

Session 3

February 25, 1976

Charles City County, Va.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, we had talked last time about some of your experiences in the state department of education, and you had told about your assistant <sup>supervisor</sup> ~~superintendent~~ position. Did you hold other positions in the state department before being appointed state superintendent of public instruction?

Paschall: Yes. In fact, I undertook more different positions than anyone had done previously in the department. During 1947-'48 I served as acting director of teacher education while Dr. J.L. Blair Buck was on leave. I was then appointed supervisor of elementary education, and when the director, Dr. Orville W. Wake, departed to become president of Lynchburg College I succeeded him as director of elementary education. I was later appointed associate director of instruction with much broader responsibilities. I was subsequently appointed director of teacher education, succeeding Dr. J.L. Blair Buck, who retired.

Williams: What about the effect on your family during those busy years?

Paschall: Well, in changing positions about every eighteen months, with each one bringing new challenges and increased responsibilities, I really had very little time to spend with my family. The trips we managed to take together were often in connection with my attending conferences. I seemed to be constantly traveling in giving speeches in all parts of

the state, conducting conferences, and serving on school consolidation survey teams.

Permit me to tell you of a development that did occasion considerable family concern. In October 1948, our son, Philip, who was about two years of age, was hospitalized in Johnston-Willis Hospital. He was critically ill and was not released until late February 1949. His recovery was regarded as miraculous. This experience, more than any other I recall, revived certain spiritual values and faith that deepened and endured. So many times I recalled the lines from Tennyson's Idylls of the King :

More things are wrought by prayer  
Than this world dreams of . . .  
For what are men better than sheep or goats  
That nourish a blind life within the brain,  
If, knowing God, they lift not hands of prayer . . .

During the time of Philip's hospitalization Dr. Theodore F. Adams, pastor of the First Baptist Church in Richmond, visited frequently. This wonderful man, who later became president of the Baptist World Alliance, helped us greatly. He later baptized me in the Baptist faith, and I taught Sunday School classes at First Baptist Church until I left Richmond in 1960. He later gave the invocation at my inauguration as president of the college.

Williams: What religious faith had you embraced previously?

Paschall: Presbyterian.

Williams: Then did you move from your apartment that you had told about on Chamberlayne Avenue?

Paschall: Yes, we bought a home in Rollingwood, located in the far west end of Richmond. This afforded a better environment for our son's extensive convalescence. It also provided a place for my wife to cultivate flowers and shrubs. In time she became a very active participant in garden clubs and thoroughly enjoyed flower arranging. She later taught at Douglas Freeman High School, where our daughter, Elizabeth, graduated in 1960.

Williams: With such a busy schedule, when and how did you attain the doctor's degree?

Paschall: I managed some brief leaves of absence during the summer months and finally attained the degree from the University of Virginia in 1954. Former Governor Colgate W. Darden, Jr., was then president of the university and presided at the degree conferrals.

Williams: When were you appointed state superintendent of public instruction?

Paschall: I was appointed by Governor Thomas B. Stanley on March 12, 1957, and took the oath of office on March 13, 1957. Incidentally Governor Stanley later served on the Board of Visitors when I was president of the college.

Williams: Were you reappointed by Governor Almond?

Paschall: Yes, in 1958.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, would you comment on those years as state superintendent of public instruction?

Paschall: It is difficult to know where to begin. Those were produc-

tive and yet "crisis" years for public education.

Williams: What do you mean by "crisis years"?

Paschall: Well, there had been the U.S. Supreme Court decision of 1954, which forbade segregation in public schools because of race. Emotions were by 1957 beginning to be aroused, and the storm was about to break.

Williams: Why was there a lapse of a few years before this situation developed?

Paschall: Well, in retrospect I think there were several reasons. It took some time for the "shock" of the decision to be sensed as a reality of law by many people. The chief reason, I think, was the fact that the court on one hand declared segregation unconstitutional, but on the other hand decreed that desegregation become a process "of deliberate speed." It took a while for litigation to ensue here and there, whereby federal judges in one instance might set a time period of several years as "deliberate speed" and fewer years in other instances for desegregation to materialize.

Williams: But you were aware of this impending crisis at the time?

Paschall: Yes. In my public statement at the time I took the oath of state superintendent of public instruction, I said in part:

In these crucial times I am deeply aware of the unusually grave responsibility involved in this position. The fact that the problems are deep and complex is all the more reason that we should face them with intelligent study and avoid hasty decisions.

We can meet these problems if we will dispel

unwarranted fears and the type of pessimism that lulls us into a do-nothing state of "what's the use?" We can meet them if we will strive for a consecrated bond of unity throughout this Commonwealth in the cause of education; if we will display the courage of dedicated conviction; and bring to bear the discipline of reason in all our deliberations.

This statement served to clarify the role I would pursue: namely a high sense of devotion and dedication to the Cause of Education as a priority objective and responsibility and would encourage reason in arriving at solutions to unprecedented problems.

Williams: And would you recount what happened?

Paschall: Well, in 1957-'58 we made significant revisions in teacher certification regulations, in revision of school building regulations, in revision of standards for junior and senior colleges, in revision of accreditation regulations, a reorganization of the State Department of Education, and completed a State Board of Education study of the curriculum. Yet permit me to read these statements which I wrote in the 1957-'58 "Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction:"

Despite these achievements, the year 1957-'58 will be remembered as a tragic paradox -- the year of our greatest advance in public education and, simultaneously, the year posing the greatest threat to our public schools since their beginning in 1870.

The impact of court decisions in the desegregation cases is being met by a mounting resistance born of deep seated tradition, mores and constitutional belief and precedent.

