W. Warner Moss

Dr. Moss is a native Virginian and thus brings a special perspective to these interviews. Having taught at William and Mary since 1937, he served as head of the government department and later as director of the Marshall-Wythe Institute. During much of this time he was actively involved in faculty organization.

C-9 | 15

INDEX SHEET

Interviewee Warner Moss

Date of interview February 12, 1975

Place 16 Morton Hall, Williamsburg

Interviewer Emily Williams

Session number 1

Length of tape 85 mins.

Contents:

	Approximate time:
William and Mary's position and status in early 1900s	8 mins.
changes in character in 1930s	
social life	2 mins.
assessment of Bryan's administration	14 mins.
operation of political connections, 1930s and 1940s	
Moss's return to William and Mary, 1937	2 mins.
administrative and curriculum changes under Bryan's influence	20 mins.
differing points of view on role of William and Mary in 1930s	
analysis of administration under Bryan and Pomfret	10 mins.
influence of education-oriented point of view under Pomfret and A.D. Chandler, bearing on elections of government department in 1930s and 1940s	10 mins.
Marshall-Wythe School of Govt. and Citizenship	10 mins.
divisional form of organization	1 min.
present state of Marshall-Wythe and Cutler trust	4 mins.
Hampton Roads study	2 mins.
Work/Study program during WWII	4 mins.

See back of sheet for names and places mentioned

18, 19

INDEX SHEET

Interviewee Warner Mass

Date of interview February 19, 1975

Place 16 Morton Hall, Williamsburg

Interviewer Emily Williams

Session number 2

Length of tape 95 mins.

Contents:

Approximate time:

government department
organization, instructional changes
expension into graduate work — 12 mins.

student interest in politics and govt.
Nixon's visit in 1968 — 13 mins.

exchange student programs — 10 mins.

faculty organization
1937 to 1951
divisional organization → informal advisory group
Faculty Advisory Council
dealings with A.D. Chandler
effect of Fowler as dean of faculty
faculty fragmentation
AAUP (local and state) — 60 mins.

See back of sheet for names and places mentioned in interview

19, 22 | C-10

INDEX SHEET

Interviewee Warner Moss

Date of interview February 26, 1975

Place 16 Morton Hall, Williamsburg

Interviewer Emily Williams

Session number 3

Length of tape 100 mins.

Contents:	Approximate time:
athletic situation	6 mins.
hints of situation	
Faculty Manifesto	
selection of acting president	2 mins.
faculty committee on selection of new president	26 mins.
background on Pomfret's method of administration	
period of acting presidency	
committee appearance before Board of Visitors on Oct. 9, 1951	
considerations in selecting new president	
wrongdoing in college operations	
report of faculty committee, faculty reactions to selection of new president	
early conversations with and actions of A.D. Chandler	4 mins.
Board of Visitors and faculty (early 1950s):	13 mins.
role of the faculty	
faculty relations under Chandler	5 mins.
new appointments	
lodge controversy	4 mins.
students and Chandler	6 mins.
Faculty involvement in 1955 protests	
Moss's disagreements with Chandler on academic freedom	11 mins.
Chandler's position after 1955	4 mins.
Moss's letter to Times-Dispatch (1955)	5 mins.
comments on Chandler	15 mins.

See back of sheet for names and places mentioned in interview

22 | C-10
23 |

INDEX SHEET

Interviewee Warner Moss

Date of interview March 5, 1975

Place 16 Morton Hall, Williamsburg

Interviewer Emily Williams

Session number 4

Length of tape 120 mins.

Contents:	Approximate time:
Colleges of William and Mary	5 mins.
expansion of sciences, liberal arts vs science in age of Sputnik	15 mins.
Colleges of William and Mary, continued William and Mary as university	8 mins.
Paschall's selection as president	10 mins.
Paschall's presidency faculty dealings with	4 mins.
Marshall-Wythe Institute - founding, administration of	14 mins.
A. Willis Robertson papers	4 mins.
setting up honors program	3 mins.
competition with U. Va.	2 mins.
assessment of Paschall's presidency	5 mins.
Controversies over speakers	9 mins.
Center for Overseas Students	4 mins.
administrative conservatism at William and Mary, 1950s and 1960s	3 mins.
protests at William and Mary in 1920s: student conservatism	6 mins.
Paschall's dealings with faculty, faculty leadership, Chandler → Paschall	5 mins.
Moss's role of opposition leader	5 mins
role of dean of faculty	5 mins.
power of Board of Visitors	8 mins.
reputation of William and Mary	2 mins.
corrections to earlier interviews	1 min.

See back of sheet for names and places mentioned in interview

Warner Moss

February 12, 1975 Williamsburg, Virginia

Williams: Dr. Moss, in some of our discussions before, you talked about being a Virginian, that you knew of William and Mary long before you came here to teach in 1937 and knew of its position in the state, which is an important aspect, I think. Could you describe how William and Mary was viewed by Virginians in the early 1900s?

Moss: Well, it depended on which particular Virginians. By the way, you say early 1900s -- that's very early. Actually if you go far back you find that William and Mary was regarded elsewhere as a curious kind of place where people had dedicated loyalties to a tradition that they valued very highly, but which were smiled at, for example, on the frontier. But that's not part of what you want me to go into. I would say that I'm speaking now of approximately the time that I went to college in 1919. At that time the various colleges had special kinds of status in the state. The University of Virginia appealed chiefly to the sons of the well-to-do and the more or less privileged, and the poor boy at the University of Virginia -- or one who didn't have any connections -- was very much left out. But of course, the university went through a great many changes. This was spelled out more and more. V.M.I. had its special

place, V.P.I. -- and William and Mary was regarded as an institution, which having had a fine tradition, had a period of relative decay, and was polite but not very effectual under Tyler. Then J. A. C. Chandler had come in with, you might say, a public education point of view. I believe he had been school superintendent in Richmond or a school principal; and he was very much of a promoter. He built the school very rapidly. Many people felt that it was without due regard for standards, with the proliferation of programs and taking almost any applicant. This was the way it was viewed. Country people and people from the southside of Virginia thought that it was their institution because, unlike the University of Virginia, it was really serving the state; it was meeting their kinds of needs. They were very happy about it. But there was always a little feeling that somehow or other by the standards on which institutions were judged, as for example, the University of Virginia (which was rated very high), that William and Mary just wasn't up there. This caused William and Mary people to have an uneasiness, a little touchiness. But there was also this feeling of dedication. When Mr. Bryan came in this was dramatically changed. Of course not immediately -- it wasn't immediately effected. But his coming and the plans that evolved in his administration were ones to change this focus, and it created a great deal of ill-feeling among the people who thought their

institution was being taken away from them.

