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January 21, 1975

Dean Miller: I came to William and Mary in 1935 and stayed until 1955. In those 20 years I served under three presidents. One of them I consider a very great president; Mr. Bryan; one of them a very good president; Mr. Pomfret. And there is no doubt that the third was Alvin Duke Chandler. You asked me the other day to say something about how I came to William and Mary and let me start with that.

About commencement time in 1935, Dr. Geiger, who was the chairman of the department of philosophy and psychology, died very suddenly in an accident. Mr. Bryan proceeded, of course, to look for a replacement. Having very close contacts with Harvard (of which he was a member of the Board of Overseers) and knowing the particular prestige of the philosophy department there, he sought the advice of professor Ralph Barton Parry at Harvard. Professor Parry suggested to him that I might be interested. I was then instructor and tutor of philosophy at Harvard. Professor Parry got in touch with me and I thought I might be interested. So I suggested to Professor Parry that he let Mr. Bryan know that I might be interested. Mr. Bryan got in touch with me and invited me to come down for an interview. I came down from northern Michigan where I was spending the summer and had a good two days, mainly with Mr. Bryan. I think it is striking and characteristic that he spent a great deal of his time on making appointments. I was very much attracted to the college as he presented it and as I saw it (and to him and to Williamsburg) and decided to accept. Then Mr. Bryan engaged Cy Lambert, who took me around to find a
house to live in. And "Cy" in typical fashion had a list of the houses that were available. There were three, and we went to see all of them. One of them was too big, and one was too little, and one was just right for my family, so I took it and lived there for five years, on Richmond Road. It may be of historical interest that that seven-room house was very nice house--rented for forty-five dollars a month. And at the end of the first year our landlord, who was perhaps the best landlord anybody ever had, said that there was no reason why I should have to pay that much, and so he reduced the rent to $42.75. So we stayed there until we built our house in Indian Springs, and then I came back to the college in September, '35 and found that I had a lot of very attractive students. I had two big classes and two or three smaller classes. I was chairman of the department of philosophy and psychology as it then was. I taught all of the philosophy and Dick Hanneman did all of the psychology, except for the fact that "Cy" Lambert taught one course in psychology. It remained that kind of department of psychology and philosophy for several years until it was finally separated into its two branches. But in those early years, I found besides delightful classes, all of which, by the way, were held in Washington Hall, a great many friendships, very lovely friendships among members of the faculty, and we had a social time in all those early years before the war. Now the whole quality of life here, both academically and socially, was inspired and dominated by Mr. Bryan. I thought that Mr. Bryan did for the college very much the kind of thing that Jack Kennedy did for the U.S. government.
Though Kennedy was relatively young and Mr. Bryan was relatively old, they were the same kind of men and did the same kinds of things.

Mr. Bryan surrounded himself with the best and brightest he could find, as Kennedy did, and he inspired the whole attitude of people. He gave us an atmosphere in which everybody thought that William and Mary was on the march, on the go, that it was really going somewhere and going somewhere good. There was great enthusiasm all the time as a result.

Bryan's previous career might be mentioned, though this is a matter of public history. He came of a very distinguished aristocratic Virginia family, and was the son of the great Joseph Bryan. He studied at Episcopal high school and the University of Virginia, where he acquired so much Latin and Greek that when he came to William and Mary he knew more Latin and Greek than anybody else outside of the classics department. Then he studied law at Harvard and took his law degree there and then proceeded to law in Richmond, though very briefly. Then he moved into the newspaper business following his father. And when he became president of William and Mary he was the principle owner and publisher of the Richmond News-Leader and later on acquired the Times-Dispatch. His policy at William and Mary was to do the best that he could do to make William and Mary a top-flight liberal arts college. The college as he inherited it from his predecessor, Dr. Chandler, was a great college, but not of the top caliber. It had two principal shortcomings; I would say. One was that the faculty, though good, was not as good as it should have been. There were a great many people on the faculty who were mediocrities who should have been appointed in the first place, except that Dr. Chandler in the days of financial stringency did the best he could and made what might be called cheap appointments now and then. It is remarkable that Dr. Chandler was able
to get as many really first-rate people as he did. There were such—

There were many such. For example, I would mention Guy and Rob in chemistry; Young in physics; Davis in biology; Taylor in political economy; Stets in mathematics; Morton, history; Woodbridge, law; Wagner, classics; Jackson, English; Hunt, theater; Swent, the librarian; and one very young man named Lambert. These were very fine people; some of them were more solid than they were brilliant; one of them was definitely more brilliant than he was solid. But on the whole it was a good group, but they were perhaps only a third of the faculty, who we shall say.... And in the second place (the second shortcoming) William and Mary in comparison with other liberal arts colleges stressed

unduly vocational subjects, especially teacher training. It was almost

the tail that tried to wag the dog. It was almost true that William

and Mary was a normal school; a teacher training establishment rather

than a college—almost I said, not quite. There was far more vocational

work than what one would expect to find in a real liberal arts college.

There were several other vocational departments, such as home economics,

which wouldn't have been here at all except for their tie-in with the

teacher training program. And secretarial science, if you please, called

that meaning typewriting and shorthand, with the name science added to

make it sound respectable. Well, I think it was Mr. Bryan's principle

double problem to deal with those two shortcomings and this he proceeded

to do, but not in the manner that some others might have done. The

obvious thing would have been to fire half the faculty and kick all the

other stuff out. But he didn't do anything of the kind at all. I

doubt if he ever fired anybody or abolished anything. He was too much

of a diplomat and one might even say a politician) to do it that way—
and too kind a man. So what he did really was to seize every opportunity to make new appointments and to make them the best that he could make and gradually to diminish the emphasis upon the vocational subjects. Now the best example I can think of which shows very well how he proceeded in the way he dealt with the fine arts department. Now the fine arts department had been before he came a small and relatively unimportant department which existed almost entirely to help train young people to become teachers of fine arts in public schools. All very well. The way he handled that was to surround that old nucleus with quality. He got Leslie Cheek—That was his first appointment there. And Leslie, of course, was tremendously dynamic and imaginatively exciting person. You know, since then he has become the director of the Baltimore Museum and then the director of the Richmond Museum of Fine Arts, Bridgehampton Museum. If you go there today what you see will be pretty much what Leslie did. I don't mean he painted the pictures, but the arrangement and what we call the philosophy of the museum is his bequest. Leslie was appointed at the same time I was in '35, and by the following year, twelve months later, the new professor of painting and the new professor of sculpture that had been added. And so you had Leslie, an architect, and the painter, and the sculptor (Ted Rust) and it was a real department of fine arts. Then there was studio work and a very competent history of art. So a department had been made from practically nothing in twelve months without firing anybody and without overtly diminishing vocational work, but simply putting it into the shade.

Emily: Was there any opposition from vocational people?

