

Paschall: As I recall, it was in 1971 when Governor Holton and his budget advisory committee visited the college as a part of their tour in planning the capital outlay budget to be considered by the General Assembly in 1972. I took them to two places on campus: Rogers Hall, where the chemistry department was housed, and the renovated law school facility. This afforded a firsthand opportunity for the state officials to see the need for a new chemistry building and a new law school facility.

I recall that Dr. Tyree showed the group the outmoded plumbing to the labs, the dangerous wiring, the gas chambers that were also dangerous, and other inadequacies. Some members of the group said they would be pleased to get out of there and that we had thoroughly demonstrated the need for the new chemistry building [to be] included in the capital outlay request. They did inquire what we would plan to do with Rogers Hall, the old chemistry building. I mention this now because it has a bearing on what subsequently happened. I explained our hope that it could be renovated for use by the English department. This would enable us at long last to get the English department out of the Wren Building and the old lodges. It was obvious that such a renovation would be the least expensive. It was also obvious that the lack of parking space

at this building on the old campus would be no problem since the English department was undergraduate, with exception of a few master's program students.

Then we viewed the law school situation. With enrollment exploding at all law schools, that at William and Mary had then attained about 325. I remember that Governor Holton, as well as several members of his committee, expressed the view that we had made a good case for a new chemistry building, as well as a new law school facility.

Williams: The chemistry building did materialize, but what happened to the proposed law school facility?

Paschall: I retired from the presidency in September 1971, and so I cannot say for certain as to why it did not materialize in the appropriation by the 1972 General Assembly. I had a feeling that several factors obtained, and I mention them as conjecture. Somehow, the possibility of Rogers Hall (the old chemistry building) being renovated for the law school tended to bring some confusion to the matter, and then there was the Shaner Report. That report was made by a consultant firm for legislative committees, and it attempted to show that many of the state institutions had more classroom space than needed. Despite the inaccuracy, especially in regard to William and Mary, the effect on many legislators was to investigate further before making extensive capital outlay appropriations.

By the time of the 1974 General Assembly the economy of the nation and the state had deteriorated considerably. Nevertheless, Governor Holton in his farewell budget message to the assembly singled out the new law school and urged that not only an appropriation for the plans be made, but also for construction of the facility. He said that this would enable its dedication on July 4, 1976, as a bicentennial landmark.

Governor Godwin, who was beginning his second term in January 1975, had been elected on [the platform, that] among other things he would not advocate an increase in taxes. He found that the economy was in such a plight that he had to rearrange Governor Holton's proposals. The law school, along with other capital outlay projects, had to be postponed.

I have already commented on what happened at the 1976 session of the General Assembly. I firmly believe that the new facility will materialize, but the delay of five years since Governor Holton and his committee visited the college has been most unfortunate, and there will undoubtedly be several additional years before it is realized. In retrospect the "iron was hot" at the 1972 session.

If all the pieces had been put together at that time I am confident that the facility would be in existence.

But in conclusion the law school is worthy, reputable, and deserving in the minds of the governor and the General Assembly. Have no doubt about that.

Williams: In the 1962 green-bound report that you gave me in an earlier interview you indicated a tie-in of the law school and social science research in general. Was there some opposition to the old Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship preventing that connection?

Paschall: There is some background on this that needs a more detailed explanation than I can give in this interview. In summary, during the late 1920s, Dr. J.A.C. Chandler obtained the Cutler Endowment, which he hoped would help revive the law school and develop a strong department of government as natural entities in William and Mary's history and tradition. This endowment helped him at the time to establish a framework termed the Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship. It became an endowment resource. In 1962 I realized that the department of government and the department of jurisprudence (which had been renamed the Marshall-Wythe School of Law) were operating separately. My mention of this at the time to the Board of Visitors was to have the board's understanding of the Cutler Endowment in protecting its intent and applicability through what might be joint research activities and to enable us to explore

a cooperative institute of law, government, and citizenship.

In exploring this with representatives of the law school and the department of government there appeared to be a concern that the identity of these academic entities might be compromised, a fear that I learned had developed under the previous framework termed the Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship. Dr. Warner Moss, chairman of the department of government at the time, was quite vocal in expressing this concern. Dr. Dudley Woodbridge was then dean of the law school, and he was one who sought peace rather than controversy and saw no reason to pursue the matter.