Now you mentioned the general view in the state. There are things that might be said, but it would be a very lengthy discussion. The state of Virginia or the people of Virginia have social attitudes that are widely known, often condemned, but even though difficult to define have been very very important. And I think you will find in Ellen Glasgow's novels and in Styron's books, in Eckenrode's book, Bottom Rail on Top, and Clifford Dowardy's work -- you'll find some of this temper. And William and Mary fits into that situation in its own special way as being a place with some prestige, chiefly historical, but in the 1920s not fitting its pretensions. Of course, the development of the Restoration had a great effect on that. You might really say that William and Mary in the decades after Bryan came in have been ones in which the state has changed. The older attitudes have been modified, but also William and Mary has, I think, staked out its claim to a position of status.

Williams: Before Mr. Bryan came the school was very much teacher education - oriented -- is this not true?

Moss: People told me when I came here that J. A. C. Chandler would certainly have changed this, but he wanted to move on from his rather loose standards in the interest of promotion, to an institution that had higher standards. I don't know; this is what they told me. I can believe it, and certainly the curricu-

lum changes were initiated before Mr. Bryan came. And some of the people who were influential after Mr. Bryan was here had come under the Chandler administration. However, Chandler didn't live long enough to bring this about. I would say that at the time he died William and Mary was thought of as being, in relation to its history and background, pretentious and insecure. That's the way it looked to me when I came. Now just at the time I came there was something very different: Mr. Bryan and some of the people that he worked with had changed the character.

Williams: Mr. Bryan has been credited largely with bringing status to the college, as you were speaking of earlier, and his administration has been described in rather halcyon terms as a "golden age for William and Mary." Did you see it that way as you came in 1937?

Moss: Not altogether. Certainly one of the reasons that I came was that Mr. Bryan talked with me in New York about what he was doing and what he was trying to do, and I was delighted with this. And when I came, there were many things that were very nice: for example, Mr. Bryan had his annual Christmas party, which was no mediocre or trivial event. This thing was done up brown, and he knew how to do it. And the people were quite marvelous. And he was able to bring to the college people of some eminence -- for example, he would call someone up at eleven

o'clock in the morning and say, "Warner, can you and your wife come? I have a friend I want you to meet from New York, and we'll have lunch." Of course, my wife has her plans -- the children and everything else to take care of -- but no, you go. And then you find, who is it? -- maybe it's Harold Laski or Mr. Rockefeller or maybe it's some friend of his from Richmond that you wouldn't ordinarily meet. He had contacts which enabled him to get not big money, but at any rate some favorable attention. There was one little program we started which Clarence Dillon supplied the money for. Probably no one else who was associated tih the college could have approached Clarence Dillon about this. Mr. Bryan could. He had many contacts with the newspaper world, particularly. He'd played a part in the Democratic convention of 1932, and the Democratic party people he had contacts with. So there were many things he could do. He also was able to bring people here as members of the faculty because they saw in him a kind of quality that they wished to be associated with. He was able to get people from Harvard, for example. He, I think, was on the Harvard Board of Overseers or something like that. He also had his contacts with the private schools in Virginia, the relatively elite institutions, so that there was much he could do. I think he gave generously of his time, money, and influence while he was here. On the other hand, the other side of the coin was that he did not spend his whole time at the college; he went back

and forth to Richmond. He did not supply a definitive type of administration and left things loose so that some people like Charlie Duke and some others were able to play an active role that they could not have played if Mr. Bryan had been here in permanent residence. And I think that this was upsetting, and I think that sometimes his delegation of authority was not always carefully considered. And I think that he often in his personal relationships with people gave a kind of support and assurance to them in their roles at the college that were not justified in terms of the actual operation of the college. I would say that this was true in my own case -- we were very friendly and I wanted to work with him and so on. But often I would find that yes, this is what we had talked about, but he hadn't given instructions to so-and-so and so-and-so and so-and-so who might be involved in this, you see. I think this was the consequence of a rather informal kind of operation, which in a small college wasn't bad. But it called for him being closer to the picture than he was.

Williams: He then left a good bit of the administrative work to Charlie Duke -- is this true?

Moss: I don't know quite who he was really leaving it to. Now because Charlie Duke was the business manager and bursar and because he was here on the ground and into everything, yes, much was in his hands. On the other hand I would say that

he left a great deal to Dean Miller. I think he left a great deal with Dean Hoke, (while Dean Hoke was dean), but you might get something better on this from someone else. I saw it from a particular angle, but I do think that the loose character of his administration created difficulties within the college. People were given the green light to go ahead, but they had to fight their own way. For example, Leslie Cheek, who was head of the department of fine arts, was given you might say carte blanche. Well, to give Leslie Cheek carte blanche was to give a check without the amount written in. So that there were difficulties created. Cheek went right ahead to do what he wanted to do, and there were some other people who were very unhappy about this. So this is what I mean.

Williams: You mentioned Mr. Bryan's contacts. Did he get along well with the politicians in Richmond, or was this important at the time? Perhaps I should ask it that way.

Moss: In a way he got along with them, but I had the impression that a great deal was left to Charlie Duke. In other words the president, I think had his good personal contacts, excellent personal contacts, with the individual politicians, such as Senator Byrd, and because of the influence of his newspapers, politicians couldn't disregard him. But on the other hand when it actually came to going before the legislature and talking about the budget of the college or buttonholing some member of the legislature in the lower ranks of the organization, I

think that he left this to Charlie Duke. I did not believe at that time that Charlie Duke actually had as much influence with these men as many other members of the faculty seemed to think. They seemed to think that he was a real politician and he was on the inside of everything. And there were men with whom he had good personal close contacts, such as Governor Tuck. But I think also that he was not regarded as a big influence in Richmond. Of course, remember that the political support for William and Mary was built very largely on the basis of the school superintendents rather than on such people as the agricultural extension agents used by V.P.I. and the highway department used by the V.M.I. and the lawyers in Richmond used by the Univeristy of Virginia, so that this group, while important in the state, still was not as influential as the lawyers in Richmond from the University of Virginia law school. And so the college did not swing much weight politically in the state, certainly as against the University of Virginia or V.P.I. I don't think that Charlie Duke really helped very much on that. I don't know particularly how he used his influence. I had the feeling that it was overrated.

Williams: This is jumping ahead a bit, but did he continue this type of role for Mr. Pomfret?

Moss: Yes, he did, and I think that this was a difficulty. I was seeing this from the outside and did not have any of the inside information about what was going on, but it seemed to me that Mr.