Miller: Not that I know of, no. Well, there really couldn't have been there because that department wasn't of such sufficient importance to stir up
any to stir up trouble. If you directly attack the department of education—
that was a crowd of Teacher's College of Columbia people. If you
crowd in three or four professors from totally different types of educational
department, there would have been trouble, no doubt. But he had no
interest in doing that. Well, when I had been at the college for three
years, Mr. Bryan asked me to become dean. In a sense this was an attack
on the department of education because the former dean was Dean Hoke
who was the head of the department of education. He wasn't fired in an
sense. His deanship was taken away from him, but he continued as
professor of education and had the department and kept the title of dean
of dean as dean of summer school. When Mr. Bryan first asked me to
become dean, my first reply was, oh no, Mr. Bryan. I'm not an administrator.
I'm a professor of philosophy. I shouldn't be giving up my kind of work
for this thing. But I said I would think about it. I thought about
it for a week. I decided to do it with the thought that every academic
ought to have at some time or other to have administrative experience
if he gets the chance. And the prospect of working with Mr. Bryan
was attractive and exciting. And I had no intention of doing this for
more than two or three years. Well, thus I got into a trap because I
stayed there for eight years. The war came and all that sort of thing.
It seemed the best thing to do for quite a long while. As dean I made
the discovery that I suppose every dean and every president makes:
you go into this sort of thing full of plans, ideas, and things you are going to accomplish, and then you discover you have practically no time to do any of them. Unexpected problems come up that take most of your time. I suppose nobody ever gets done all that he wants to do. I'm sure I didn't. Now, the things I did do, the one I remember with greatest approval is the preparing and instituting of a sort of constitution for the faculty, the by-laws, I think we called them. Mr. Bryan and I worked together on this and worked out a document which we presented to the faculty and which the faculty approved and accepted. The whole purpose of this was to give the faculty much more power than it had had before, especially in academic matters. Under Dr. Chandler it had had very little, I understand, so I'm told. Dr. Chandler ran the college and the professors stuck to classes and that was the division of labor. The two main points in the constitution which endeavored to make a real difference were—and to make a real difference in this regard were first, it was specified that the faculty should have regular meetings. I think it was once a month that there was to be a faculty meeting, oh, the second Tuesday after the third Wednesday or what have you, and the second place was that several committees which hitherto had been appointed by the president were to be elected by the faculty, particularly and most important, the curriculum committee. That had never been elected; in fact, nothing had been elected. Since that was the major committee of academic policy it was really significant I think, to have it elected. The committee on honorary degrees was also...
was also to be elected. That was more a token sort of thing, but
the curriculum committee was really important.

Emily: Was this giving some power to the faculty at Mr. Bryan’s instigation,
or was it something that you took to him as an idea?

Miller: I’m not really sure. I knew we worked together on this. I think,
and I’m not positive, I think he suggested that I prepare the
constitution. And I think, I’m not sure, that when I prepared it
and took it to him he toned it down a little bit, not much. What it was
legally was his concession of power to the faculty. Now I think maybe
that was something permanent. I think they still have this.

It has probably been amended and modified in many ways over the years
to the like most constitutions which is all well and good. That I think was
the start of real faculty participation in college policy. The one
thing that Mr. Bryan did that I regret took place in 1939. He decided
to increase the emphasis upon athletics, particularly football. Now
I’m sure he did so to a great extent under pressure from alumni and
the like, but I don’t think he did it unwillingly. Well, I’m sure.

Probably nobody knows just how it came about, but the whole atmosphere, a whole
and convergence of influences were at work. I know Charlie Duke was for it, very
keen for it. He was an assistant to the president and he had
considerable influence on Mr. Bryan on various things. Now Charlie,
since I hadn’t planned to mention him elsewhere, was a first-class
person. He had his limitations, but he had great abilities and great powers.
He was a very hard worker for the college. Well, whatever may have
been the influences at work, I think Mr. Bryan was perfectly willing
and became enthusiastic. When he had to do something he became very
enthusiastic about it.
And quite possibly his background had a good deal to do with places like the University of Virginia and Harvard where the college spirit has been centered around a football team. Here was William and Mary with a miserable little team, and Mr. Bryan decided to have a good one. He did this, I think, with no realization of the potential evils of intercollegiate athletics. And those evils, as far as I know, never came apparent in his administration. They became apparent much later, after the war when there hadn't been athletics too much or anything.

In his administration, he brought in Carl Voyles in 1939. Carl was a terrific top-flight coach. Carl brought in very good assistants. Before long William and Mary had a powerful and successful football team. So that brings me on to 1940, and I might say here that the regrettable thing that happened (though it was no fault of Mr. Bryan's, namely the scandal at the Norfolk Division. I'm almost certain it was 1940. That can be verified. If it wasn't '40 it was '41.

Emily: It was '41. I was looking at the newspaper today and it was '41.

Miller: It was? Oh, good. I guess it was probably in '40 that a little before the scandal that Mr. Bryan asked me to go down occasionally to the Norfolk Division and get acquainted and cultivate good relations with them. He said we had been neglecting them too long in our exclusive concern for things in Williamsburg. So I went down to the Norfolk Division two or three times and got acquainted with the people and the faculty. It was perhaps on my third or fourth visit when two or three of them took me inside after a formal meeting or something we had had and they told me that peculiar things were going on, namely, the dean of the Norfolk Division, Dr. Hodges (Billy Hodges) had been falsifying
transcripts sent out by the division. Well, I was staggered at that idea. I said, "Well, I'll talk to Mr. Bryan about that." So I went and told him and he was very much concerned. He said, "Well, we'll have to go down there and see what this is all about." So one day Mr. Bryan and I, taking along the registrar, Miss Kathleen Alsop, and we went down and went right in to talk to Dr. Hodges. I suppose we phoned up in advance that we were coming. Well, Mr. Bryan told Dr. Hodges what he understood was going on. Dr. Hodges admitted it right away. He said he'd done it in three cases. There were three boys -- who well -- one of them wanted to go to West Point or something like that and had an appointment, but to be admitted he had have a course in physics. The boy hadn't had the course. So Dr. Hodges fixed up the transcript for him which included a course in physics. Well, that was the kind of thing it was. There were certifications to other colleges and universities that a certain person had a course that he had not had or that he got a grade better than he'd got. Now poor old Billy did this out of good nature. He wasn't bribed to do it or getting any personal benefit. He was sorry for these kids who wanted to get in somewhere and couldn't and he fixed them up with just credentials that they didn't have. Thus for their sake, supposedly not stopping to think what that did to the credit of his institution or the collegiate system generally. Well, Mr. Bryan was much taken back. He said -- and I think I am quoting him correctly -- "Are these the only cases?" Hodges said yes. Mr. Bryan had meanwhile sent Miss Alsop to the registrar's office there to look and at that point Miss Alsop came out
twenty
out with about 20 more of these cases.

Emily: That she had found readily in the records?

Miller: Yes, I'm not sure that all of them were quite as flagrant as
the ones that Hodges had admitted to. I don't know. But anyhow,
there were tamperings in his handwriting in the original records.
So then as soon as Miss Alsop had produced all this stuff, Mr. Bryan
said, "Dr. Hodges, I think I shall have to ask for your resignation,"
which of course, is an emphatic way of saying, you're out. And he
was. There was enough sentiment in Norfolk in favor of Billy Hodges
as a person that there was a great deal of publicity about this. He was a very
popular man and a nice chap, no doubt about it. But in view of public
discovery of what had happened, there was inevitably publicity—alot
of it—whereupon the college got in trouble with one of the
leading educational associations some months later. The A.A.U.
(Association of American Universities) started to investigate us.