So as a result the law school continued on an independent direction, but the social science departments worked harder to cooperate in joint endeavors such as the Marshall-Wythe Symposium, and we found ways to utilize the Cutler Endowment fruitfully and within legitimate bounds. In fact, the major part of the endowment income was applied toward the salary of the John Marshall Professor of Government, as originally intended. Dr. Moss was the John Marshall Professor of Government.

Williams: Did you envision some joint institute of an interdisciplinary nature during the latter years of your administration?

Paschall: Yes, and the foundations were laid for its evolution.

What I envisioned was something like an Eighteenth-Century Institute of Culture. I felt that such a framework, to encompass by coordinated direction much that we had in the making, would become distinctive and certainly merit considerable private support.

The college had made a significant contribution during the eighteenth century, and here it was located now amidst the most distinctive laboratory of eighteenth-century American to be had, namely Colonial Williamsburg. Here were the authentic furnishings, buildings, theater, research, art, music--all of that period. How exciting and promising, I felt, it would be for those academic departments of the college to generate under some overall administrative framework a relationship that would truly make this the mecca for scholars and others.

You see, the college and Colonial Williamsburg were already sponsoring the Institute of Early American History and Culture. This would be further enhanced under the overall framework of an Eighteenth-Century Institute of Culture. The college had inaugurated the doctoral program in history with emphasis on colonial America. Its library holdings, including manuscripts and primary source materials, were outstanding. We had established an excellent

department of anthropology with a strong division of archaeology, and it was increasingly becoming involved in digs of colonial sites in Tidewater. The department of theatre and speech had inaugurated a strong concentration at the master's level in theatre staging and production and managed and directed The Common Glory. The department of music was strengthening its focus on the eighteenth century, especially in relation to Colonial Williamsburg.

Furthermore, the General Assembly of Virginia had authorized plans for constructing an archaeological laboratory, and the site had been chosen on the William and Mary campus. In fact, it was to be located just off Jamestown Road in the wooded area south of The Common Glory site. Mr. Russell Carneal, the delegate from the Williamsburg area, was chairman of the commission, and I appointed Dr. W. Melville Jones, vice-president for academic affairs, as liaison representative of the college. It was to be more than a museum; it was to be a truly archaeological laboratory.

So that in summary was the idea. Had Dr. Jones and I not retired (he retired the same day that I did) I am inclined to believe that this would have come to fruition and enjoyed substantial private fund support.

Davis Y. Paschall
Session 8

May 19, 1976

Williamsburg, Va.

Williams: Dr. Paschall, in these interviews you have provided a great deal of information that I'm sure will be most helpful to future historians. There are a few remaining questions, though, that I would like to have you discuss that we may not have fully clarified in our previous sessions.

For example, last Friday, May 14, there was an impressive announcement in the Great Hall of the Wren Building of the college's launching a large-scale fundraising campaign, and you were introduced at that time as honorary chairman. Had you anticipated such a campaign before you retired from the presidency?

Paschall: When President Graves presented me last Friday he quoted the following from my report, Highlights of Progress, 1960-1970, page 59:

This college of "good arts and sciences" with certain advanced and professional programs emerging from its historical evolution and its present responsibilities to the Commonwealth, and now at a modern university status, must continue and enhance its excellence and quality for which it is currently recognized nationally.

To achieve this goal will require increased private fund support in the next decade--especially when it is recognized that State funds have generously been appropriated in the past decade, and very little

further increase in tuition and general fee can be applied without curtailing the opportunity for attendance by the well-qualified student of modest resources.

To obtain the private funds needed will require, first of all, a coordinated effort in overall fund-raising for the College. . . .

On that same page in the report I suggested the organizational procedures and the goals for such a campaign. I was pleased to see that these were the guidelines detailed in announcing the campaign last Friday.

Williams: You spoke earlier of developing a master plan for the new campus and the other buildings. Now this master plan has been attributed by some to your predecessor, Admiral Chandler. Will you clarify this point, please?

Paschall: I am glad to have the opportunity to speak to this. When I became president in August 1960, the first new building, the library, was under consideration. As I explained earlier, preliminary plans were already made that would have located this huge, proposed Georgian-type building at the end of the Sunken Garden. For reasons I have indicated in an earlier interview, this fortunately did not come to fruition. It was urgent that a master plan be developed which would require approval of the State Art Commission as well as the State Division of Engineering and Buildings and which would provide for orderly construction and development.