No assessment by the future historian of this deepening crisis can be fully accurate unless it reflect the sense of values held by those who now experience these tragic moments.

Since the May decision of 1954 we have witnessed

the gulf widen and deepen between the races; felt, here and there, the hand of mutual friendship grow icy and be withdrawn; seen old wounds, seared over by time and circumstance, reopened; and sensed the inevitable conclusion that the monumental progress of recent years in public education for both races may now be seriously retarded.

Williams: What followed?

Paschall: Well, I have a copy of the 1958-'59 "Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction," and I would like to read two of the paragraphs I wrote at that time:

The future historian will undoubtedly record the 1958-1959 school year as a year of crisis in its import for public education in Virginia.

Whereas there were many factors that impinged on the cause of public education, the main focus was two-pronged: the explosive series of events related to integration suits emanating from the Supreme Court decision 1954, and the birth pangs of a space age that turned critically to education as a determiner in the sudden warfare of ideologies for the capture of the minds of men.

Williams: Under the "first prong" of integration to which you refer, what was the situation there?

Paschall: During the fall of 1958 white high schools were closed in Norfolk, Front Royal, and Charlottesville -- also one white elementary school in Charlottesville -- as a result of the application of the then existing Virginia statutes in instances of federal court-ordered desegregation in these schools. Other cases in Arlington and Alexandria resulted in an order of the federal court for admission of Negro pupils in certain white schools at the coming mid-term. Under these Virginia laws it was required that the state superintendent of public instruction take

charge of the closed schools. I remember having to make decisions as to whether the football teams could play their fall schedule, whether the bands could participate, what security measures were to be enforced, and many other related matters.

Williams: How did you manage such activities from Richmond?

Paschall: Fortunately I enjoyed a good rapport with the local school officials and dispatched those persons from the State Department of Education who could work well with them on an informal basis. I also personally visited the situations involved. As a result we had no unfortunate disruptions or violence.

Williams: What happened next?

Paschall: The Virginia laws to which I referred were invalidated by Virginia's own Supreme Court of Appeals in a January 1959 decision which related to the issue of payment of tuition grants that was then the matter primarily before the Court. Governor Almond called a special session of the General Assembly during the latter part of January 1959, to deal with the emergency. The assembly promptly repealed the compulsory school attendance law and revised provisions for payment of tuition grants in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the State Board of Education. On February 2, 1959, while the assembly was in session, Negroes under federal court orders entered white high schools in Norfolk, Arlington, Alexandria, and Front Royal. Appeals in

the federal courts had resulted in a stay of integration for the school year in Charlottesville. No white students returned to the Front Royal High School on February 2, or thereafter during the second semester. They chose instead to attend a private foundation school established by citizens of the community.

Williams: What did you observe as the mood of the General Assembly at that special session?

Paschall: It was somber. A sense of frustration permeated the air. So many members were torn between a time-honored respect for law, which they regarded the Supreme Court decision, and at the same time were keenly sensitive to the deep-seated resistance that prevailed in southside Virginia and a few other areas.

Williams: Were you, as state superintendent of public instruction, called before the legislative committees?

Paschall: Yes, frequently. My approach basically was to react to proposals by assessing the possible effects on the Cause of Public Education. My role, I felt, was to help find solutions, short-range admittedly in some instances, as would keep the lamp of learning burning and enable us to weather the storm. This position, I discovered later, earned a very rewarding respect on the part of leaders in the General Assembly.

It is difficult, if not impossible, for one today who did not experience those times to imagine or believe the



charged, emotional setting under which solutions were sought and which in itself often deterred a climate of reason. But one thing I knew inwardly was that the leaders of Virginia were basically supportive of public education and were soul searching in their efforts to assure its survival.

Williams: And what did the General Assembly do in that special session in 1959 finally?

Paschall: Well, the governor appointed a commission composed of members of the General Assembly to study the matter in all its complexities, and the special session recessed until the commission's recommendations could be formulated. Upon reconvening, the General Assembly enacted legislation under a freedom-of-choice theme that provided for pupil scholarships (previously referred to as tuition grants) to become a joint program financed by local and state funds, revised procedures for local appropriations to schools, reenacted with certain changes the school compulsory attendance law on a basis of option by the localities, provided for direct issuance of permits by the state superintendent of public instruction for operation of private schools, devised a cancellation process for teaching scholarships in private, nonsectarian schools, and enacted a pupil placement law to become effective in March 1960. Suffice it to say that there were many problems, but they were gradually resolved within an increasing climate of

reason and understanding.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, what about state appropriations under the impact of that situation?

Paschall: We realized during this anguishing period not only the largest state appropriation for public education in its history, but also the highest percentage increase over any previous biennium. This fact to me, in the final analysis, is a most revealing testimonial and tribute to the faith held by the governor and members of the General Assembly in the Cause of Public Education in Virginia. I certainly commend it to the attention of the future historian who writes about that crisis.

Williams: A few minutes ago you said something about "the birth pangs of a space age" that affected public education at that time. Would you elaborate on this, please?

Paschall: The launching of the Russian satellite Sputnik in October 1957, ignited a fuse of widespread alarm amid the American public. After the first wave of hysteria, which was peppered with criticism of education at all levels, had subsided, the significance of the event came to be recognized more for what it symbolized than its basic worth as such. Some of the criticism was justified and served a useful purpose in bringing financial support for scientific equipment, facilities, and research that would not otherwise have been realized by schools and colleges. The danger, however, of crash programs on the curriculum, resulting

in unbalanced instructional processes, suddenly became very real under the strong advocacies to produce scientists, mathematicians, and engineers and to develop quickly a technology that would surpass that of Russia.

