tradition in the arts and sciences will capitalize on that. I think it's already happened -- we were in Florida for two months, and we had the Virginia Gazette sent to us, and I noticed that one of the workshops in the school of education ran in history maybe six weeks or so. It was run by a man from the school of education and a man from the department of history, and I think that's just exactly the way it should be, and I would hope this would expand into other cooperative endeavors with the arts and science people.

Williams: Do you sense more of an acceptance on the part of arts and sciences of education? At one time I know a number of the arts and science people were just dead-set against education.

Brooks: No question about it, and I ran into that, of course, when I first came back. I don't mean by that that it disappeared because it didn't, but I think there were more people who were willing to accept it when they found out that the school of education had some standards. This was one of the things -- and I think they were right. I know when I first came here, one of the first things I had to do in
February we changed the semester. A young man came to my office; said he wanted to major in secondary education. And I asked him, "What field?" and he said he thought mathematics. He said, "I'm a senior." I said, "A senior? This is your second semester your senior year?" He said, "Yes." I said, "When did you decide to be a math teacher?" He said, "When I got my grades from the math department. I flunked a course or two, and I can't graduate." And I said, "And now you want to change to education so you can graduate?" He said, "Yes." I said, "Well, I'm sorry, we won't accept you." But I found out that before they had been accepting people who were not doing well elsewhere. I know the reputation education has in many places, and it's well earned. I don't think this is necessary. I think, in fact, it's just the opposite; I think it's deplorable. I don't think -- and I'm reciting now from a speech I made once -- I don't believe that the professional liberal arts scholar or the professional educator, either one has the answer for preparing a teacher, and I think between them they can come up with some kind of answer. The arts and sciences people can be just as petty in their way as the people in education can. I get exasperated with each of them, have at times, but I do think there's more to be said for the genuine liberal arts scholar than there is for many of the people in education who are looking for
a short-cut way of doing something and I don't think there is any short-cut way of doing that sort of thing. There is not, for example, a method of teaching and any professional educator that says so is just talking for the sake of talking. There may be a method that you like, and there may be method that I like and we'll each try to promote, but we've got to find one that reaches these children out here, and there isn't one method that works for everyone, just as there is no one method for doing anything with people that I know of, and that's why I think there is an argument between the two. I think the area of methodology is the one where most of the sparks fly and when I first came here I was accused of being pro-liberal arts by my colleagues (some of them) because I used to go to Dean Fowler's office — and I did, frequently. I did all the time I was here. He's a good friend of mine, and I went over to him for counsel at times and to argue with him at times, and we had a good relationship, and he was very helpful to me. I found out working with the curriculum committee of the arts and science division when I was trying to get a ruling of theirs changed that affected the elementary teachers. Elementary teachers had to take so much more work that they weren't getting credit for, degree-wise. They had to take it because of the certification requirements among other things, plus the
fact we thought they should. One committee I worked with was fine and another committee I worked with just the opposite; they gave me trouble. So they needed some education to take place on both sides. Now take George Healy, the vice president, a historian. When I retired I wrote him a letter telling him how much I appreciated working for him and with him. I do not like some of the historians that I had to cope with in the past because the historians have been notorious for their antipathy toward professional education. Jimmy Fowler is a historian; he's very understanding. Ed Crapol has been very helpful, and some of the others.

But I think there has to be some give-and-take on both sides. Neither side has all the answers. But again, as I've said many times, I think a place like this, William and Mary, can bring that kind of a fusion together to the ultimate benefit of both, and that's what I'd like to see happen. That's why I'd like them to remain relatively small in the number of areas in which they are attempting to obtain proficiency or expertise instead of being everything to everyone or trying to be.

Williams: You've just answered my question, which was going to be: as the recently retired dean, what would you like to see the school of education at William and Mary have that it doesn't have now?
Brooks: Nothing. I'd just like to see it increase in quality and performance. I mentioned this before I left: that I didn't think that the school of education should really become any larger. I know that as years go by there're going to be demands that it become larger because of the number of credit hours that it produces, for example. But I don't think it should be. I much prefer it to remain a small, quality school. Let someone else take over the bigness. I don't think there is the money, for one thing, to support bigness and quality at the same time. We've got enough of the bigness; we don't have enough of the quality.