Pomfret did not have many contacts in Richmond. He came from outside the state, and though he had some personal relations he had been chosen as a scholarly president. And I think that he may have felt that Charlie Duke and the board were responsible for forwarding the interests of the college in Richmond, and he never did get into a role on this which would have been the dominant one. That was the impression that I had. So that during his administration Charlie Duke continued to play a part. And in the case of Governor Tuck, Charlie Duke had, I think, a personal entre, which was important. I think that this made Pomfret's position more difficult.

Williams: Do you think it aggravated his position in 1951 when the athletic scandal broke?

Moss: I think that was the unfolding of things rather than being central. This was just what happened as a result of much more. And of course, there is the question of the board at this time. Now I believe on one occasion Mr. Pomfret expressed to me the view that the college president did not interfere in the selection of board members, and I think that this was probably the case. But I think that a person like J.A.C. Chandler probably asked for particular board members or conveyed the idea that someone would be useful on the board. But I don't think that Pomfret would have attempted to see that any particular person got on the board. I would say that it was never his board. On the other hand I think that when Admiral Chandler came in that particular board was -- he looked on it as something that was

an instrument for him rather than a body to which he reported.

Williams: Which would have been his father's attitude, it seems.

Moss: Yes, I think so.

Williams: That really is getting ahead somewhat. I wanted to go back and ask you -- you spoke of Mr. Bryan coming to New York to speak to you. When you got out of graduate school (I believe you said at one time) you would not have cared to come back to William and Mary at that time. Was it Mr. Bryan or just the general uplifting of the quality that drew you back to William and Mary?

Moss: No, of course there were personal factors. I was interested in coming to Virginia. I did know that William and Mary was one of the places that was on the way somewhere. I knew from my experience at the University of Virginia that this (University of Virginia) was pretty much of a routine kind of operation at that time. Not much change seemed to be taking place at the University of Virginia, and William and Mary seemed to me to be a place that was changing from its old to a new character, so that I was a little more interested, but not entirely sold on William and Mary. And then this was the offer at the time that was appropriate for me. While I didn't have long to debate it, I did think very deeply about it and realized I was making a change for a good many years. Well, when I talked with Mr. Bryan you might say that this clinched it. If I had talked to J. A. C. Chandler I think I wouldn't have come. If I had

talked with Dean Hoke -- who I was fond of and respected, but who represented the old type of William and Mary -- if he had talked with me I don't think I would have come. But Mr. Bryan did make it look as if this was the right thing. He was a good salesman.

Williams: This was the time, as you said, when William and Mary was sort of beginning to move from old to new. The curriculum was changed about the time you came, and there were some administrative changes. I believe it would have been right around the time that you came there was a sort of phasing out of Dean Hoke and what he represented. I wondered if you would comment on this.

Moss: I knew nothing about this at the time I talked with Mr. Bryan except that he spoke of getting new people and changing the face of things, and clearly he had much admiration for some people. I believe he mentioned Dean Miller, who at that time was not dean. He was rather proud of what he had done about getting in these new people. And I didn't know just what had been happening. As a matter of fact I wish now that I found out a little more. So I arrived here discovering that the shape of things at the college was a little different and that there was this -- you might call it a faction. But I came with a somewhat different point of view than they had, and I felt that Mr. Bryan was telling me that he wanted a somewhat different point of view. In other words they were focusing very much on the idea of William and Mary being a small institution after,

you might say, the pattern of Dartmouth and very good. I thought that was fine, but I also felt that as a state institution, the college could hardly turn its back on the state. And I felt that if anything here was going to develop and grow, as Mr. Bryan seemed to want, it would have to look outside of the college walls. So that I was skeptical of this point of view that was represented by Miller. At the same time I couldn't swallow the low standards which were, you might say, part of the extension picture and so on. So that I found myself not in that new camp, and at the same time not in the old one.

Another thing is that this new group had not been consulted about my coming. Evidently it was a bolt from the blue as far as they were concerned. My contact here at the college was with A. G. Taylor, and he was the one who first wrote to me. Then my negotiation was with Mr. Bryan. When I arrived here I found that A. G. Taylor did not have the kind of authority which enabled him to take an aggressive position on any of these issues. He was not a part of the new crowd, and he wasn't with the old crowd entirely, but was rather ... Well, I think that he simply was filling his job, (dean of the Marshall-Wythe School) doing the things that were necessary, but not likely to embark on anything of the scope that Mr. Bryan had in mind. Have I explained it well enough?

Williams: I think so. Would it be accurate to say that the phasing out

of Dean Hoke gave birth to this old faction?

Moss: I don't know that Dean Hoke was central to it. Of course, he was the dean, and he was head of the school of education and in many ways was the focus for this kind of thing. And I suppose the new faction had to remove him -- or that Mr. Bryan had to remove him. But there were other people who were offended by the new point of view and chiefly by the tactlessness, I think, or poor judgment for some of these newer people. Now going back to what I said about the nature of Virginia, there's a kind of offense in Virginia that is felt very deeply. I think that these people may not have been aware of that, and they were not sensitive to the feelings of some people. So there was a very great tension. Now it seems to me that there has been always at William and Mary, even from the earliest days, a kind of tension between the ideal of a liberal arts college (you might say a traditional college) and the ideal of a service educational institution for the state. I think that this has not been bad. It has caused us a great deal of grief and trouble, but it has been a kind of tension which kept things in operation and moving. Now you couldn't stay still on this kind of thing, and I think that maybe this has been a good thing at the college. But people have felt very, very deeply about it. I might give you this as an illustration: there was a question of admissions and academic standards. The people in education at that time and up until the end of the Pomfret administration, I think

felt that the college ought to accept as students people who would go into the school system, whether they were very good or not. The state needed teachers, and it was the business of the college to do the best it could with these people who were willing to be teachers. I had this argument made to me by George Oliver, who was the head of the department of education. Virginia needs teachers, and it is the business of William and Mary to see to it that the people who will be teachers are as good teachers as they can be. So even if they can't write good master's essays, if master's degrees are required by the state, it is our business to help them get those master's degrees and in the process give them as much education as we can. Now I grant the merits of this proposition. It doesn't accord with my notion of what William and Mary should do, you see, but such an argument as that from him would simply make the hair stand on end in the case of some of these people who were eager to have an institution of quality at all costs and also were sensitive to the fact that we didn't quite make it. They were acutely sensitive. This has made some difficulty in the way the people -- oh, if it kept the place moving and exciting, it also invaded some of the time and energy that was available for more constructive things.

Williams: Would you date this tension from this period?

Moss: I would say that the tension has been with us, is still with us, and that it began as early as the revival of the college

at the time that Tyler was president. And now, of course, it has been more intense at some times and less intense at others. I'd say just now that it is the least intense that I have known it. Of course, I am not as much in things as I was, but as I observe it, there is much less tension on this point than there used to be.