Williams: How was this danger met as far as the public schools were concerned?

Paschall: It was met by the State Department of Education and educational leaders throughout the state who recognized and appreciated two very important factors: (1) that the public school in a democracy operates within a context of events that often occasion new or revised emphases in its aims and practices, and that (2) it is the responsibility of those in positions of educational stewardship to exercise the wisdom as will invite a serious consideration of current innovations, reputed panaceas, and new ideas, while at the same time preserving a sound continuity of learning based on time-proven fundamentals.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, a moment ago you referred to what Sputnik symbolized. What did you mean by that?

Paschall: Well, for those who paused to reflect on the startling changes of the previous two decades, it became evident that Sputnik was not the usher of the New Age, as it was termed, but rather a striking highlight in an explosive sequence of developments that tended to dim the very foundations of time-honored bodies of knowledge and belief in the awesome promise of things to be. In a more philosophical

sense I felt that it symbolized a new type of warfare amid an uneasy peace -- a struggle of ideologies for the capture of the minds of men in a rapidly developing nuclear arena, in which the chief contenders would be Russia and the United States. The final determiners, I believed, would lie increasingly in the realm of the intellect and spirit rather than in the power of brawn. The quality of our educational system became, therefore, more important than ever.

My concern basically at the time of such a sudden worship of science was that we not lose sight of the arts and humanities in the education of our citizens. To suffer such loss, I felt, might well mean that an ultimate technological win on our part would be no more than a hollow victory, devoid of certain values that had nourished and sustained us as a nation. Put another way, a nation in an arduous struggle with a formidable rival may without adequate safeguards so subtly emulate the tactics of its adversary as in time to become a betrayer of its own ideals, convictions, and higher purpose. Such safeguards should be the very heart and core of our educational system.

I believe that Thomas Edison summed up what I am trying to impart when he said in the last days of his life: "I like to feel that I have been able to contribute something toward making the world a better place in which to live,

but I am fearful of the day when man's <sup>ingenuity may devise and invent that which man's</sup> sense of saving humanity will not or cannot control."

Williams: What would you say then, in summary, were some of the achievements during your administration as state superintendent of public instruction?

Paschall: Well, first of all I must emphasize that such achievements, and there were many, were "shared achievements." It must be obvious that I alone could have accomplished little without the tremendous help of dedicated, hard-working members of the State Board of Education, the State Department of Education, and educational leaders and teachers throughout the state. Anyone interested in these collective achievements should read the "Annual Reports of the Superintendent of Public Instruction" for the years 1957-1960. I will cite a few to illustrate:

The standards for teachers in Virginia were thoroughly revised to emphasize increased preparation in basic subject fields, and the academic requirements for graduation from high school were strengthened; the accreditation standards for colleges -- these were then subject to the State Board of Education-- were brought up-to-date; school building regulations were completely revised; specialists in the basic subject fields were employed for the first time in the State Department of Education; a strong guidance program was inaugurated on a statewide basis; the teaching program was expanded, and a new program of general scholarship and loans for college students was initiated.

Aside from such specific achievements, I would have to say that the very survival and advances of public education during those crisis years were the result of the great faith

of the people of Virginia and the superb leadership of so many who possessed a deep sense of educational stewardship. I was humbly grateful for the opportunity afforded me to serve the Cause of Public Education at that crucial time in our history.

Williams: When you were appointed president of the College of William and Mary, did you have to submit a letter of resignation to the governor, and if so, what was his reply?

Paschall: Yes; as you know, the governor of Virginia under the Virginia constitution is the appointing authority for the state superintendent of public instruction. I did therefore submit my resignation to Governor Almond, and I cherish deeply his reply, which was:

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE  
Richmond  
June 16, 1970

Dr. Davis Y. Paschall  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
State Office Building  
Richmond, Virginia

Dear Dr. Paschall:

This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 16 which comes pursuant to conference with you on June 13 and June 15 relating to your appointment as President of the College of William and Mary and your resignation as Superintendent of Public Instruction.

You submit your resignation as Superintendent of Public Instruction to be made effective at my convenience.

In the several conferences which you and I have had relating to this situation, we have reviewed and you have advised me of the vital programs relating to the cause of

public education now pending under your direction before the State Department and the State Board of Education.

I wish to express to you my deep appreciation for your complete willingness to afford me a reasonable period of time in view of the necessity of evaluating the important considerations in naming your successor.

Your resignation is therefore accepted according to the terms and tenor of your letter of submission. I express to you not only my personal appreciation but the gratitude and appreciation which I know emanates from the people of Virginia for the great services which you have rendered as Superintendent of Public Instruction. Your pre-eminent qualifications, your devotion to the cause of public education and your full realization of the times causes me deep regret that the high honor which has recently come to you necessitates your resignation.

Permit me to say that no association which I have had in public service has inspired a deeper sense of satisfaction nor a higher respect for an incumbent in public office than has my official association with you. I congratulate you on the opportunity which your recent appointment affords for continued leadership in the field of education and congratulate the Board of Visitors of the Colleges of William and Mary in Virginia for the splendid judgment which it has exercised in tendering your appointment as President of a great educational institution.

With very best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. Lindsay Almond, Jr.

Williams: I know the State Board of Education adopted a resolution regarding your service as State Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Paschall: Yes, I have a copy and will read a few paragraphs that I regard as particularly gratifying:

During a period in which the Commonwealth of Virginia has been confronted with its most serious and perplexing problems of education, Dr. Paschall,

by his good judgment and foresight, has helped bring about far-reaching progress in sound education.