You must remember that the college was from July 1960 until July 1962 a part of the legislatively established system the Colleges of William and Mary. The preparation of the master plan became my first major task, but its presentation to state authorities was the prerogative of the chancellor of the system, who was Dr. Alvin D. Chandler. Its presentation was made and approved in 1961. I think this explains the matter. I recall most vividly the many hours and conferences I experienced in preparing the plan and also Chancellor Chandler's support of the same in his presentation to state authorities.

Williams: The system of the Colleges included two branch colleges, Christopher Newport in Newport News and Richard Bland in Petersburg. In view of the political pull of the Newport News and Petersburg communities, how important has William and Mary's stewardship of the branch colleges been?

Paschall: The importance of William and Mary's stewardship is evidenced by the fact that these branch colleges were initiated from the beginning, organized, and developed to become reputedly accredited institutions by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The college had already nurtured Richmond Professional Institute and Norfolk College to four-year accredited status. Such stewardship was highly recog-

nized by legislators from the areas of these institutions, and this recognition accrued positively to state support of the college's budget and programs.

It is significant to note that when the community college system was legislatively established in 1966, all of the two-year branch colleges of the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute were incorporated into the system. But the college's two branches, Christopher Newport and Richard Bland--both at the two-year level--were left under the stewardship of William and Mary.

I believe I mentioned previously that the gradual development of Christopher Newport College to a four-year level provided an opportunity for attendance by students from the Peninsula and thereby freed William and Mary to admit more students statewide and nationally.

Williams: What were some of the problems involved with coordinating the branches?

Paschall: Perhaps the chief problem was time and effort required of the president of William and Mary and the dean of the college in being certain that budgetary problems could be resolved; that academic programs were needed, appropriate, and inaugurated with such quality as would meet accreditation

standards; and that good public relations were maintained with the constituent communities of the branch colleges. Faculty appointments had to be reviewed and approved by the parent institution. These matters, as I said, required considerable time, frequent visitation, and a manifestation of genuine interest. The fact that the branch colleges thrived is testimonial to the quality of stewardship exercised.

In the instance of Richard Bland College I recall that the General Assembly in 1970 wrote into the appropriation act a provision for that institution to move to a four-year level. This was viewed by the William and Mary board and administration as an admonition to cooperate accordingly.

Before the appropriation act became effective in July 1970, a federal suit was instituted under the Civil Rights Act to stay the elevation or escalation of Richard Bland College to a four-year level, citing its proximity to Virginia State College. The result was that the branch college remained at the two-year level. This, of course, required extensive time and involvement. For instance, I gave a 104-page deposition in the case. In the meantime Christopher Newport moved to a four-year level without incident.

Overall, it was to the mutual advantage of the college and the branches to exercise an effective stewardship role. My chief reservation about Christopher Newport College becoming independent stemmed from a concern that it might then begin graduate programs which would dilute state support of such programs at William and Mary. It was, therefore, a point of importance that each undergraduate degree program resolution submitted to the State Council of Higher Education indicate that no future graduate program was contemplated.

Williams: On the subject of VARC, why was it that the University of Virginia and V.P.I. were added as operators of VARC when the original negotiations were only with William and Mary?

Paschall: The director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) did in 1961 indicate intention to build a huge synccyclotron to be managed by William and Mary. At that time the college had just developed a masters' program in physics. Both the University of Virginia and V.P.I. had doctoral programs and considerable federal research support in nuclear physics. It became evident that Congress would have to have assurance of capable academic management of any \$15,000,000 nuclear laboratory. Therefore, the General Assembly in its 1962 resolution added V.P.I. and

the University of Virginia, along with William and Mary, as the Virginia Associated Research Center (VARC), this being with the consent of NASA. I explained earlier how William and Mary soon built its competence, faculty, and research support, as well as its doctoral program in physics, and how Governor Godwin later by executive order dissolved VARC administratively and put the entire operation under the responsibility of the College of William and Mary.

Williams: Why has there been opposition to resident degrees at VARC, and what is your own feeling on the matter?