Williams: You mentioned that when you came you were neither an old faction person nor a new faction person. The new faction got the name (and I'm not sure how) of the "Kitchen Cabinet". Was there a third group who viewed them, and how did they view them? I can imagine how the old group saw them.

Moss: Well, this was a very informal and intangible kind of thing. I was told shortly after I came here that Charlie Duke was having a small coterie of associates who were meeting with him to discuss issues of national policy, you might say. But at any rate they were discussing things. I do think that some people, such as Jim Miller and Charles Harrison, perhaps Mel Jones (though I don't think he played as large a role then), perhaps Jimmy Fowler... At any rate this group often -- well, I'll use the word intrigued -- I wouldn't say it was conspiracy and intrigue of the worst sort, but they understood each other. They cooperated, and to the people who were on the outside it looked as though they they were in very close association. I think that people viewed them more as men on the make than as people who had any great policies. Now they did stand for the narrower

conception of the college and for the excellence. Some people thought of them as the Harvard group because there was a surplus of Harvard people in the college. (I heard the story the other day that Jess Jackson had been asked on one occasion if he couldn't find people who were pretty good from somewhere else than Harvard. And he said, "Yes, but why take a chance?") And the Harvard group tended to have this kind of attitude. They couldn't believe that anybody who went to the University of Idaho could possibly make a contribution to the College of William and Mary. (Of course, I think that, too, but they let people know it.) And of course, Mr. Bryan fitted into this.

And then parallel to this was the Restoration emphasis on prestige and status, and the presence of some of these Restoration people introduced a new element, a set of practices from a social standpoint. Williamsburg had never known afternoon teas with candles before that, but this began to be the thing, you see. There were lots of changes like that. There were some people who were just left out of this and who didn't fit. They had deep feelings.

How were these people viewed, this "Kitchen Cabinet?" I think people also felt that really they were not quite, you might say, what they purported to be. For example, who at the college should discuss foreign affairs? Well, obviously the people in the field of international relations and related fields -- international economics and so on. But, no, you had

people who had no background here and who perhaps could carry on very pleasant social conversations about these things, but they were not specialists. I think that was the way they were viewed.*

Williams: Earlier you spoke of the constituency that William and Mary had with the superintendents of public instruction in the state...

Moss: School superintendents --

Williams: School superintendents, right. What was their reaction to Bryan?

Moss: Well, they felt that their college was being taken away from them. They supported the school of education, and they were indignant about this kind of thing. Another reflection of this was in the response to Leslie Cheek's promotion of the department of fine arts. Some alumni were very much disturbed that William and Mary was getting the reputation of being a "panty-waist" institution. They thought what William and Mary needs is a good football team, so they went out and brought the Voyle's team from Tennessee. They just bought the team! This was to balance, you see. So you had people in education being interested in this thing, the athletic business. They (pro-athletic and pro-education people) were allies. We're talking chiefly about some of these inner politics. Actually as I look back on it now it was too bad. I wish that there hadn't been this kind of thing at the college. I think that while it was

*(Author's note: I see I did not answer the question on a "third group". I do not think there was any third group. The college was polarized. The most you could say was that there were some persons of various degrees of independence.)

related to some bigger issues, the bigger issues were more important.

Williams: How do you think it would have changed the college's history, had it not been so?

Moss: I think that there was an alternative possibility, but it should have come at the beginning of the Bryan administration rather than later. Now they did follow this: there was a study of the college -- I think this was with general education Board money -- and Mr. Bryan was responsible and Jackson Davis was very much responsible, that resulted in the Works Report. I did not like what Works did, especially as I saw it related to my work. It was a kind of objective analysis by an outside person, and in a framework of educational philosophy that was needed as a firm foundation, and yet what we had was this kind of personal regime. So that that would have been the better thing. But it came after many of these events had taken place; Mr. Brayn followed the Works report by some effort to develop the Marshall-Wythe school; but these things did not seem to come to very much. The difference between our aspirations and our resources was too great. But I do think that things would have been better if there had been a careful study of the college and a laying out the plans for a decade.

Williams:** (#1) Why wasn't there long-term planning in the 1930s following the building program. What could planning have accomplished that was not accomplished without it?

(** - Question #1 not included in the original interview, but added and subsequently answered by Dr. Moss)

Moss: Long term planning has not been characteristic of Virginia political life. The state organization was interested in economy and efficiency and frowned on expenditures for social services. Any projection of future needs was likely to be dismissed with the hope that if needs were ignored they might never occur. So institutional administrations have had to depend upon exploiting the obvious pressures when it became clear they could not be avoided.

The building program of the Thirties was accomplished with Federal money.

Mr. Bryan's presidency was an interim affair and was directed towards improving the atmosphere and personnel and setting goals such as that of a liberal arts college. The Works Report had the character of long-range planning but it is my recollection that Dean Miller and his friends had their own goals and conception of the college and did not welcome the Works Report.

It was difficult to undertake long-range planning when the mission of the college and its role in the state was ill-definded, and it remained undefined. The polarization between the liberal arts idea and the idea of a service institution for the state stood in the way of definition. Had the college developed a long-range plan on the basis of a firm decision about the mission it would have reduced or eliminated the tensions in the college.

Williams: This report (the Works Report) was during the Bryan adminis-

tration?

Moss: Yes, Bryan was responsible for this, and yet at the same time, his personal administration had been the dominant one all the time. Now of course, his personal administration followed on the intensly personal administration of J. A. C. Chandler, so that the college might not have known what to do with a situation where an objective study was made by a people thinking in broad terms. No, Mr. Bryan in the beginning, I think, was hoping that by getting some good new men he would get some results. Actually the people that he got, I think, were not likely to produce that breadth of vision. Now it's true that they had some commitments to excellence and high quality, but it was from too narrow a foundation. I'm referring particularly to the people who took this narrow view of the college. I believe that they looked back on their own experience; this was what they had to work with, and they could see William and Mary fitting in with that. This is what they worked for. But they had had no experience with a state institution that had to have its constituency; they had no experience with that. They just didn't see it. They thought somehow it would be taken care of, maybe by Charlie Duke. Of course, I'm expressing what it looked to me, and it may have been that other people saw it very differently.

Williams: I wanted to ask you when you were talking about the reaction of the education-oriented to Bryan and about personal administration if this carried on into Mr. Pomfret's administration?