The State Board of Education is appreciative of Dr. Paschall's faithful and dedicated services as State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and in other capacities in which he has served public education.

Williams: As a matter of interest, did your colleagues in the State Department of Education present you a gold watch or something on your departure?

Paschall: Well, they did assemble -- the entire staff -- and presented me silver candelabra, and various ones recalled this and that experience. With all its humor and joviality I was touched by it. And then they adopted a resolution in the form of a tribute which, despite its embellishments, I have always cherished.

Williams: Would you read the resolution or tribute they presented?

Paschall: Here is a copy, and I hesitate to read it because of the embellishments, which at the time were quite sincere, but which I fear now would be regarded as a bit too elaborate. I wondered if you would read it?

Williams: Certainly.

TRIBUTE OF APPRECIATION  
Dedicated to  
Davis Young Paschall  
Superintendent of Public Instruction  
Commonwealth of Virginia  
"Quantum instar in ipso est"  
Vergil

Impassioned with a dream, endowed with academic eminence, imbued with strength and force of native ability and character, Davis Young Paschall, on March 12, 1957, was named by the Governor of Virginia, to become the Com-



monwealth's thirteenth Superintendent of Public Instruction.

As a pensive scholar and inspired leader, he has written for public education a unique record characterized by a galaxy of creative achievements.

He has demonstrated most lucidly the distinguishing characteristic of consecrated dedication through his abnegation of self; his candor and sincerity; his pioneering qualities of vision; his profound and exhaustive contemplation; his steadfastness of purpose; and his faith in God. His truth, honor, and integrity have generated fulsome respect, admiration, and appreciation.

As he now divests himself of the mantle of the high office of public education and ascends to the presidency of the College of William and Mary in Virginia, we, the members of the State Department of Education who delight to do him honor, do dedicate to him this tribute of appreciation.

-----

Presented at Richmond this fifteenth day of August,  
anno Domini, MCMLX

And would you translate the Latin quotation at the beginning?

Paschall: Well, the Latin translated literally: "He is in himself as much as his own image," and translated freely means: "None but himself can be his parallel."

Williams: Now we'll move on to the years in which you were president of the College of William and Mary. When was it you were appointed as president?

Paschall: I was appointed by the Board of Visitors on June 11, 1960, and took the oath of office on August 16, 1960.

Williams: Now was there a search committee involved in your appointment?

Paschall: There was a nominating committee of the board, but not a "search committee" as you term it. Search committees became popular, so to speak, in the late 1960s but were not the procedure for nominating presidents in the early part of the decade. Permit me to elaborate a bit on this: when I served as state superintendent of public instruction and for several years thereafter, the law required that the state superintendent serve on the boards of several of the state institutions of higher learning. For example, I served on the boards of the University of Virginia, Virginia Military Institute, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Medical College of Virginia, and the College of William and Mary. During that time the boards elected new presidents of Virginia Military Institute (superintendent in that instance), the Medical College of Virginia, and the University of Virginia. The boards, through their own nominating committees, considered various persons prior to a nomination, but they did not involve "search committees" in broad membership nature as became the practice in the late 1960s.

Furthermore it must be remembered that in 1960 the "Colleges of William and Mary" had just been legislated, and this legislation provided for an administrative -- not honorary -- chancellor of the Colleges of William and Mary. In implementation of that legislation the board elected Dr. Alvin D. Chandler, then president of William

and Mary, to become chancellor. The board asked that he recommend a person to succeed him as president of William and Mary. He recommended me, and it was then a matter for the board to consider me, along with any others, for the position.

Williams: Why do you feel that you were appointed?

Paschall: I was told by board members that there were several reasons: they were anxious to appoint an alumnus, particularly one who had a recollection of and appreciation for Dr. J.A.C. Chandler's administration, and also a knowledge of many alumni, as well as some ties with the Williamsburg community. They felt that my service on the board for several years had afforded me a first-hand understanding of the needs and problems of the college and that my membership on the then emerging State Council of Higher Education and other college boards had provided me a keen insight into higher education in the state. My years as state superintendent of public instruction were construed as a proving ground in administration, and my broad acquaintance with Virginia leaders in the General Assembly and officials of state government they felt would be a timely asset in handling problems involving state support. They also desired to appoint someone who could work effectively with the newly appointed chancellor, Dr. Alvin D. Chandler. Above all, they told me, they sought a person who really loved the college and wanted to serve "with his heart

in it."

There was one undeniable asset in my favor; namely, my lovely wife, the former Agnes Winn of the class of 1931. From what the board members -- who all knew her -- told me afterward, I wondered a bit if this <sup>were</sup> ~~was~~ not the major factor in considering me! Our marriage in the Wren Chapel had a bearing as to where our "hearts lay." Our children, Elizabeth and Philip, were also an influential consideration for certain board members who wanted to see a family again in the President's House.

Williams: Before inquiring about various developments and the like during your presidency, where would you suggest that a future historian might look for research material covering your years as president from August 16, 1960, to September 1, 1971?

Paschall: That is a very important consideration for any future historian. Whereas I cannot think offhand of all such research sources, I will mention three or four that should be quite helpful: the first and most official would be the minutes of the Board of Visitors. This is particularly the prime source for the years I served as president for a very special reason. Prior to that time agendas for board meetings consisted almost entirely of a listing of action ~~itmes~~ <sup>items</sup> for consideration. Recognizing the importance of board minutes as a historical record, I felt very keenly that the agenda should be arranged in two

parts: (1) action material, and (2) informational material.