Now that was a very important association of graduate schools in
universities. It was not like the Southern Association of Colleges and
Secondary schools which is our accrediting agency. This was
something else. Well, that association appointed a committee to
look into things at William and Mary. I remember two of them, and there
may have only been two—maybe there were three—two very nice men,
one of the older men a very distinguished scholar, a leading mathematician,
and Dean of the graduate school at Brown. He and this little committee
came down and spent a lot of time looking at everything and talking
to everybody and so on and so on. They went home again and deliberated
and finally decided to take disciplinary action against the college.
Now I'm not sure just what it was technically—sort of being put on probation. It didn't prevent us from doing what we wanted to do. As far as I recall, for example, there was nothing to prevent us from going on teaching graduate courses and giving graduate degrees, though this was an association of graduate schools. But it was more I would think in the nature of a menace than anything genuinely destructive or effective. Poor old Dean Richardson I know felt terribly about having to do this. He hadn't slept all night and all this that and the other. So we were in the bad graces or whatever they were of bad institution for a while. I always felt that the decision on their part was not only unjust but stupid. If Mr. Bryan had done the soft thing and covered up for Billy, then there wouldn't have been any trouble and we would have escaped. But he was penalized for having been honest and strong.

Emily: He did state didn't want it tried in the newspapers but was this more out of consideration for Hodges?

Miller: I don't remember about that. I think it was also paradoxical that the committee though they approved of Mr. Bryan's dismissal Hodges criticized us for having neglected to supervise the Division properly. But it was the attempt to supervise properly that had discovered the error! So I think the decision was rather unsound.

Emily: During this time wasn't there some talk also of separating the Norfolk Division?

Miller: I don't know. There has been that kind of talk many times.

I don't remember then, particularly.

Emily: Did Dr. Hodges hold to his position the entire time that he had not really done anything wrong, but had merely advanced credits to people? In other words, did he ever admit that he had done anything wrong?
Miller: Oh, I don't know if there was ever occasion for him to admit it or not to admit it. He admitted what he had done, and Mr. Bryan called upon him to resign, and he did. Well, that's a sort of question like discussing whether Mr. Nixon has admitted doing anything wrong. No, I can't answer that. I don't know about that. I know that Billy himself didn't resist resigning. He may have stirred up some of the talk in Norfolk to get them to come to his defense.

Emily: Apparently there was a great deal of uproar in Norfolk.

Miller: Oh yes. Well, that is perhaps a sour way of ending the account of the Bryan administration. So let me add generally in conclusion that he was a very creative president. There was constant development in the right direction during his presidency. It was an exciting time to be here. He did everything with style. That was one thing that the college really hadn't had before. It was a little on the dull side.

But Mr. Bryan brought his style to it and that affected the whole campus. He brought style in his personal appearance and behavior, as an aristocratic Virginian in the best sense of the word, style in his writing, style in his speaking, style in his entertaining and social relations. I might say a word about him. He gave any number of delightful parties for members of the faculty, both here in the President's House and at Laburnum, his house in Richmond, for distinguished visitors, of course, great parties. One of the most noteworthy and memorable was the one in which he entertained the Harvard Board of Overseers, of which he was a member, the first time they had ever had a meeting so far away from base. President Coen of Harvard said to Mr. Bryan afterwards something like this, "Mr. Bryan, you are ruining my boys." He said, "When they get
back home they'll expect to have southern hospitality." For the students, perhaps the greatest social occasion was the June ball which took place every year in the sunken garden outdoor ballroom surrounded by magnolias and honeysuckle. Lesley Cheek designed the whole ambiance and the girls were all dressed in lovely dresses and many of the boys were in black tie—at least many of the faculty were. And who paid for that, you know? It was terribly expensive. I think it almost certain that Mr. Bryan paid out of his own pocket.

Emily: Was this generally known? A few people knew this? Miller: Nobody—something about a party—you don't ask where the money came from, do you?

Emily: In connection with you becoming dean, I wonder if there is some tie between the easing out of Dean Hoke and as I'll put it the de-emphasis on the school of Education?

Miller: Yes, though that's only part of something more general.

It was rather Mr. Bryan's desire to have a dean who was a liberal arts man rather than one who was not.

Emily: Were you actively involved in faculty hiring during this period?

Miller: Oh, yes. Yes, I should have mentioned that. A great deal of my work as dean was of that kind, done in cooperation and collaboration with department chairmen and then with the president. I was the intermediary between the department chairman and the president. Later, during the war I did a good deal of the hiring directly when there was no department chairman, so to speak. When the faculty was so decimated by participation in the war, I did much of the faculty hiring.
Emily: Before the war, let's say, what would have been the attraction for a young professor coming to William and Mary? And conversely, what would have been—do you think would there have been any disadvantages, for example, salary?

Miller: The attraction was the quality of the place and the fact that nearly everybody who came was getting at least a slightly better job than he was leaving. I think that's the thing that really works in the academic world. The greatest disadvantage in being here in being here for a faculty person was the teaching load was much too heavy so that there was very little opportunity for most people to go on with their research. They were too busy teaching their classes. The teaching load when I first came here was fifteen hours of classes. I remember once at McGill when one of my colleagues went to the principal and said, "How do you expect we can hire anybody who's any good with our teaching load of six hours?" Well, here we had fifteen.

Emily: After Dr. Hodges was relieved at Norfolk, Mr. Bryan sent Charlie Duke down there as director; is this accurate? Did he go down there or did he remain here and just....

Miller: He went there as director. Now I'm not sure how soon after that there may have been some kind of interval—there must have been some kind of interval—I don't know how long—I think I'm right in saying that when Charlie was director there he was also still bursar up here and he really did both jobs.

Emily: There was apparently some criticism of Dr. Bryan for making Duke director because he was a business man and he wasn't an academic man. Why do you think he chose him to oversee the Norfolk Division?
Miller: Well, of course there was a dean under Charlie to look after the education side. But Mr. Bryan had an extraordinary confidence and respect for Charlie. Charlie was sort of Mr. Bryan's trouble shooter. This was a real trouble shooting job down there. He was also...

Charlie was from there originally or from the region, wasn't he?

Emily: I think he was from Portsmouth or Suffolk or somewhere around there.

Miller: Yes. Portsmouth. He was somewhat of a native, if not from Norfolk, at least from that region. I think that had something to do with it. But mainly I would say was because he was Mr. Bryan's trouble shooter. And it was made perfectly respectable academically by having an academic dean under him—I think it was Agnes Gray originally and later Lewis Webb.

Emily: This censure that was slapped on the college, did Mr. Bryan realize that this was serious?

Miller: Oh, yes. I think he perhaps took it more seriously than anybody else. It was an insult to him.

Emily: I've never really understood why it was that he resigned.

Do you think this was something that had troubled him, contributing to his decision of resigning?

Miller: No, I don't think so. Let me get these dates before me. He would have been about 70 years old then. Mr. Bryan was born in 1871 in 1919 he would have been 72 years old, and he died in just two years later. I think he wasn't well. I think he felt the end coming.

Emily: That it was best for the college for him to retire?

Miller: Well, anybody an old man who is sick is going to retire whether it's best for the college or not. Unless he's on the Supreme Court, and then he'd better hang on.