Moss: Well, of course, the personalities of the men were entirely different. I believe that Pomfret wanted to operate as president in a somewhat more orderly and formal way and that Miller was the dean, and he expected Miller to function as a dean. I would say that one thing that Pomfret did was to assume a scholarly leadership which Bryan and Charlie Duke, for example, couldn't. In other words, during the Bryan regime, why, Miller was obviously the only person who had authority who was truly an academic person. But after Pomfret came it was a case where the academic leadership was in the hands of the president, and Miller functioned I think quite cordially and cooperatively with Pomfret and Pomfret with Miller. I think on many things they saw eye-to-eye. But certainly there wasn't the kind of blossoming that Miller had enjoyed under Bryan. Pomfret was more cautious in his personal relati onships -- this is, none of the social festivities. I think the Pomfrets felt that this was something beyond them and beyond most of the faculty people, and why go into this kind of thing? Why compete with Mr. Bryan, anyhow? The college ceased to have this festive character. Along with it was this less personal administration. Pomfret was a very nice sort of fellow personally, and so was his wife, and so they got along mostly with people. But it wasn't a case of, "Well, I think this would be a grand idea, so let's do it." No, he said, "Let's figure out what our major objective is, what we can accomplish." He tried very hard to get some-

thing in the way of retirement and something in the way of salaries and this kind of thing. And then remember, too, that the war came, and this robbed Pomfret of the opportunity to do something very much his own. We did what we had to do. Of course, I think he did well in guiding us through the situation, but we had to sacrifice many of the goals that we would have otherwise pursued. There was a great loss in the student body (especially men, of course), an increase in the number of women, faculty people lost. How could you build a faculty if the young men might be pulled out? So this was a difficult thing. He didn't have a chance to show what he could do.

Williams: What bearing did this education-oriented influence have, if any at all?

Moss: I think that the feeling was that the die had been cast in favor of a liberal arts college with a de-emphasis on education. But he was too wise a man to think that we could do away with all these education features. Now as I remember, we did do away with the school of library science at that time. I expect that in the way that money was divided up and the energies of his administration expanded that the education people were very much short of what they had enjoyed before. He expected them to take care of their role in the college, and he wasn't very much interested. He wanted to bring up the quality and the fringe benefits and so on of the faculty, and he wanted to improve the library. I believe it was while he was here that we

developed the Institute of Early American History. This was a big contribution.

Williams: Would you say that the election of Alvin Duke Chandler was a reaction to this liberal arts college idea?

Moss: I would say that this is very important, yes. I wouldn't say that it was the sole factor, by any means, and I wouldn't say that Admiral Chandler was committed to the supremacy of education (with a big "E") and public school education. No, not at all. Not only the general picture but the particular persons and actions in connection with that change of command marked this as definitely an exclusion of the remnants of the "Kitchen Cabinet." I don't know if you want me to talk about that or not now, but the actual events that took place in connection with the change were ones involving some of these same people, at least as a faction.

Williams:** (#2) We never did get back to the connections of A. D. Chandler's election and the rejection of the old "Kitchen Cabinet".

Moss: ** Kitchen Cabinet was too narrow a term to be used in 1951. The kitchen cabinet was a feature of the Bryan administration and disappeared with the coming of the war, or even earlier. The reference above was to the exclusion of the remnants of the "Kitchen Cabinet" and even that exaggerates the importance of the "Kitchen Cabinet" in 1951. "Liberal Arts faction" was a more appropriate term.

Men like Miller, Fowler, and Guy preferred a scholarly president like Pomfret and opposed the selection of anyone

(** - Question #2 not included in the original but added later - see #1)

resembling J. A. C. Chandler. I have been told that the Board's selection of Sharvy Umbeck as Dean and rejection of Pomfret's nominee, Phalen, was a clear signal of the reduction in influence of the liberal arts faction. Though I do not recall the names of the persons taken to Richmond by Bemiss to see Shewmake I believe they were Miller, Fowler, and Guy. The choice of Chandler for president was a repudiation of their advice by the board. The selection of a new committee by the faculty also meant a reduction of their prestige. Though this was not a complete repudiation of their leadership and it is notable that Miller served briefly as Dean under Chandler, Mel Jones became dean and later academic vice-president, and Fowler became dean.**

(Answer to Question #2)

Williams: When Pomfret was elected, though, there was a deep division, apparently within the board. Was this known generally at the time?

Moss: I would say that it was not known, and my own particular view of it is perhaps based on some information, but more or less speculation as to what must have been the case for these events to have taken place as they did. I was told that the man who was at Mary Washington was the preferred candidate of the defeated minority of the board. I don't know, but I was told that. And he was the brother of the patronage dispenser of the state machine, so that you can see this was very important.

Combs was his name. (Later he went crazy; he had to be removed from Mary Washington, so it's just as well we didn't get him.) I don't see what he could have added to the college. He would have been public school-oriented, and he would have carried on many things that he thought Chandler stood for. And if Combs had come in, I would have been looking for another place, without any question. I was quite prepared for a change in the presidency that might not be altogether what one individual would like. Combs would have been a throwback to the worst of what we had known -- that was the way I viewed it.

Williams: Were you alone in this feeling?

Moss: Oh, no no. There was a great deal of trepidation in the college as we saw the prospect of Mr. Bryan's being replaced. Not that he was altogether effective in his last years here at the college -- it was clear that he would soon have to go. We didn't want to lose the gains that were made.

Williams: But was this division within the board generally known, known that there were competing candidates for the presidency?

Moss: Was it known within the board? Surely.

Williams: No, within the faculty that the board was divided.

Moss: I don't think so. I think they did recognize that there were some members of the board, who in their view were not their friends. I think that there were a good many people on the board (and of course they constituted a majority in the longrun) who favored the kind of institution that William and Mary was

becoming. They may not have agreed with some of the faculty people, but they liked the direction. Now certainly Francis Pickens Miller was in this group, and he is still living, and he would be helpful to you. There was also Gordon Bohannon. Whether he was on the board at the time of this election, I don't know, but I was very much interested in having met him one night at Mr. Bryan's. And we spent a long, long time talking about the college. I had the feeling that Mr. Bohannon was decidedly in favor of excellence and a good liberal arts college. In fact, as I told you before, I felt something of a dedication to -- Jackson Davis on the General Education Board and also to Gordon Bohannon. They had talked to me about this kind of thing, and I thought I had come to an agreement with them that this is what I would work for. So that when I think that there were in the alumni and some of the groups in the alumni, particularly connected with Phi Beta Kappa (by the way, that's an important element of the college), and people like Gordon Bohannon who would not have gone along with the election of Combs. Combs might have had his troubles if he had been here.

Williams: Would you like to expand on what you said about Phi Beta Kappa being an important part of the college?

Moss: You see, this being the Alpha chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, the national orgainization of Phi Beta Kappa is intensely interested. They don't want to see the college of the Alpha chapter a school of education. And then remember that they are influential people in the field of education, the leaders of Phi

Beta Kappa. They also have a kind of investment: some Phi Beta Kappa money is in Phi Beta Kappa Hall and was in the old one. So that whenever the college has been faced with one of these crises of overall quality, the Phi Beta Kappa people have been very attentive to what was going on and have put their oar in. Now you'll have to talk to some of the Phi Beta Kappa people.