The action material consisted of carefully numbered resolutions, each sufficiently extensive in the "WHEREAS" paragraphs as to convey the high points of background in a factual manner, and then followed by logically composed "RESOLVED" paragraphs. This enabled a board member to have all the pertinent information in his agenda in advance of a meeting, and he could deliberate on each resolution without having to wait for the facts and related information to be revealed during the course of the meeting. Furthermore if there were any pertinent correspondence referred to in the resolution, the same was appended to the resolution:

As for the informational material part of the agenda, it consisted of descriptions of very important developments between board meetings that, although not requiring action, should be reported. These became a part of the permanent minutes.

Williams: How did the Board of Visitors' members react to this procedure?

Paschall: They felt it was highly desirable. This procedure, they said, not only expedited their meetings, but it also kept them informed, and this point they regarded as most important. They also recognized that it would constitute a comprehensive chronicle of the period.

Williams: What other sources of reference would you suggest?

Paschall: I feel that the ten-year report dated October 1970, entitled The College of William and Mary, Highlights of Progress, 1960-1970: A Report on the Decade and a Look Ahead to 1970-1980, would be an excellent source of information. Although this report is short by one year of the eleven-year period I served, it covers such important items as purpose and mission of the college; major organization changes; expansion of facilities; development of academic departments, programs, and advanced degrees; highlights in student affairs, including admissions; library developments; athletics; endowments and private fund support; personnel; special events, traditions, and related areas of interest. I recall that at least fifty copies of this report were placed in the archives. The facts presented were carefully authenticated and presented in a highly attractive pictorial and narrative form. I now give you a copy which you may wish to file with a transcript of this interview. } attached

Williams: Certainly. What other sources do you have in mind?

Paschall: Well, I would hope that the tape recording and transcript of this interview would be helpful, certainly in understanding something about my life.

There will be another source if circumstances and longevity permit. I would like to tell you about it: under date of January 17, 1972, Dr. Graves, president of the college,

wrote to me as president emeritus and stated that the Board of Visitors at the January 14, 1972, meeting adopted a resolution deeming it "appropriate and valuable" that I "record for the archives of the College my recollections of some of the significant events and actions during my tenure as President." With this request of the Board of Visitors in mind I have written what may be termed two "chapters." I have been so busy with other matters that I have not had an opportunity to write additional chapters but plan to do so.

Permit me to describe in<sup>#</sup>summary at least the first chapter, which I have completed and will, with the remainder, deposit in the archives of the college. Realizing that one of the most vague, least understood, and least documentations involve the statute of 1960 establishing the system, "The Colleges of William and Mary," and the statute of 1962, disestablishing this system, I felt that it was of primary importance to relate the full import of these developments. In attempting this I soon realized that it was somewhat difficult to write one particular segment or period of the college's legal development without placing it in a context of overall legal events sequentially. As a result I wrote a chapter entitled "Legal Status of The College of William and Mary in Virginia." The sections included are:

The Royal Charter and its current status  
 The Enactment of June 24, 1727, of certain  
 statutes for the government of the Col-  
 lege by the Board of Visitors

The Court of Convocation of December 4, 1779  
 Intermediate Actions  
 The Act of May 1784, "Palace Lands"  
 The Grant of the General Assembly, 1888  
 The Act of 1906 -- establishing a state institution, the College of William and Mary in Virginia  
 The Act of 1960 -- establishing the system, "The Colleges of William and Mary"  
 The Act of 1962 -- disestablishing the system, "The Colleges of William and Mary"

I would like to emphasize that the narrative regarding the establishment and disestablishment of the "Colleges of William and Mary" is carefully documented, and the reference materials -- studies, Council of Higher Education material, organization chart, acts of assembly, governor's message, copies of press editorials -- are all appended<sup>d</sup> to the narrative. I doubt that these very valuable research items exist elsewhere. So the reasons for this unique system and its disestablishment are set forth in detail and thoroughly supported with actual copies of the referenced documents.

Williams: Would you indicate some particular points of interest from this first chapter?

Paschall: The analysis of the respective articles of the royal charter is interesting; the John Marshall argument in the case of Braken v. Visitors of William and Mary College is important; and the Court of Convocation, December 4, 1779, making the college the "first American University" is significant. Permit me to mention one inclusion in the Code of Virginia, Section 23-44, which I worked hard to assure would be retained during the procedures involving



the establishing and disestablishing of the system "The Colleges of William and Mary" and I quote:

The Board of Visitors shall be vested with all the rights and powers conferred by the provisions of this chapter and by the ancient royal charter of the College, in so far as the same are not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter and the general laws of the State.

This is undoubtedly the<sup>1</sup> only code provision in any state that refers to a royal charter. It also reveals upon examination that there are several articles of the royal charter still in force. Should the college ever enjoy an endowment as would restore it to private status, then this legal provision enables it to operate again under the ancient royal charter. I doubt there are many people who know about this important point, and it should be preserved in all future changes in the state code that affect William and Mary.

Williams: You mentioned a second chapter that you had written. To what does it pertain?

Paschall: I entitled it: "Reasons for Architectural Design of New Campus Buildings and Academic Court Arrangement of New Campus." One of the first tasks I undertook as president was that of working with architects and state representatives in developing a master plan in 1961 for the then-contemplated new campus. In the chapter I have documented the reasons for the design and the arrangement of buildings, which I feel is vitally significant to the historical record of the college, especially since the question will

be raised in the future as to why these buildings are not Georgian, as are those on the old campus.

Williams: It would be of interest in this interview for you to mention a few points of importance from that chapter.\*

Paschall: Well, the theme chosen for the new campus was similar to that for the old, namely, "A New Campus of Good Arts and Sciences." (Incidentally it was derived from language of the charter.)