Paschall: There were some persons in the beginning days of VARC who envisioned a gigantic scientific institution, similar to M.I.T., being built around the huge machine, the synrocyclotron, and it would confer resident graduate degrees. There were others who began to question the academic soundness of this possibility. They had considerable doubt as to the validity of the idea of a nuclear laboratory becoming the parent of an academic university and expressed the view that such a concept should be in reverse. It was pointed out by some influential leaders that there already existed, for instance, fine engineering schools at the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and to establish another would be very costly to the state and tend to dilute existing support of these schools.

From this divergence in views there emerged a consensus approach which became the operable practice. This was that the nuclear laboratory was needed by the state, NASA, and the institutions, and that it should be shared by eligible Virginia institutions, as well as those out-of-state, and by qualified scientific institutions. This sharing was to be done through scheduled research teams ~~in~~^{utilizing} the laboratory and also by institutionally designated faculty members who would offer certain graduate courses for which resident graduate credit would be accepted toward a degree conferred by the institution and not by VARC. The student was free to choose the institution. Thus academic control was maintained institutionally through jointly agreed-upon course offerings and approved faculty.

The state provided a building close to the nuclear laboratory in which instructional, laboratory, and administrative space was available. The University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, William and Mary, Old Dominion University, and the Medical College of Virginia became the primary operational sharers under this plan.

My feeling was that ^[this] was the best solution in the long run because it utilized fully the resources of the laboratory and at the same time afforded students in the area an opportunity for certain resident graduate courses

approved by the institutions. By maintaining academic control of such courses and faculty, the integrity of the institutions was protected, and the conferral of degrees was validated under proper academic procedures.

Williams: As you know, critics of extension work have said that extension courses are not of the quality of the work at the Williamsburg campus. What is your feeling on this?

Paschall: That criticism was not justified. In the first place, the quality of teaching on campus was not uniformly the same simply because it was on campus. In the second place, the teachers of extension courses were primarily those who were regular teachers of such courses on campus and certainly were as good in one classroom location as another. In the third place, the academic dean of the college, Dr. W. Melville Jones, kept a sharp scrutiny of such courses and faculty involved. Finally, the students in such courses were more mature from the standpoint of experience than those on campus, and they were purposively motivated in taking the course in which they enrolled. Their performance, therefore, in most instances was quite challenging to the instructor, and their achievement was important to their employment, future promotion, and salary.

Williams: Moving on to a totally different subject: in the administrative reorganization of 1964, which you commented on in an earlier session, why was it that the director of athletics continued to report directly to the president?

Paschall: Under the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accrediting provisions at the time it was expected that the president be primarily responsible for financial and budgetary arrangements involving athletics. We were then in the final stages of payment of an athletic indebtedness, and the board desired the president to keep a close eye on such financing to be certain that no future indebtedness occur. For these reasons it was imperative that the athletic director report directly to the president on budgetary matters.

At the same time, I hasten to add, he reported directly to the faculty athletic committee in matters of policies, scholarships awarded, teams to be scheduled, coaches to be employed, and compliance with conference regulations. This committee considered his recommendations and acted and made an annual report in writing and orally to the faculty of arts and sciences.

Williams: Do you think the students of the 1960s, Dr. Paschall, were more mature than their predecessors and therefore more prone to question the administration?

Paschall: I am not sure that "more mature students" means that the criterion for such maturity is simply whether they are prone to question the administration. I would prefer to think of a student's maturity in terms of his acceptance of responsibility; his understanding of why he is in college; his perception of some constructive life goals; his sense of appreciation to parents and others who make the opportunity for his education possible; his discernment of priorities for study, recreation, and choice of friends; his recognition of the rights of others; and the common sense he applies in making judgments and decisions.

These criteria may not be the correct ones for judging maturity. There are others of a more intellectual nature, such as the quality of student inquiry. I suspect however, that the ones I mentioned have been characteristic of many students of every generation who attended William and Mary. As for questioning the administration, this has been a notable student manifestation from the days of President Blair of William and Mary, and the evidence of it is often revealed from the records.

Having said this, permit me to make another observation: students are not immune from the impact of the times in which they live. The impact of the rapidly changing times of the '60s nationally and internationally

was undoubtedly greater on students in that period than in any comparable period in this century, with the exception of the Great Depression years and a few years of America's involvement in World War II.

The technological explosion, scientific discoveries, the awesome shadow of the Vietnam war, the civil rights movements and marches, the plight of the ghettos--all and much more made one's direction quite uncertain and his outlook one of frustration.