Emily: True. I don't believe I had any more questions that you didn't answer during the course of your narrative.
There is an incident about Mr. Bryan's poems that he doesn't really care to have put on tape.
Miller: I think I was discussing the reasons for Mr. Bryan's resignation at the end of our last talk. I think the principal reasons were simply his age and his state of health. He was 75 years old, and though none of us knew that he was ill, he did die within two years, so presumably that is the explanation. It may well be, and I'm not sure I would not have been surprised if it were the case. That he was displeased in those later years of his administration with the support that he was getting from the Board. That may have had something to do with it. Perhaps he wouldn't have been able to tell us why he resigned. People don't always have conscious reasons for what they do, but looking at it from our viewpoint, obviously his age, his evident declining health, and perhaps lack of sufficient cooperation from the Board, all these account for it.

So far as I know, Mr. Bryan had nothing to do with the appointment of his successor. I think Mr. Bryan would have thought it improper to try to have a hand in the choice of the next person. But I do know that he was very much pleased with the choice that was made. He was delighted with the appointment of Dr. Pomfret. I think myself that it's amazing that the Board made that good an appointment. At least it did and Dr. Pomfret came into office shortly thereafter. He served for nine years, 1942 to 1951. His prior experience certainly qualified him very well for that kind of appointment. He had an excellent education from the University of Pennsylvania, where he got his doctorate degree. He had been at Princeton and then later at Vanderbilt, besides being the professor of history, he was the dean of the so-called Senior College and Dean of the graduate school.

I think that he made a very good president though he disliked, I think, the nonacademic details that fell upon him. I remember his saying once
that it had never occurred to him before he became president that he would have to exercise oversight over the dining hall. His notion of the presidency was derived from universities where a president delegates all that sort of thing, but in a small college, or in a relatively small one, the president is quite actively responsible for everything as Mr. Pompfret discovered to his dismay. I think that he made two principle accomplishments in his presidency. No doubt he would have made more, if not for the war. During the war it's rarely possible for a college to progress. The best it can hope is to survive. And so if one finds less progress made in those years than one would like to see, at least one can be grateful for the fact that the college didn't perish. I think his two principle constructive accomplishments were first that he had preserved the qualitative progress that Mr. Bryan had made. He was essentially, in my view, a preserver of value. Then there was the special accomplishment that everybody knows about. He contributed greatly to the study of American colonial history. He built up the department of history in that region and also more spectacularly, he created the institute with the collaboration of Colonial Williamsburg. In a sense the making of the Virginia Quarterly into a magazine of national scholarly importance and generally the construction of the institute, these are perhaps the marks of his own that he left principally upon the college. The war had started even before he had become president. Pearl Harbor was in December of 1941, and Mr. Pompfret came in a few months later. So he inherited the college that was in the wartime situation.
The impact of the war upon the college was great and happened from the very beginning. Any number of faculty left to join the Armed Forces; some became Army officers and some Navy officers. This certainly decimated the faculty. I'm not sure what proportion one could say left. It could be figured out very easily with a computer or even with the knowledge of arithmetic, but I would guess offhand that it was something like twenty-five percent of the faculty went to war. But just about everybody except the female members and I guess some of them got involved in the waves and what not—just about everybody except those who were older and who stood in danger of being drafted. Even some who would not have been drafted volunteered; it is true. So the faculty was very much reduced in size. The student body even more so. Practically all the male students were of draft age and were drafted very shortly. Then of course the younger men who would have been admitted to the college didn't come in because of their impending military service. So we were a heavily female student body. I'm expressing something. I'm just saying that the student body was much smaller which caused great financial strangencies for the college. After all, these young people would have been paying tuition. And so the college introduced two military units which greatly helped with the financial situation. And this was a contribution presumably to the war effort on the part of the college. We had a Navy unit and then an Army unit. The Navy unit was the Navy Chaplain's school. It really had very little to do with the college as an academic institution but it really occupied space. We rented space to the Navy. That's what it came to—space that might have otherwise been empty—very good business. So the Chaplain's school—
So the Chaplain's school had a whole floor of offices (or at least they occupied a whole floor either for offices or classrooms) and I think they had some classrooms elsewhere. We housed them in the dormitories. We fed them in the dining hall. I had nothing to do with them. I just knew of their existence. By an extraordinary stroke of good luck and intelligent appointment on the part of the Navy, they appointed Cy Lambert to the Naval staff of the Chaplain's school. He already had his commission and this was his assignment. He was the best person in the world, of course, for this. He can tell you in any amount of detail that can be wanted (I'm sure) about that school, can perhaps correct mistakes that I may have made, though I think I have been sufficiently general to avoid error. Now the other unit was the Army Specialized Training Program (ASDP). This was very closely integrated with the college because as part of their training the boys in that program took academic courses just as in the ROTC and our faculty taught them in all these courses.

The Army staff taught them military activities and gave them their military training, but they had their liberal arts training with us. It was quite a heavy curriculum. In our courses and under our teachers they took physics, chemistry, history, English, mathematics, and engineering drawing. So our classrooms were filled by hundreds of these boys—I don't know just how many. In general they took their courses with our students. I mean a typical course of freshman English (I take it) would have been fifteen of our girls and fifteen of these boys.

Wartime had its pleasant side. The staff of this organization consisted of I think about five officers, something of that order. The two who are most memorable (rather the two that I remember with the most interest) were the commanding officer, Major McGinn, and the man who was I think the
junior member of the staff, certainly one of them, Dick Brooks, whom you know. Major McGinn was a national guardsman and who was inducted into the Army for the war. Major McGinn, the commanding officer, was tough, rough, boy-stroous, vulgar, jolly, outgoing, very likable man. I liked him anyway (with perhaps a taste for uncouthness) and he and I never had the slightest trouble. We got on famously, partly no doubt because he never tried to interfere with the College in any way. He simply turned over to us the academic work and told us what the curriculum was and how many students there were and that was all. And if he felt any need of liaison with the academic side of the college and his people, Dick Brooks was the one appointed to take care of that and there was never, never the slightest interference from the Army in this program.

Now I had a certain amount to do with making new appointments on account of this program. The program called for a larger number of students to take physics, for example, than we had had in previous years. It called for work in engineering drawing which we didn't have, as I recall. In any event, I found it necessary to find an additional teacher in physics and a teacher in engineering drawing. Well, how I got that man in physics, I don't remember. I guess he just turned up somehow, but anyhow he was much needed. In those days physicists were scarce nationally, so I was happy to have a physicist to add to the set, even though he wasn't the caliber to be a full professor. But by an odd coincidence he happened to be the son of Sigmund Freud. He was named Oliver Freud, and he was a gentle, meek, mild, inoffensive man, a something I wouldn't have expected the son of Sigmund Freud to be. But he had a flamboyant wife, which
perhaps accounts for his enforced gentleness. People did use the nasty phrase "henpecked" about him. While he was a perfectly competent man in his teaching he taught some mathematics besides physics. He never had any trouble with his students. I never heard of any of them being wildly inspired, but he served the purpose very well. A wild inspiration was hardly greatly needed in the 95 program. Then the other appointment I remember with particular pleasure is a teacher of engineering drawing. She at the moment is about two blocks from here. She is Sally Stepperson, then she was the wife of the head of the mathematics department, interested primarily I had supposed in landscape gardening and so on. But it appears that in her training as a landscape architect she had had to study a great deal of industrial drawing and engineering drawing. And so she was persuaded to teach courses in that field and did so very confidently and remembers her experience, I think, with very great pleasure. As far as I know it is the only time in her life that she ever taught unless conceivably she did so long before I don't know. You could ask her. This very interesting program came to an end. Before I go to that I will mention one personal note. Young Dick Brooks in the midst of the program decided to be married. The marriage was to take place here, travel was such then that the bride's mother couldn't come all the way from Florida, and the bride couldn't go all the way down to Florida or what not. Those things were rationed, I guess, or at least we couldn't do them easily. Well, the wedding took place in the college chapel. As dean and friend of my wife and I had the wedding reception in our house, and the bride's mother sent up a lot of flowers from Florida to decorate the house. This was a pleasant link between the academic
side of the college and the ASTP. And now every year starting a few years ago the Brooks and my wife and me entertain my wife and me on their anniversary. The boys in the ASTP program were suddenly yanked out of here. They were needed in the infantry. They'd been here training but there wasn't time to finish. Something about the Battle of the Bulge made it necessary for them to go into active service. General Eisenhower needed them, and so they all marched away. Most of them were killed. I shouldn't say that; I don't know that but many of them were.