Williams: Yes, that would be the thing to do there.

I've been asking you questions mainly so far about politics on the administrative level at William and Mary. I want to ask you also about the government department. Would you like to do that now?

Moss: Yes, I think I might just as well.

Williams: Okay. Now when you came, the government department was part of something that was called the Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship. What was this?

Moss: Well, this has been a real problem in the college. J. A. C. Chandler was a man who went out to get money, and he didn't always carefully look at how it was wrapped up. So he was able to get some money called the Cutler Trust, which specifically prescribed certain things that would be done, such as an annual lecturer and the gold prize and a contribution to the salary of the John Marshall professor of government and citizenship. And the people who were most closely associated with this had established what they called a Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship. Now [Oscar L.] Shewmake had had much to do with it.

Its orientation was essentially legal. I would say that it had two types of orientation. John Garland Pollard, who later became governor, was the first John Marshall professor of government and citizenship and I think the dean of the Marshall-Wythe school. He was a man who had perhaps modest qualifications as an academic man, but who was very loyal to Virginia, believed in citizenship, and talked much about the duties of a citizen. He believed in an (important role for) education and government in the college. He also was a lawyer. And to these people government and law were almost indistinguishable. That was their point of view. Now this was one of the things that,at William and Mary , did finally grow into something very real: Pollard became governor of the state. I don't know how Shewmake happened to be removed from it, but he was no longer teaching. The law school at William and Mary had, you might say, declined; it was a department of jurisprudence. It had few students, small faculty, an inadequate collection of books and so on. In fact, I think it was in the first year that I was here, there was about one week in which the law school was abolished. But great noise was made, and it was restored. The two points I want to make: one is that this was a very special kind of administrative organization, a college organization that didn't fit into the normal way things developed. And yet it was tied to the Cutler trust. If you gave up the organization of the Marshall-Wythe $chool you had to give up the Cutler trust. Don't worry too much if it makes people too uncomfortable with that,

whatever their administrative relations are.

The other side of it was that it was law-oriented, and you might say had a kind of evangelical attitude towards citizenship. Now these two things didn't square with the developments in the field of political science. If I came to the college as a political scientist developing the department of government I couldn't tie it in with the law if the law was professionally oriented, and I couldn't let it be on a superficial basis of evangelical citizenship. I had to work towards its being a professionally qualified department of government. I don't think that these people who were connected with the Marshall-Wythe school understood that altogether -- that is, the people like Shewmake. I knew that this was a kind of disorderly thing, but I felt that Mr. Bryan was going to really make something good out of it. But when I got here I found that it was sort of left hanging. Mr. Bryan had made himself the dean of the Marshall-Wythe school with A. G. Taylor as the assistant dean. Then when I went to A. G.Taylor to get something done, that was for the government department, I found that A. G. Taylor didn't have the scope of authority that was necessary for this. Mr. Bryan talked with me about his wanting to see things developed in the field of political science, and so I decided, well, if we were going to have anything in the way of political science developing in relation to state government, it was not likely to come on the Williamsburg cam-

pus because Miller and his group would be against it; Taylor wouldn't be able to do anything about it. And then, too, it was far-removed from Richmond. So I went up to Richmond, and I intiated some work in public administration there at the Richmond Professional Institute. I didn't want to continue that. I didn't want to identify myself with the Richmond Professional Institute, drive up there for these courses, and so on, but I thought if I could get it started then we could get somebody up there with whom we could work. And we did bring in a good man, Hart Schaaf. But the war was on, and he was taken out and eventually had a good career in public administration. But this was a kind of end-run around the situation here in Williamsburg you see.

Returning to the Marshall-Wythe school: during the war I was a little uncertain how things would develop. A. G. Taylor went to Washington and at the same time he had just been made dean of the Marshall-Wythe school. And while he was in Washington Marsh took over as I suppose acting dean. He was much more aggressive and was pursuing a positive policy. I was disturbed about this because I wanted to know where the government department came out in this. They couldn't abolish the Marshall-Wythe school. They couldn't abolish the Cutler essays; they had to keep that up. I don't know what all the steps were, but they appointed me John Marshall Professor of Government and Citizenship. I was told this by Mr. Bryan (before Pomfret came

in): to report to him directly. "Never mind about the Marshall-Wythe school. You come in to see me when you want to do something, when you want advice on something," which of course, is a wrong situation, but it was also felt that it was wrong to have a dean of the Marshall-Wtyhe school. This was an inappropriate organization for a college that was trying to be a small liberal arts college. Now this kind of thing has been kept in a state of uncertainty over the years. The one way in which Pomfret tried to solve it was to establish divisions so that we had four divisions of the college, one of which was the division of social science. The Marshall-Wythe school was merged with the division of social sciences. That, I think, went along. We didn't have so much trouble after that, but we always hung on to this business of the Marshall-Wythe school.

Williams: You said the Marshall-Wythe school was inappropriate for a liberal arts college. Did you mean because of the professional nature of the legal training -- is that what you mean?

Moss: Well, even with the legal training out -- your small liberal arts colleges are made up of departments. And whenever you bring some of these departments together in a special group and have a dean, it changes character somewhat. The dean is charged with, you might say, some kind of promotion of a program, and it means that the individual departments in the social sciences would become less significant. Now there have been

liberal arts colleges that have had something of this sort: for example, Haverford, I think, has a special school of you might call it social service because the Quakers have this organization. It's within the college, but it doesn't play a very large role. Oberlin has a school of music or a conservatory of music. I think Dartmouth had something of this kind, so it can be done. But no one was making any decision as to how it would be done. It wasn't a case of where the president and the board said, "This is what we are going to set up," and tell people why it was good and what they wanted to accomplish. It's just that it was a vestige of some policies of the past that didn't fit the present. And you still have it in this Marshall-Wythe Institute.

Williams: Did the Cutler Trust carry over into that?

Moss: Yes, the Cutler Trust has continued. I don't know what they are doing with it now, but Mr. Swindler in law has been made the John Marshall Professor of Government and Citizenship. Then because of the Marshall-Wythe names, why, I suppose that the law school really feels that it ought to have this or it ought to be part of the law school or something.

Williams: How did Mr. Pomfret when he set up the divisions and merged the Marshall-Wythe school take care of the Cutler business? Was it through the creation of the Marshall-Wythe Institute?