With so many traditional anchors and values falling asunder, students nationally began a desperate questioning of government and whatever indicated authority or the establishment. This was manifest in many forms throughout the country. It was only natural that its focus on college campuses should be directed to the nearest symbol of authority, the administration. Spurred on and encouraged by national movements for "student rights," the pattern became widespread to attack first student regulations close at hand and utilize the college newspaper as a major mouthpiece to be backed up by sit-ins and other large-scale demonstrations.

So it is within the framework of the impact of the times of the '60s that I attribute largely the volatile

nationwide student questioning of college administrations and not to some belief that this meant "more mature students" than their predecessors. By the very end of the decade, for instance, a great deal of the sound and fury of a few previous years had subsided.

Williams: There were several occasions here at William and Mary when the president and the Flat Hat clashed. Would you comment on this and say what you viewed as the responsibility of the Flat Hat?

Paschall: The college newspaper, the Flat Hat, began publication in October 1911. Many of its editors later became outstanding professional and civic leaders as well as ardent alumni. I regarded it as a respected media for the campus. Its function I felt primarily to be twofold: 1) to report college news and events, and 2) to provide an excellent first hand journalistic training opportunity. It should, I felt, be worthy of being regarded as an example of free press on campus. The editorial page had before I became president indicated along with the staff the fact that the college was the publisher.

It was felt by college officials that the college was basically and legally responsible for what happened

in this activity since it was supported by a student activity fee levied by the Board of Visitors and since it was regarded as the press voice of the college. This view did not mean that the Flat Hat editor was to be dictated to by the president or the publications committee or that censorship was to be applied. It did mean that in granting editorial freedom to student editors, the college as publisher must insist that such freedom entail corollary responsibilities to be governed by the canons of responsible journalism. These, as adopted by the publications committee (which included two faculty members plus student editors) and as approved by the Board of Visitors, included the avoidance of libel, obscenity and indecency, undocumented allegations, attacks on personal integrity, and the techniques of harassment and *in*nuendo.

There were only three occasions during my eleven years as president that I felt it obligatory to convene the editor of the Flat Hat and his staff and explain what I deemed to be blatant violations of certain of the canons of responsible journalism. I would like to mention these briefly:

The first instance occurred at the time when President Kennedy challenged Russia regarding the missile base situation in Cuba and warned that if Russian ships advanced beyond a certain point that it would be regarded as an act of hostility to the United States. For several days there were hurried mobilization orders in this country, tension was great, and emotions ran high. The threat of war was in the air.

During this period, a reporter from the Flat Hat inquired of me if we might have the secretary of the Communist Party--Gus Hall, as I remember--speak on campus. I explained to him the tense situation that would defy adequate security measures and said, "No, not at this time." He reported in the Flat Hat that I said, "No," but did not add "not at this time," which I had implicitly asked him to do, nor did he report the reasons I gave him.

In the same edition of the paper, Dr. W. Melville Jones was misquoted in a matter of some consequence. In the same edition an announcement of Dr. [W.W.] Abbott's return to the history department was carried when Dr. Fowler, then chairman of the department, had asked that it be withheld until a similar announcement

could first be made by the then employer of Dr. Abbott. So I convened the editor and staff and cited these instances and urged them to avoid such in the future.

In the second instance, the editor of the Flat Hat wrote an editorial in criticism of the honor system. I did not mind the criticism, but he stated that there were ninety or more known cases of cheating on campus. I told him that there was no objection to his editorial right to criticize but that he could not hide behind editorial freedom his statement of known cases of cheating without divulging them to the honor council. Not to so divulge them to the honor council would make him guilty of one provision of the honor code, and for the administration to ignore the matter would involve it indirectly as party to the infraction. He corrected the allegation in the next edition of the Flat Hat.

In the third instance, the Flat Hat editor deliberately permitted recognized obscenity to occur in the paper. I admonished him and the staff that such was in violation of the publications committee policies and asked that he include in the next edition a statement from me, acting as publisher in behalf of the college, expressing regret in this matter. This was done.

In conclusion on this, I might say that for college newspapers, especially during the late '60s, to be critical of the administration was the normal order of the day. I understood this from other college presidents, one of whom told me that if he read an edition that did not have at least one scathing editorial about him that he would have to inquire if the editor were ill.

Williams: The 1968 Statement of Rights and Responsibilities seems to have become a major focus of student discussion. Would you comment on this, Dr. Paschall?