As for the academic court arrangement it is semicircular -- the boundary being formed by the road leading off Jamestown Road by the women's dormitories and curving to the rear of the library and returning to Jamestown Road at The Common Glory parking lot. The library is located at the apex of the academic court, and rightly so. It is designed so that another floor can be added, thereby giving it a height advantage over all the other academic buildings. The classroom buildings fan out from the library in such a manner as to provide an openness when one views the new campus from the front (that is, Jamestown Road).

As for the architectural designs, there are several factors that should be remembered. Following World War II there was a tremendous backlog in building needs at state institutions. Taxpayer funds had to go as far as possible. It became a part of state policy that where a new campus was projected, extensive sums of money could not, as in the case of William and Mary, be expended on roofs, <sup>hipped</sup>

\*See also Highlights of Progress.

dummy chimneys, and other nonfunctional Georgian features. This was particularly applicable because the new campus would be in an entirely new location with a rather sharp break from the old. Furthermore Phi Beta Kappa Hall had until then been the only building constructed on the new campus, and its design was deemed by the State Art Commission to be a pleasing and functional challenge for the future new buildings. Let me emphasize, however, that we did seek and were permitted to use the Flemish bond fleck bricks -- the same as on the old campus -- which in time develop a soft, mellow effect; to use limestone trim, which gives a distinctive column-type impression; and to use a limited extent of glass in the new buildings. All of this made for an aesthetic symmetry in architectural design.

Williams: What other chapters do you plan to write?

Paschall: I contemplate writing a chapter on facilities -- how obtained and how named; another on the development of academic programs, departments, schools, and degrees; another on student unrest in the late '60s; another on administrative organization developments and key personnel; another on endowments and private fund support; and perhaps another on significant special events of the period.

Williams: Let's start with the first one that you mentioned. There must have been a critical need for facilities when you became president.

Paschall: Yes, from 1934 to 1964 -- a thirty-year period during which enrollment more than doubled -- no new classroom building was completed. As a result classes in the early '60s were jammed into basements, attics, and quonset huts. The Wren Building, for instance, was packed from the basement to the very top. Faculty endured severely overcrowded offices. More than half the library holdings were outside the library in temporary storage areas. The law school was located in the basement of a men's dormitory, and students stood in line for hours after registration to obtain books and supplies from a woefully inadequate bookstore. Dormitories were crowded -- for instance, four men occupied rooms in Tyler Hall designed for only two; Brown dormitory had <sup>forty</sup> men beyond capacity; and all of the single rooms in Old Dominion were used as doubles, while <sup>fifty-five</sup> men were also housed in the attic. The women still had to use the basement of Jefferson dormitory for physical education, and the old Taliaferro dormitory had been converted to the Fine Arts Building and was on the eve of being condemned as unsafe. Blow Gymnasium was inadequate for men's physical education and could not accommodate students and visitors for basketball games to any desired extent. The infirmary was inadequate.

These critical conditions were alleviated and fortunately my successor did not have to face them.

Williams: In summary, what was the extent of the building program?

Paschall: More than \$36,000,000 had been raised, expended, or committed in construction as the decade closed -- more than twice the amount spent for facilities by the college in its long history from 1693 until 1960. Twelve major buildings were complete, three more were under construction, and another was renovated at a cost of more than \$500,000 to serve as the intermediate or "for the time being" home of the Marshall-Wythe School of Law.

Williams: This must have been a gigantic undertaking. What buildings were constructed, as you recall?

Paschall: Yes, we were at times constructing two or three buildings simultaneously. The important facilities realized were: the Earl Gregg Swem Library; the John Millington Hall of Life Sciences; the William Small Physics Building; Robert Andrews Hall of Fine Arts; Hugh Jones Hall for philosophy, mathematics, business administration, and the new Computer Center; Adair (Women's) Gymnasium; the men's extensive dormitory (fraternity) complex; Yates dormitory for men; a new campus center; a new bookstore; a new dining commons; duPont dormitory for women; Richard L. Morton Hall; a dormitory complex for women; the extensive new William and Mary Hall; and a new infirmary was also underway.

Williams: Would you recall some unique or unusual situations that illustrate particular stories about a facility?

Paschall: Practically every facility has a story of unique interest that should be recorded for the future. I will describe

one in the instance of the mathematics/general classroom building, later named Hugh Jones Hall: This is the only building on the new campus that has an unobtrusive line of indentation at each story level. How did this happen? The final plans for construction of the mathematics/general classroom building were not complete at the time we took bids for construction of the life science building, subsequently named Millington Hall. The low bid exceeded funds available for the project. We were faced with the possibility of starting over in plans, thereby delaying the project and also incurring an even higher cost because of inflation, or curtailing some salient features in the building. Furthermore we had a federal grant of some \$500,000 under the Higher Education Facilities Act at that time which would have been lost had we not been able to begin construction. Faced with this dilemma I conferred with state officials and the governor of the possibility of transferring some of the appropriated funds from the mathematics /classroom building project to the life science facility in order to permit the college to take the low bid and commence construction. Such a transfer of funds was allowable in the case of dormitories, but this was the first instance to my knowledge of an attempted transfer involving academic buildings. The transfer was approved, and we built the life science building. We were reminded, however, that we would only have enough