Moss: He didn't create the Marshall-Wythe Institute, no. That came later. What he did was to continue a description in the catalog (and you can read this yourself) in which it is stated that the Marshall-Wythe School of Government and Citizenship

was merged with the division of social sciences. And what did they do with the John Marshall professorship? They gave it to the head of the department of government. What did they do with the Cutler lectures? They merged these with the Charter Day exercises. Then what would they do about continuing something that is Marshall-Wythe? Well, the Marshall-Wythe seminar was continued. They did drop the essays for which the gold prize was given because you couldn't give gold, you see. So what they were doing was trying to hold on to the trust by making some perhaps inappropriate changes for the college. It never had any significant substance, you see.

Williams: Because they were simply labels, was there no objection made to this structural change that Mr. Pomfret made?

Moss: I don't recall any objection to that. Maybe a man like Shewmake would have an objection.

And there are people (for example, Marsh) who would argue -- at least he did argue before -- that this served a very good purpose in bringing together the social science departments in a cooperative way. I think he saw this a little more clearly because he was the one involved centrally in the cooperation, so of course, he was fully aware of it. I would say this was less significant to some of the rest of us; insofar as government engaged in any of this cooperation, I believe that it could have been accomplished without the Marshall-Wythe school. It did give to the people in the social sciences the ideal of having some kind of cooperative activity.

Williams: You spoke of the setting up of the public administration work at R.P.I. as a departure of what was being done in the government department here. Last time we had talked about the Hampton Roads study during the war as being a departure from the norm here at the government department. Exactly what did this entail?

Moss: I don't know that this Hampton Roads study was a departure from the norm of the department. I think we would have done it along with the other departments in any case, and it was good to have the leadership of Chuck Marsh in doing it. But this came out of the war. Number one, we did want to have some kind of research going on, and we wanted to get some money for it. So we proposed that we should make an analysis of what was happening to the Hampton Roads area during the war. This would be useful information. And so we parcelled out the different chapters to different people, and they wrote them. And it was a decent little book that I don't see referred to anywhere. One chapter that I wrote which was on the political side -- I feel rather badly that it hasn't been ever noted anywhere. It apparently didn't get into circulation. If I had written it in an article I probably would have seen references to it in connection with Virginia politics. So I feel those things were in a way lost. But this was a good thing to do and yet it did not continue; I don't know why. It would have been logical that we would have built something else on top of this. I don't know why we didn't.

Williams: One more wartime event that you referred to when I last talked to you was setting up of the work-study program. Would you describe how that came about?

Moss: Well, I thought afterward about this some -- as to how I would describe it. I can tell you this: at a Rotary Club meeting the man who was in charge of the work at the Naval Mine Depot pleaded with the members of the Rotary Club at the meeting that they needed some kind of help. The work was being done by Negro women who were making bombs, and this wasn't a very satisfactory kind of labor force. So I talked to him afterward, and I said, "Well, why can't you use students at the college? We can recruit students who will work part-time and will study part-time." See, we needed men students, and we could take some men who might be going into the army after maybe a year, but meanwhile they could do this work and come to the college. Now from that point on I'm not sure just what happened. I do know that I definitely did not want to operate a program like that myself. I think that I referred the man to the president of the college or to someone else. A committee was set up -- you always have committees-- and I think that Charlie Duke was a member of the committee. At any rate, yes, we would do this. They tried to look for someone as director; I turned it down. I think that the next man to take it was Hib Corey, but it may have been Sharvy Umbeck. (Sharvy and I had discussed work-study

plans before the Mine Depot problem had come up.) When Sharvy Umbeck took it he made a very good thing out of it. He effectively promoted it, and I would say that in normal circumstances, we might not be happy about this work-study program, but at the time it did work. Now some of these people that you refer to as a Harvard clique looked down their noses at it. Why should the college be getting in the "trash" that would come this way? But they knew perfectly well that under the circumstances of the war we were not free to make our choices about these things. We had to do something. They went along with it, and it worked out all right. Then after that we developed a much more substantial work-study program in which boys worked at the Kings' Arms and did their studies at the college; in other words we found employment for students. I would say that this has been a constructive move at the time, and it has had its continuation and development.

Williams: I think perhaps we should call it quits for today.

February 19, 1976 Session 2

Williams: Now Dr. Moss, when we ended last time we had begun talking about the government department, and you expressed a desire to talk a little bit more about teaching in the government department during these years.

Moss: Well, when I first came the department was very small: Ernest Pate, Lionel Laing, and myself. We had no such thing as a secretary or a telephone. The department head's office was bare except for a desk and a chair, certainly no kinds of administrative services and nothing in the way of a departmental library. This was all minimum. During the years all these needs were satisfied by additions: a secretary at first, then the telephone service (the first year I paid for it myself, I think), finally filing cases and typewriters. But all of this came slowly through the years.

From the standpoint of instruction I did not know what courses I would be teaching when I came. The decision was made very late in the summer and I went to England immediately after I saw Mr. Bryan, so there was no chance to do any planning for that first year. So I found that Ernest Pate, who was the senior of the two men here in Williamsburg, chose public administration and local government for his area to teach. I chose the other courses not so much because they were what I wanted as because they had to be taught. I may say that over the years I found

myself often in that situation: that something had to be taught. The head of the department of government was responsible to see this was done and others might not have the same notion (that it had to be taught). And so I often found myself teaching courses just as a service. That did not fit the point of view which I accepted for the department in general, which was that it was more important to have good people teaching what they wanted to teach and were enthusiastic about than it was to teach particular courses. The whole time that I was head of the department I followed the policy of trying to get people who were good at teaching and who were scholars, and then find out what it was they wanted to teach. Now sometimes I ran into trouble on this because very often a man would come expressing enthusiasm for what I had suggested that might be taught, and after he arrived I found that he wasn't nearly so much interested in this but in something else. So we had some complications through the years, but generally speaking we followed this. (I might say that I was led to this point of view by Lindsey Rogers at Columbia, and I think I would have accepted it anyhow, but I did feel that his views were important. He was a good person.)

When I first came, Mr. Bryan had the feeling that we ought to teach something about dictatorships and democracy, but I think that his view on this was a rather naive one.

It didn't fit a conventional political science point of view. In other words democracies and dictatorships were at opposite poles, and you must choose one or the other, Bryan felt. I felt that a political science point of view would try to discover what these things were and the extent to which dictatorship might be better than a democracy or the other way about. I felt these lines were not as clear as he did. But we began to make adjustments to the war situation. It was first a shifting to international relations, and then we came more to a military point of view. As the war progressed this is what the students were keenly interested in, and this was what was important to the country. This was the area in which some very interesting ideas were developing that had not been used before, and so we moved into that. But as the war came to an end and the veterans returned we found that there was a marked interest in political philosophy. And in the academic profession there was also a shift in the direction of political philosophy. And so we had a period in the '50s (which incidentally coincided with these crises at the college) where there was a keen interest in political philosophy and you might say a broad view of public affairs and also higher education.