Paschall: The Statement of Rights and Responsibilities to which you refer was adopted by the Board of Visitors on August 12, 1968--the same being basically recommended by Dean Lambert and myself to the board. I give you a copy for filing with the transcript of this interview and also a copy of my letter of transmittal of the statement to parents and students.

copy attached

I hope that any assessment of this statement in the future may be made within the context of its formulation, the timing, and the process it set in motion.

It was a time when court suits were increasing, involving alleged abridgment or denial of college student

rights in dress, search, appearance, use of records, and the like. The Civil Liberties Union had a field day, so to speak. National student organizations, the American Association of Colleges, and the American Association of University Professors were urging colleges to make pronouncements of student rights. Campus disturbances were increasing across the nation, some involving violence and destruction of property.

At William and Mary there was a growing advocacy for a promulgation of student rights. By the close of the session in June 1968, there were several proposed statements of rights, and copies of similar statements adopted by some other institutions were being circulated. It was obvious that the administration and the Board of Visitors would be faced with either adopting one of those advocated or some other.

The administration and some members of the board were also increasingly aware of an unprecedented legal situation: namely, to avoid the type of suits evidencing lack of documentation of specific rules, penalties, rights, and the like, some clarification of these should have official sanction and be made known prior to the beginning of the session in September.

Whereas there had always been certain codes of conduct and major regulations governing student activities and disciplinary procedure, the college had never before been faced with an apparent legal necessity for detailing so much specificity in the form of a code. For instance, such matters appeared insufficiently clarified and detailed in the college catalog, the student handbook, the honor code, and the rules of the Women's Dormitory Association. An official attempt to remedy this gave urgency to adopting the statement we are discussing.

It is important to note that the various statements proposed nationally and by those at the college dealt with student rights but were quite silent in regard to student responsibilities.

Those having a stewardship role for the college felt keenly that the omission of "responsibilities" was a serious one. They felt that each enrolling student has the right to expect the college to fulfill its educational mission as effectively as its capacity and resources would permit, but they also felt that the college must enjoy the right to establish and maintain high academic standards and the authority to adopt and implement standards of orderly conduct which will promote an atmosphere conducive to learning and meaning-

ful individual development.

They felt that rights without corresponding responsibilities are destined to perish and that both are meaningless without explicit means for their assurance. Therefore, we composed the statement setting forth mutual rights and responsibilities-- institutional and student-- and the related procedures for implementation. These covered such matters as Access to Education, the Classroom Situation, Student Records, Student Affairs (including Right to Orderly Environment, Free Inquiry, Expression, and Peaceable Assembly), Student Publications and Student Involvement in Institutional Life.

The statement also provided for a very representative campus Board of Student Affairs and procedures whereby representatives of the same could meet with the Board of Visitors. Incidentally, the Board of Visitors established a committee of the board for student affairs.

In my letter of transmittal of this statement to parents and students, a copy of which I gave you, I quote the following important paragraph:

In adopting this Statement, the President of the College and the Board of Visitors recognize that any statement of this nature

is, and should be, subject to further improvement. With this in mind, students and faculty are invited to prepare and present suggestions for improvement to the Board of Student Affairs.

This statement and the invitation for future improvement when fully acknowledged had a mitigating effect in offsetting certain militant endeavors at the beginning of the session and thus became the vehicle for mutual discussion between the campus Board of Student Affairs, the administration, and the Board of Visitors committee on student affairs. Its inclusion of "responsibilities" as well as "rights" also provided a timely, unique, and provocative consideration.

After a year's discussions the pressures for such a statement subsided, and the college catalog was revised to incorporate provisions that stood the test of legal validity and safeguards. In fact, in 1969, there began a swing away from the militant atmosphere that had characterized many college campuses for some two years previously.

Williams: In 1960, Dr. Paschall, when you assumed the presidency of William and Mary, you were quoted as saying that you'd rather be president of William and Mary than president of the United States. In view of everything that went on in the eleven years you were here,

would you today in 1976 still say that?

Paschall: Yes, I believe I would.

Williams: Then I want to thank you; you've spent a great deal of time ~~working~~^{giving} out your thoughts and doing the work of gathering additional materials, which are going to be filed with this report. You've been associated with the college now for I guess about fifty years, and I appreciate your taking so much of your time to tell about it [and about some of the other highlights of your life].

Paschall: Thank you.