left in the appropriations for the mathematics building to construct a basement and first floor (and then top it with a temporary roof) and that the State Art Commission, which had to approve such projects, would hardly approve anything of this nature. My next step was to do some special *investigating,* conferring, and we had the architect propose a plan that projected a line of indentation at each story level, thereby obviating a sharp contrast or demarcation if we could only build the basement and first floor at first and the remainder later. The art commission thought this desirable and approved the plans -- to the surprise of state officials in the engineering division. So we were permitted to go ahead. But when we advertised the project for bids we were careful to specify the "part" building, for which funds were available, and also as an alternate the entire building in case we might obtain the funds in time to carry it all the way. Construction began, and just before the time for installing the temporary roof, I made a plea to the General Assembly for the remainder of the funds to continue the entire building to completion. I pointed out that we had a bid in hand for the alternate providing for complete construction, and if we had to forego this that a new bidding later would cost considerably more; that the college desperately needed the complete facility; and that it certainly would not reflect favorably on the state's image if we had to place the temporary roof and it became a sad picture of the state's construc-

tion of "low-rise" buildings -- basement and one floor! We obtained the funds in the "nick-of-time" and never stopped construction. So that in brief is the story behind the one building with lines of indentation at story levels.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, were there similar interesting highlights<sup>n</sup> in attaining the other facilities?

Paschall: There certainly were, and that is why I hope to write a full chapter describing them. The story of how we got the new library, for example, reads like something in fiction. The same is true for the new men's dormitory (fraternity) complex, and especially for William and Mary Hall, and also how we selected the site for the new infirmary.

Incidentally there is one facility which I had hoped would have had the planned second phase added before now -- by "now," I mean the time of this interview. I refer to the new dining hall on the new campus which we named William and Mary Commons. What you see there today is the first phase; the second phase was planned to be constructed in front and would provide additional dining space, some student activity rooms, and special dining rooms. Across the front the architectural design provided for windows, a colonnade, and beautiful arches. We could not build this second phase because we were still using the old dining room on the old campus. Realizing that people in passing would wonder why we built what you see there now with an "all-wall" appearance from the front, we had the



architect provide a rendering of what the second phase would look like and enclosed it in a glass-covered, attractive sign near the road. Unfortunately this has disappeared.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, there must have been some reasons or some procedures to account for your success in attaining so many important facilities. Would you indicate how this was done?

Paschall: Well, first I must emphasize that no one person could possibly have done it. It required the assistance of so many, and I shall always be grateful to them. It did require, however, the leadership of the president in what might be called "putting the pieces together." He not only had to envision the projects that would invite approval and backing by the Board of Visitors and project them budget-wise with justification for each, but also employ a strategy in working with state officials, the governor, and the General Assembly in obtaining the appropriations.

I had learned what I believed to be a lesson when I served as state superintendent of public instruction: namely, that about 85 percent of what you might obtain from the governor and the General Assembly depended on how they regarded you and your presentation, your integrity, sincerity, and sense of dedication to the cause you advocated; -- and about 15 percent to understanding the specifics of your proposals. This lesson stood me in good stead.

Furthermore I was fortunate in already having established

good working relationships with the leaders in the General Assembly and felt somewhat at home in consulting with them. For example, permit me to mention a few of the assembly members who helped so much: for several years at the beginning of my presidency Williamsburg was in the senatorial district represented by Senator Lloyd Bird. He was one of the very influential members of the assembly, thoroughly dedicated to education at all levels, and a long-time friend. When Williamsburg was subsequently re-districted and represented by Senator Garland Gray, I enjoyed the assistance of another long-time friend (going back to the days when he served on the State Board of Education when I was state superintendent of public instruction). I doubt that anyone had greater influence in the state senate during the 1960s than Senator Gray. Delegate Russell Corneal from Williamsburg was regarded as a very effective legislator and was thoroughly cognizant of the needs of the college. Legislators from southside Virginia were keenly aware of William and Mary's stewardship role in developing Richard Bland College, and those from the Peninsula appreciated the college's efforts in developing Christopher Newport College. My role was primarily that of interpreting the college's capital outlay priority needs to these influential legislators. There were many others I could mention, as well as the help of Mr. L.M. Kuhn, the budget director. He was of inestimable

assistance. Governors Harrison and Godwin were major influences in terms of their recommendations.

Williams: Did you also seek assistance from alumni for state appropriations?

Paschall: Yes, I certainly did, but not assistance in the form of petitions or any pressure campaigns. I initiated a procedure of individualized assistance that proved most effective. I would ask two or three influential alumni in the constituency of a member of the appropriations committee to approach him in behalf of a particular priority capital outlay project and provide them a brief but clear justification of need for that project. I would ask two or three such influential alumni in another member's district to make a plea for a separate priority project. So when the appropriations committee met there was one member strongly supporting a certain project, another member a different project, and the net effect was very effective in obtaining the most essential projects recommended by the governor, and even adding one occasionally.

Williams: What were some special-type difficulties encountered in that very significant building program?

Paschall: Well, the matter of getting appropriations was a difficult consideration when one recalls the keen competition for available state funds on the part of all state institutions during the decade 1960 to 1970. There was a chronic shortage of skilled labor in the Williamsburg area, and to

have to import labor from Norfolk or Richmond meant higher bidding on projects. Furthermore the military installations on the Peninsula were expanding, and this resulted in even keener competition for labor. The fact that a large underground vein of puffy clay extended through a major area of the new campus meant that extensive piling under buildings was required, and the cost increased accordingly. The Vietnam conflict adversely affected the availability of many crucial items of equipment. The fact that the appropriation for a building had to be requested over two years in advance of its construction meant that the original estimate of cost, which had to be realistic at the time in order to be approved, was practically always short in amount because of inflation. When the bids for construction were taken [this] posed an acute problem repeatedly in making it possible to take a low bid without deleting some needed features in the building. It was tough, but we managed to meet these special difficulties.