Now I have spoken of a few appointments I made in the ASTP. Last time I forgot to mention (as you called to my attention) the appointments I made in the Bryan administration. So I think this might be a convenient point to take that up and do a few of them. I'll mention one appointment that I made after the war in Mr. Pomfret's administration and two that I made back before the war in Mr. Bryan's administration. Now I think that, both presidents, my relation as dean was essentially the same. Appointments were regularly made with the joint advice and consent of the department chairman, the dean and the president. Sometimes the heavy spade work in preparation for a new appointment was made by the chairman who would then bring the dean into the picture and we would report to the president. Sometimes the heavy spade work was done by myself for some reason or other, usually because the president requested that that particular appointment be prepared in that way. Well, when I did the heavy spade work, then I would in due time take the chairman into the picture and we would report to the president. And then later there were a few cases in which the president might say he took the initiative or did the heavy spade work.
For example, I'm sure that it was entirely Mr. Bryan's initiative that brought in Lester Cheek. That was before I was dean. I'm sure it was President Pomfret's initiative that brought in the new professors of colonial history. The thing was that it depended on the interest and on the contacts of the chairman, dean, and president as to how it was worked. I don't believe there was any case in which this was done completely over the head of the chairman. There were cases when it was done over the head of a department when there was no chairman. For example, I'll mention that kind of thing at this point. Dr. Young, who was head of the department of physics, died very suddenly of a heart attack. He died in his office as he was preparing his morning's work. Well, he left behind a rather small and I am obliged to say a rather unimpressive department. There was nobody in his department that I would have thought the president would have thought in a real position to appoint a new full professor of physics. And also, I think it very likely that they would not have wanted to have anything to do with it. Well, anyhow, it devolved on me to find someone of the sort that we would want as a full professor and chairman of the department. So this is the time when I did the spade work, though it wasn't much work. I just telephoned my former college roommate, who was head of the physics department at the University of Michigan, and I told him the situation and I said to send us somebody. So he did. He sent Wally McCormick, who stayed with us for a few years until they called him back to the University of Michigan as a full professor there. He was very good, and I think that's just about the easiest point. It wouldn't have made any sense at all to scrounge around the whole country because it is not easy to get, and I knew that
David Dennison, my roommate, would send me somebody first-class. There is always the danger, you know, when you don't know people of getting people of getting sold a bill of goods. Now two appointments, I might mention that took place before the war in Mr. Bryan's administration. I had the major hand in appointing Fred Butel, whose name you may know, and whose daughter is the wife of a man whose name I can't remember in the physics department. But that's pure coincidence, pure coincidence because Fred didn't stay many years. Fred was a distinguished legal scholar and has been since then a dean of a leading law school. Why it was my job to get him I can't remember. It seems odd; I would have thought that Ted were the dean of the department of education or Mr. Bryan, who was a lawyer by trade, but for some reason I did it. I'm sure I consulted them but I did the work and read a vast amount of stuff about Fred Butel and other people. I might mention just for fun, my first memory of him personally. He came to Williamsburg for me to interview him. My secretary and I did not know how to pronounce his name, and looking over his papers we decided that it was probably Boytel, the German pronunciation. So she and I always talked about Mr. Boytel. I had studied his credentials. One morning, the day he arrived, he came to the outer office and she came in to me and said in a very significant tone of voice, "Mr. Butel is here." Well, I'm sure I took him to see the president and the dean of the department of Jurisprudence, and there was no doubt that we wanted to get him. I think the only doubt was whether we could get enough salary to attract him. Somehow we got quite enough, maybe we raised it fifty dollars or something. In those days that was an amount.
Then Edgar Pomfret was appointed in 1939. It came about this way: I received a letter from England from a close friend of mine there telling me about him with very high praise. He was a refugee from Austria who got as far as London and wanted to come to the United States to go on with his career, which was closed, of course, in Austria. I told Mr. Bryan about him and he was very much interested and got enough money together—perhaps out of his own pocket—to send him traveling expenses to come across the Atlantic. Well, he turned out to be a very brilliant, engaging man with the highest credentials. But he also turned out (and what I hadn't quite known when this entered into things) he was primarily a criminologist, a specialist in criminal law, the sociology of crime and the psychology of crime, so that he didn't belong exclusively in one department. But no matter. The various departments that were concerned were willing, some were happy, to have him. He taught in all three of those departments after his appointment. And a little of this, a little of sociology, a little of psychology, and a little of law. He left here many years ago. He is still alive, though very old, in Pittsburgh or the vicinity of Pittsburgh. I think he became professor at the University of Pittsburgh when he left. Now I resigned my deanship in 1946. There were several reasons, and I had wanted to do that all along, that is after the first couple of years. I hadn't planned to be dean more than two or three years at the most. It was mainly the war and having a new president and his needing help that made me stay on. I resigned really the first year that it was decently possible and feasible to do so. Now Mr. Pomfret was very decent and helpful. In turn I went back to my own department.
President Pomfret was very kind and helpful and arranged that in returning to my department I would have the rank of chancellor professor, one of the recently established chancellor professorships. Charlie Umbeck of the department of sociology was appointed dean to succeed me. He remained in office for three years and left to become president of Knox College. He in turn was succeeded by Nelson Marshall in 1949, who remained for two years. This brings me to the famous football scandal of 1951.

Emily: Can I stop you there and I'll change the tape?
Emily: One problem that came up that surprised me having lived through the 1960s was apparently at one time there was some sort of flack of the college over some conscientious objectors that were on the faculty do you remember this?

Miller: Yes, I know very well about that. The flack was not in the college but in the board. There were two conscientious objectors in the faculty. A lot of alumni went to the board with protests and the board itself was displeased would displace at this.

Emily: But President Pomfret stood behind them, is that not true? They were not fired?

Miller: Well, it's more complicated than that.

Emily: More complicated than that?

Miller: This was in 1945. I was very anxious that any further uproar or scandal should be avoided. Also these men had no rights of the tenured they were both acting members of the faculty. But if they had been fired it would have created a scandal and been a questionable ethical justification. Well, I arrived by strange luck at the following solution. In May of 1945 the German Army collapsed. I remember the dates closely. May of 1945 was V.E. Day. It seemed to me quite probable that those members of the faculty on leave in the Army would be back by September or at least possibly. Whereas those who were in the Navy probably would not be because there was still Japan to deal with. So I decided that acting members of the faculty who were substituting for persons in the Army would not be reappointed whereas those who were substituting for people in the Navy would be. By a peculiar coincidence the two members of the
the two members of the acting staff who were substituting for people in
the Army were the two conscientious objectors. So as a matter of this
natural policy they were not reappointed.