Williams: Did you have to spend considerable time at the General Assembly when it was in session?

Paschall: No, indeed. I never went to the General Assembly unless the college was scheduled to appear before a committee in considering its budget. When the hearing was concluded I would return immediately to Williamsburg. There were several reasons for this: in the first place, I knew that

the chief appropriations the college could expect would have to be included in the governor's budget recommendations. So my time in Richmond, budget-wise, was spent in October in working adroitly to be certain that the projects would be included, and that they be the ones most urgently needed in the sequence of construction. Furthermore those administrators who did appear daily when the General Assembly was in session came to be thought of as lobbyists rather than as institutional educators, and I believed it tended to reflect unfavorably on the institution.

Williams: Did you follow similar procedures for the m. and o. -- the maintenance and operation budget?

Paschall: Yes. The main thrust in the m. and o. budget was always an increase in faculty salaries.

Williams: When you were scheduled to appear before appropriations committees did you follow some pattern in your budget presentation?

Paschall: Yes and no. I endeavored to highlight some activities or programs that I knew had an appeal, but I always avoided long, detailed recitations of specific needs and statistics. Let me tell you about a presentation in 1968, I recall, that was quite unorthodox, and which resulted in the largest appropriations for any biennium. However one in a future assessment might term it "corny" or something akin, the times, the members, and the setting were ripe for it.

At the outset I indicated that I would refrain from

the customary enumeration of budget items and speak to them in behalf of "The Alma Mater of a Nation." (This was the first time that this designation had been made in reference to William and Mary.) I shall always remember my concluding remarks, which I quote:

In the late hours of night when the campus was asleep, and the town quiet and still, I strolled the ancient Wren Yard. The moon was a ghostly galleon floating amid fleecy clouds, and mist settled all about.

In reflection on the fires and wars that had engulfed this place; the anguish and despair as well as the rare courage, honor and sacrifice of the years, I felt deeply the great spirit that here for nearly three centuries had knit the generations each to each. And, then, amid the giant elms, I sensed the shadowy presence of Jefferson, Wythe, Monroe, Marshall, Washington, the Randolphins, and others who walked this hallowed ground and conceived the ideas that wrought the great documents of this Republic.

With head bowed in humility and reverence, I knew that this, indeed, was the Alma Mater of a Nation, and I prayed that it might today muster the strength and devotion to keep faith with those Founding Fathers.

Williams: It had its effect?

Paschall: That's the actual quote. I had copies from my budget presentation -- I didn't talk about any data or figures at all.

Williams: A minute ago you said that faculty salaries were the main item in the m. and o. biennial budgets. Would you elaborate on this, please?

Paschall: Well, from 1960 to 1970 the number of faculty more than doubled -- from 175 to ~~403~~<sup>408</sup> -- and average -- underscore average -- faculty salaries for nine months increased

from \$6,060 in 1960 to \$13,000 in 1970-'71. There is a real story behind this remarkable increase. Would you like for me to tell it?

Williams: Please do.

Paschall: I fear that I have gone into too much detail already in this interview, but this is indeed a fascinating story, and many of the faculty were unaware of how it was achieved.

To be brief, there was in 1960 a "lock-step" scale for faculty salary increases. In other words there was a state scale under which each faculty rank might receive so much. The only increase possible was to obtain appropriations for, say, a one-step increase in the scale. I chaired a committee of presidents to confer with Governor-elect Harrison whereby he might approve the Virginia institutions going to what we called a national average faculty scale. He agreed to advocate it and did. The result was that the U.S. Office of Education provided the guidelines for such national scales on the basis of institutional classification. This established William and Mary as a liberal arts institution somewhat higher than the teacher-training institutions per se. So although higher than Mary Washington, Longwood, Radford, Virginia State, and several other colleges in Virginia, it was still below V.P.I. and the University of Virginia. Keep in mind that the State Division of Personnel, under the governor, would approve the national salary average for each category of institutions

to attain. Under this plan V.P.I. established a "critical scale," with approval of the Division of Personnel, for such fields as physics and related sciences, whereby they could exceed the national average in faculty salaries. Coincidentally William and Mary's first doctoral program was approved by the State Council of Higher Education in physics, and we sought the same "critical" faculty scale advantage, and it was approved. Obviously, as I told the faculty, this "critical scale" would broaden, and it did.

When Governor Godwin was elected for his first term I again headed a committee of presidents to urge him not to be content with a national average faculty scale, but to support our going beyond it by establishing classifications of institutions in peer groupings that warranted it. He approved the advocacy, and William and Mary by that time had been declared a "modern university" by the Board of Visitors and the State Council of Higher Education, it having several doctorates, many masters' degrees, and several schools. As a result, William and Mary could establish a state-supported faculty salary scale above that of all other state institutions, except V.P.I. and the University of Virginia, <sup>which were more comprehensive in size and scope.</sup> This was a major accomplishment, and fortunately my successor could at the time inherit a situation in which the college's peer grouping classification for faculty salaries was well above all state institutions except V.P.I. and the University of Virginia.



Williams: Did the other state institutions resent this privileged status accorded William and Mary?

Paschall: Yes, I took considerable "ribbing" at the meetings of the Presidents' Council.

Williams: Was the faculty at William and Mary cognizant of these developments?

Paschall: I tried to keep them informed, but I am not sure they understood fully all of the intricacies. They did, however, understand that this "modern university" status for William and Mary meant a great deal more for their salary status and finally realized how the so-called "critical scale" soon broadened fruitfully across the board for all faculty.