Emily: It did well.

Miller: Yeah. It did one of them it did a great benefit because he was able to
go to Swarthmore faculty and it wouldn't have helped him any to have the stigma of being "noted." As for the other, Harry Freeman, he didn't suffer in the least. He went on to become full professor at Cornell. But Freeman was furious. He was the kind of pacifist who wants to have a big row. He was furious at the move that the trick and idea was to get rid of him because that deprived him of the opportunity to cry civil liberty and so forth. It was the case, you see. For some reason, I don't know more why, many of the faculty went into the Navy. The Army was the exception and the Navy was the regular thing. So as I said there were just two in 1944 on leave who were in the Army and my formula accordingly applied.

Emily: Did you have any trouble when the Navy and the Army people who had been on the faculty beforehand, did you have any trouble finding work for them when they returned to William and Mary?

Miller: No, because one can tell pretty far in advance when people are getting back and you make appointments quite a long time in advance. I don't recall there was ever any difficulty about that. We could have had two people for the same job which could have been handled, but I don't think
I don't think that ever occurred.

Emily: People who had been hired during the war had been hired expressly for the duration, is that right?

Miller: The acting faculty were as. 

Emily: They hired acting faculty?

Miller: Yes, oh yes. Now, definitely. They were appointed year by year with the title acting. And it was always known who they were acting for, who they were replacing.

Emily: Did the great influx of veterans after the war present any special problems for you, or had you already resigned from the deanship first?

Miller: Well, let's see...They began to come before I resigned...Most of it came a little later. No, I don't think there was ever any real problem there. No, it was really all to the good. It just meant that one's classes tended to be a little more mature than usual—at least a little bit older. I remember particularly in my big introductory course, in the middle of the lecture somebody sounded off with a question. Well, that was never done, you know. The students would always wait until the end—that is with a big class. And this man asked such an intelligent question and expressed it so well that I couldn't be taken back. He turned out later to be quite a person—Peter Boyton, who graduated and later became a very distinguished novelist and professor of English and one of our most prnamental alumni who died unfortunately just a few months ago.

Emily: But in general, you didn't find the veterans to be at least more mature students?

Miller: Yeah, no, I don't think there was ever any difficulty on account of the fact that they were veterans. On the contrary.
Emily: Except in housing.

Miller: Oh. They were married, you mean?

Emily: Yes. That was an altogether different problem from yours.

Miller: When you resigned from the deanship, then, there was a problem between Dr. Pomfret and the Board in choosing your successor. How much did you know of this at the time?

Emily: 1 didn't know that there was any problem—was there? Umbeck?

I didn't know about it.

Emily: He was not Dr. Pomfret's recommendation.

Miller: Oh, I see. Do you know who was?

Emily: Yes, Dr. Felan. The Board selected Dr. Umbeck.

Miller: No, 1 didn't know about that. At least if I did I had forgotten. I think Umbeck made a good dean, and I think Felan would have, also. No, I didn't know about that.

Emily: And now you are going to get on to 1951.

Miller: Well, the ambitious athletic program that William and Mary had adopted before the war of course came to an end during the war. I think the whole coaching staff left—That could be verified. I think all of it and—certainly most of it. But then when the war was over fairly soon thereafter the college returned to its bigtime program of athletics. Rug McCray was appointed as head coach. He had been one of Carl Voyles's assistants. I think you'd say he was the principal assistant. Anyhow, he was made Director of athletics and had coach with the intention on the part of the Board of having a strong football team—a team that would win more than it lost with other teams of high caliber. Before long, and I can't give the exact time lag on this, there was a good deal of opposition
from the student body to the program of athletics. There was a regular phrase that was used, "the overemphasis on football," "overemphasis on athletics." The students were quite active in protesting. I don't recall what the faculty were openly engaged in protest, but certainly the students were. They didn't protest in the way that students in the late '60s or did. There were no strikes, computers burned, or bricks thrown through windows as there were in the '60s, not at William and Mary perhaps, but in many other places. Now, the students that I'm talking about back in the late '40s and early '50s were completely free from violence. They got petitions together and got things into the Flat Hat, no doubt, passed motions, and so on. But there was quite a definitely observable movement of protest that went on. Then the scandal itself started with the falsification of the high school records by the coach McCray. This is curiously the reverse of what what Dean Hodges did. He falsified college records to deceive other institutions, whereas McCray was falsifying the records of other institutions to deceive his own. The thing was, you know, that there were certain standards of admission, after all, and if you got hold of a promising football player who did not have the academic qualifications for admission, he would fix the record up so that apparently the student did have the qualifications. It was easy to change a 60 into a 90, you know. Well, now in due time this came to the attention of President Pomfret. I do not know exactly how it came to his attention, whether it came through the dean (Dean Marshall) or in some other way. There are those, no doubt, who do know. But anyhow it came to his attention. His reaction to it was the opposite of the way Mr. Bryan had reacted in the Hodges affair.
immediately and

Mr. Bryan had acted strongly as you know. He discharged Deen Hodges. Mr. Pomfret delayed, did not take strong action. I presume that he told McCray that this sort of thing is not done, you can't do that; must not do that—in the future. And he probably hoped that McCray would find himself a job somewhere else and probably move away. I think that this was Mr. Pomfret's great mistake. He should have acted promptly and vigorously. But he was a very kind man, and he didn't want to destroy McCray's family. As a matter of fact, he was personally very much devoted to the McCrays. And so he delayed and really did nothing for the time being, at least.

Well, Nelson Marshall was outraged at this delay. Now Marshall was a man of very high integrity who regarded anything dishonest as a cause for capital punishment, so to speak. He was, shall we say, an idealist. Mr. Pomfret was a realist in this matter. Lots of people often spoke of Nelson as a sort of Sir Galahad in his impractical purity. And I think it could be argued that being under Mr. Pomfret he acted unethically in challenging Mr. Pomfret's decision. Who knows? These things are very complicated, and I don't know all the facts—perhaps never did. Perhaps nobody does. It involved a full round of different people and what have you and what happens when and what private conversations were held when, you know. In any event, this much is certain: It was Mr. Pomfret's soft response to the McCray problem and Nelson Marshall's strong intervention that created the scandal, because all of this leaked into the press and the Board of Visitors found about all of it. It was the leaking to the press, of course, that put the Board into a difficult position. So long as the Board doesn't get a bad press, it's perfectly willing that anything
should be going on. Now whether it was Nelson that leaked this to the press or not, I don't know. But then again, who knows? Leaks, this is very difficult to identify. But it became publicly known that McCracken had falsified the records and that Pomfret had not fired him. So then the board put a very pious look on its face and decided that Pomfret was to blame for all this and for all this bad publicity that the college was getting. The ironic thing is that it was the board, not the president, who was basically responsible for the big athletic program. Pomfret hadn't wanted that. The board had. The board and the alumni were the ones that wanted bigtime athletics. Now when you have bigtime athletics the danger of the sort of thing that McCracken did is very great. The cause of McCracken's behavior was that we had a bigtime athletic program. He had to build a winning team. Now how do you do that? Now so the cause of the cause of his behavior was the policy of the college which was established by the board. But the board, instead of recognizing that it might be somewhat to blame for this denounced Pomfret for not having fired the coach. They didn't want the coach fired; they just didn't want bad publicity.

Well, things came to a head very rapidly. The board made things so hard for Mr. Pomfret that, of course, he resigned. This happened in a few days. He resigned and departed and went to a job that was far better than when he got ahead. Now was this just coincidence or what? That he had been in touch with the Huntington people some months before? I don't think he could have foreseen what was to happen at William and Mary, but I think he was planning to resign to go to the Huntington job—not that that matters very much.
Not that that matters very much. So for the first time possibly in the history of the college, the college had no president because Pomfret's resignation was not as a month from now but immediately. So there was no president. So to tide things over until they could find a new president, the board asked me to be the acting president, which I was for four or five or six weeks. I think I'll call this installment ending there.

My acting presidency I think belongs more with the next division rather than at the end of this.

Emily: Do you want to talk about how you were selected now or would you rather save that until next time?

Yes

Miller: Yeah, because I don't remember.
Miller: At the end of our last session, Miss Emily, you asked me how it was that I was appointed as acting president. The simplest answer is simply this: The director of the Board asked me to be acting president, and I reluctantly consented. I never knew quite why he asked me rather than anybody else, but I presume that it was probably because I was the only former senior dean in the College. Other former deans had died or resigned to go elsewhere sometime before. I believe, and I remember vaguely, that there was a ad hoc faculty committee that advised with the rector on the appointment of acting president, but I really don’t know anything about that. In any event, I was appointed and became acting president on September 18. Dr. Pomfret had resigned on September 13. So for five days there was the extraordinary circumstance that the College had no president, acting or otherwise. It seems to me that it got on perfectly well during those five days. A few days ago if you had asked me how long I was acting president I think I would have said five or six weeks. To my considerable surprise, looking through my papers, it was only three weeks, precisely three weeks that I served. My function as acting president was simply to tide the College over until their regular president could be appointed. In the short time and under the circumstances it was hardly possible to accomplish anything in particular, and of lasting value. So most of my work was simply routine and ceremonial, tidying things over. I did one thing which is perhaps memorable; I recall with pleasure. I gave a speech to the annual autumn convocation of the College on September 28. I think it was published in the Alumni Gazette. I can’t find a copy of it myself, but I’m quite sure it was published, and it was quoted in part in many press stories. This is how I came to write it: On the Sunday morning a few days before the convocation I had not prepared it at all. Neither had I cut the grass around our house in Indian Springs. I decided to spend Sunday morning cutting the grass. As I cut it, the speech began to take form in my mind, and when I had finished cutting the
grass I had finished the speech. So I phoned up Pearl Jones immediately (Pearl was my secretary; she had been Dr. Pomfret's, and she was to be Mr. Chandler's. She was the presidential secretary.) Pearl met me over at the President's office and I dictated the whole thing and she typed it up from her shorthand notes. Of course it came out exactly as I had dictated it. Now the morale of the college was very low at that time because of the events in the last few weeks of the Pomfret administration: the football scandal, the forced resignation of an admired president, the high-handed action of the board. Both students and faculty were very depressed at that time. The purpose of my speech was to lift their spirits to improve the morale of the whole college community.

Fifteen years later I was told by Bill Guy that he remembered the speech very well and that I had indeed done the things that I had meant to do in it.

So much really for my acting presidency, which was a very momentary thing.

I might add that lest anybody think otherwise, I had no thought or desire of becoming the regular president. All I wanted was to get back to my department as soon as circumstances would permit. So I'll go right ahead to the appointment of President Chandler and my views of his administration.

I want to describe the four years from his appointment to my resignation.

In order to do this I'm going to jump ahead to 1955, to the end of the four years, for a reason that will soon be apparent. In 1955, summer knowing that I was about to resign, I prepared a statement for the press of my reasons for doing so. There had been many resignations during the four years. Faculty members resigned because they were dissatisfied, opposed to the Chandler administration. But all of them had simply departed silently, at least with no statement to the public as to why they were leaving.

My wife and I decided that when it was time for us to leave we would not depart silently. So as I said I prepared a statement for the press to be
be released on the day of my resignation. This is the way I prepared it. I wrote it up of considerable length. In fact, I wrote a 20-page statement of my reasons for resigning. Having done so, then realized that having got that off my chest, it would be more effective to issue a short statement. Readers of newspapers were not likely to plow through twenty. So I wrote the short statement then to use instead and a long statement lay in my files, where it has rested undisturbed for 20 years. I think I mentioned it to you last time (perhaps not on the recorder) and expressed some doubt as to whether I could find it. But I found it without any trouble in a file labeled 'first draft of statement.' Now I propose to read it to you, Miss Emily, and you, Mr. Recorder, because I think it is by far the best way I can present in fairly full detail my reasons for resigning and my views of the whole Chandler administration. Before I start reading it, here is my little prefaces. It should be pointed out that the first draft is addressed to the rector of the Board. I had forgotten that, but I had intended that it was to take form of a letter to the rector. So I occasionally say in the statement, Mr. Rector, sir, and so on. In the second place, from the perspective of the present, 20 years later, I recognize that much of the style of this document is over emotional and flamboyant characteristics that were the product of the time. If I were writing this now—which is some contradiction in terms—I think I'd tone the style down, but the substance, the content I find myself in full agreement with now. I think that the content is absolutely correct as expressing my views of 20 years ago. In the third place, by way of preliminary, the document takes a running start.
I begin by a brief description of the Bryan administration and then the Pomfret administration. I won't omit these in reading because they are integral to the whole document. So they give a quick summary of things we talked about in the previous sessions. And also it might interest you as a historian to compare what I said about those administrations the other day with what I said twenty years earlier. I think you'll find them completely consistent though as I have indicated the later portion is flamboyant.

Here is the so-called first draft of the statement:

About a year and a half ago I came reluctantly to the conclusion that under its present auspices there is no hope for the College of William and Mary in the foreseeable future. Rather than remaining here to witness further its rapid and constant deterioration and the destruction of much of my life's work, I decided to seek appointment elsewhere. But positions on the senior level in my field are scarce and it was not until early this summer that my search was successful. That new position is better than my old one in respect to salary, teaching load, and kindred matters, and that it is in one of the most distinguished universities of North America is simply my good fortune. Accordingly I have resigned at the College effective at the end of the present session when I shall have completed twenty years of service on the faculty. Four years I planned to remain at the college for the rest of my life. Since I have had the privilege of playing a rather special part at the College, having been Dean of the faculty from 1938 to 1946, and acting President from September
13, 1951, to October 11, 1951, I consider it my duty to inform the citizens of Virginia and you, Mr. Rector, of the cause of my disillusionment.

It was John Stewart Bryan, 20th president, who brought me to the college as associate professor in philosophy in September, 1935. Teaching here in those early days of William and Mary's new golden age was a wonderful experience. In its modest way it was like living in Renaissance Florence or fifth-century Athens. Mr. Bryan's infectious enthusiasm gave color and élan to the whole college. He had a genius for leadership. He led by inspiring us with love for the college and (unintentionally) love for himself. Nearly all of us, students and faculty alike, strove to do our best in order to please Mr. Bryan and out of devotion to the College.

There was a wonderful sense of surging forward, a conviction that the College was on its way to reassuming its rightful position among the two or three leading colleges of the liberal arts and sciences in America. Petty critics often complained that Mr. Bryan spent only half of his time at the College. Apparently it never occurred to them that he could do in half his time what lesser men could never hope to do in all of theirs. He was a great college president, one of the greatest, in a class, for example, with Eliot of Harvard.

His successor, Dr. John E. Pomfret, though he lacked Mr. Bryan's genius, was an admirable college president, a fine historical scholar, a gifted executive, he preserved and consolidated the gains of Mr. Bryan's administration, further increased the academic excellence and reputation of the college, and brought it unscathed through the difficult days of the war. Much that he might have done, however, he never did; hampered as he was, like Mr.
Bryan before him by reactionary influences which exerted a powerful and baleful effect and constantly dampened his enthusiasm. After the events of the summer of 1951, which issued in Dr. Pomfret's resignation, in the famous faculty statement and in my acting presidency (a position that I did not at all desire since it involved an erruption of scholarly work to which I was committed), the appointment of Alvin Duke Chandler as twenty-second president of the college announced on August 9, 1951, bore all the earmarks not only of furtiveness but of hysterical haste. Most members of the faculty regarded it as a wanton violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of a commitment which the board through its then rector had made to the faculty. Many members of the faculty, probably a majority, and many members of the student body, probably a majority, were so outraged that they planned strong and immediate representations to the governor which would not only protest the manner of the appointment but also question the qualifications of the appointee; a mass march to Richmond being actually contemplated. It was one of the last acts of my brief acting presidency to disavow them from these extreme measures on three grounds, namely: 1) that the issues were too subtle to enable us to hold the support of the general public, 2) that we really knew nothing of Admiral Chandler and as the board had presumably studied his qualifications, we should have confidence in its choice, and 3) that Admiral Chandler was probably ignorant of the circumstances of which he had been appointed and was therefore not to be condemned out of hand. If I had to do it over again I suppose I should give the same advice, though it would be on the first ground only.

In spite of indignation at the manner of Admiral Chandler's appointment
and doubts concerning his fitness for the position, the devotion of the faculty and students to the college was so great that with negligible exceptions, they hoped sincerely that Admiral Chandler's administration would be a success and earnestly strove to support and cooperate with him. Admiral Chandler will find this difficult to believe but I know it to be true. But their hopes were soon dashed, their attempts rebuffed in a matter of days or weeks or months or years, depending on the individual, it gradually dawned on us, one by one, that Admiral Chandler is not only catastrophically incompetent as president of the College of William and Mary, but incapable of something Admiral Chandler, in my opinion, is no more fit to be president of the college than for example, professor Jess Hamilton Jackson, head of the English department, is fit to command a battleship in wartime. Indeed, I think that professor Jackson would do a less disastrous job at such a strange assignment for at least that he would know that he knew not and would seek and follow the advice of a competent staff. It should be admitted, of course, that the admiral has certain virtues. He is gifted with tremendous energy. He has an unusual capacity for very hard and sustained work. He is capable of joviality and often makes a pleasant impression on parents of students. He is capable of deference to people whom he considers to be his superiors in his hierarchical world and impresses them with his technique of "throwing a lot of paper at them." He is deeply devoted to the college according to his likes. But since it is obvious to any competent educator that
his lines are all wrong, his virtues all become vices. His principal
disqualification for the presidency (disqualification) is his monumental
genius for antagonizing people. As a former member of the administration
remarked upon taking his departure, "If there are two ways of doing any-
th ing, Chandler will infallibly choose the one that will make
everybody mad." He has antagonized the faculty collectively and most of
us individually. He has done the same with students. He has antagonized
officials of Colonial Williamsburg and many residents of this city. All
of that I know at first hand. I am told on good authority that he
antagonizes nearly every newspaper man who comes in contact with him and
that he has granted himself persona non grata with ranking officials of
the government of the commonwealth that he is not precisely a pied piper
in dealing with the members of the assembly is shown by his staggering
failure with that body in the matter of appropriations. As a proof of
Admiral Chandler's incapacity to get along with his co-workers, I submit
the matter of his loss of the excellent administration which he inherited.
Why did the dean of women, Katherine Jeffers, resign? Because she found
the Admiral impossible to work with and therefore sought another post.
"A well-deserved promotion," the Admiral said. It has been muttered
I am told by some members of the board that we are better off without her, but
that is refuted by her great success at the excellent college of which she
is now dean. Why did the assistant dean of women, Margaret Wynne-Roberts,
then leave after serving the college many years? Because Dean Jeffers,
knowing that Miss Wynne-Roberts found the Admiral impossible to work with
and knowing her splendid ability, called her to Jackson College whenever a
vacancy occurred. Why did the beloved college physician, Dr. Gordon Keppel,
leave? Because of a "clash of personalities" no doubt. But why must we have a president who disrupts the whole college by clashing with nearly everyone? Why did John E. Hocquet, Dean of Men, an alumnus of the college who had been dean here for fourteen years, who had planned to spend his life here and of whom no one could even mutter that we are better off without him, why did John Hocquet leave? For the very reason that lost us Katherine Jeffers. Another "well-deserved promotion." Why did Lockett Benes, Jr., Lockett-Denus, Jr. the director of plant and maintenance, a man who was appointed originally not on the initiative of President Pompert but on that of the rector himself, resign? He has told you, sir, in a blistering letter which I hope will be released to the public. I have been informed by the Board member generally supposed to be principally responsible for the Admiral's appointment that the reason for his selection was that the college needed an administrator. Let us consider Admiral Chandler as college administrator. He knows, apparently, only one system of administration: that which prevails in the Navy. He sought to apply it to the college, but it simply will not work in a college for two reasons: 1. No college has the wealth to provide the large staff which this method requires. When the admiral first came aboard he set the deans and other administrators to work writing reports, terms of reference, detailed description of office procedures, and so forth. Before long he had practically the whole faculty spending most of its time writing self-evaluations and what not. That is all very well, but with a small staff it means that little time will remain for doing the current work at one's office. In the course of time this nuisance has been abated to some extent, but now key deans must spend most of their time trying to dissuade the admiral from making major blunders.
That is all very well; but with a small staff it means that little time remained for doing the current work at one's office. In the course of time this nuisance has been abated to some extent. Now key deans must spend most of their time trying to dissuade the Admiral from making major blunders. The net effect is that the routine work of the administrative offices has to be neglected or done hastily; and there has never been in my memory so much administrative confusion and inefficiency as in the last four years. Mr. Bryan was no administrator. He was an executor, a leader, a poet, a prophet. Dr. Pomfret was perhaps no administrator in the special sense intended by the board member. He, too, was an executive. But under them the administrative offices functioned efficiently.

2. The Navy system presupposes obedience on the part of those below and the giving of commands on the part of those above. —"loyalty up and loyalty down." The professional men working together in civilian life find command and obedience irrelevant to their situation and quite intolerable if an administrator tries to impose it. They proceed rather by the free interplay of trained intelligence. What would the staff doctors of a great hospital think if the practice of their profession consisted in carrying out the orders of an administrator? College teachers, too, are professional men; and the Latin for 'teacher' is 'doctor.' But what began as a futile attempt to apply a method that is suited to a military arm but impossible in the civilian life of a democratic society was soon distorted as a result of anger and frustration into something else. Is it military method that a senior member of the faculty who suggested to the Admiral that the presence at the entrance to the college yard of a large banner advertising 'The Common Glory' was in-