So the philosophical issues in the nature of higher were found both in the crises at the college and in this interest that was felt.

Williams:** (# 3) What, if any, effect did the McCarthy era have on the government department, other than the question about the texts that

**(Question Number three not included in original interview but added later)

you discussed?

Moss:** (#3) While the McCarthy era may have influenced the focus and language of repression and there may have been some intensification of the repression, that era does not stand out in my mind apart from the general pressure we felt about discussing questions which would be critical of established interests.

Shortly after my arrival in 1937 the plans for the government department were discussed in a committee, and when I said that I expected us to discuss politics realistically Charlie Duke hit the ceiling and said William and Mary was not the place to talk about corruption. What I had said did not warrant such an outbreak. I had pointed out that the Wisconsin report on education in Virginia had said that Virginia students were given an unrealistic view of the world. Later A. G. Taylor told me that some of my views were viewed critically and pointed out that the college had to look to the state political organization for its welfare.

Mr. Bryan asked me to begin to take some part in state affairs. I told him this involved difficulties, particularly since Governor Price was at odds with Senator Byrd. I wrote to Governor Price enclosing an article of mine on New York civil service, and as a result I was appointed to a committee of the Governor's Advisory Legislative Council, chaired by Francis Pickens Miller. It was the committee on state personnel and retirement and produced the Personnel Act and the Retirement System Act. I was chairman of the drafting committee on personnel. This association with Miller and my support of

him in the Democratic primary for Governor labelled me a "radical" though the personnel act was a "conservative" document and passed the legislature with organization support.

Against this background the repression during the McCarthy era was simply more of the same. I had concluded that this kind of thing was inevitable and I could survive it if I would give up hope for any political preferment. Of course, after my oppoisition to Chandler and my participation in faculty affairs the label "radical" was inescapable.**

In the department of government you might say that we went overboard on some of this. I became very much interested in French existentialist thought, and the students were interested. We also were interested in the relations between contemporary literature and political ideas, for example, with Ignacio Silone. We had very lively discussions about contemporary literature, which was being neglected, you might say, in some of the literature departments. For example, our students said that Glenwood Clark, who taught American literature, wasn't interested in anything since Mark Twain. And this is probably an exaggeration, but I can see that he might have had an antipathy to Thomas Wolfe and Faulkner and Hemingway, or at any rate not have been very much interested. And the students said, "What are the poli-

** Conclusion of answer to question #3 of additional interview questions.

tical ideas that are implicit in Faulkner, for example." And so we found ourselves dealing a great deal with contemporary literature; this was popular with the students who thought they weren't getting this somewhere else. Also we had two people in the department who were exciting and excited about political philosophy. One was Morten J. Frisch, who was a disciple (though I don't think he had ever studied with him) of Leo Strauss and who enjoyed a very close textual analysis of the important philosophical writings. This was the kind of thing that Strauss did, and he did this well. Elizabeth McClure had worked with some good people in England at Cambridge, particularly Oakeshott, and she had a keen mind, and this was very exciting to the students. So we had, you might say, a very intensive development of political philosophy at that time. At the same time professor Chou in foreign affairs was a very good lecturer and very much excited about the issues of the Far East. So I would say that this was really, to me, as I look back on it, the happiest time in the department when we were doing this particular kind of thing.

Then the profession moved on to another type of interest -- in quantitative research. There was a rather nasty argument between the people interested in political philsophy and the people interested in the quantitative approach. My own feeling was that this was a very wrong kind of battle going on, that it wasn't proper for the academic profession to do this. I thought the people doing this with the greatest arrogance were the quantitative people or the theory people; the disci-

ples of Leo Strauss were also sometimes ...

I had already in the past had an interest in this, and so I felt that I had been through the wringer and had explored this quantitative material as much as I wanted to from my standpoint. I didn't see why they were getting so excited about it. You might say that in those years the department had neglected the quantitative material.

Williams: This was in the '50s?

Moss: As you go from the '50s into the '60s. You might say that we were neglecting it. I would have been willing to do more of it if it wouldn't have created a crisis or a conflict. I didn't want the department all torn to pieces on this issue, because there were some departments that had gone overboard on it. They had ceased to be political scientists as I saw it.

Now these issues, I think, began to give way to some other issues within the department as we approached the mid-60s and the time of my resignation. These were issues that go back to the administrative politics. The new president, Paschall, very much wanted us to go into graduate work in government. And there were some good reasons for this, mainly that the Commonwealth of Virginia would pay professors more when they were doing graduate work than they would when they were doing undergraduate work, so it was sort of imperative that we move on with the graduate work if we wanted to be paid at the level that we wanted. Then also the view was that an institution with graduate

work was a quality institution. When I first came to the college I had felt that research could go on in an undergraduate institution and be pretty good.

Williams:** In what ways do undergraduate teaching and research conflict?

Moss:** My original assumption that research and undergraduate teaching might be compatible had resulted from acquaintance with the most favorable situations.

In most institutions, including William and Mary, the resources and the atmosphere are not conducive to research scholarship and writing. The library resources are inadequate, the teaching load is heavy both as to numbers of students and classes and as to the variety of fields for which the professor is responsible. The heterogeneity of the student body in terms of preparation and ability make the teaching task very heavy so that there is little energy, imagination, and time left for the research. It is not only that these burdens are heavy but the professional leadership in the institution as a whole is lacking, administrative and promotional goals always appear in the forefront and concern with scholarship is capsulated and appears as an afterthought. The daily routine is focused upon administrative problems.

In order to reach the average student the professor must reach down to the vocabulary of the student and stay within the range of the student's understanding or go only a little way beyond it. Most students become exasperated with explora-

(** Question number four not included in original interview and Dr. Moss' subsequent response)

tions of the uncertainties. A professor's scholarship may be ruined by his inter relations with students just as a professional tennis player may ruin his game by playing with novices.

Since a professor is a scholar who also teaches it is part of his task to meet these situations and many do. And over the years conditions at William and Mary have become more advantageous-- sometimes in one way, sometimes in another. But, on the whole William and Mary has had to operate on very narrow margins. Faculty writing consists chiefly of book reviews, short articles of a "manageable" character, or text books. Even "gifted" teachers, however popular they may have been with students, are by some standards judged "flawed".

The difficulty was exhibited with the "Faculty Lecture Series". The first year there were a few lectures on a plane to interest thoughtful scholars. The second year there was a decline. By the third year (if the series lasted that long) men made fools of themselves. We have had good lectures from some faculty people when they stayed within the range of their narrow interests. But when called upon to make their scholarship relevant to a wider audience they failed. Of course there have been memorable occasions of sucess.

William and Mary stands above the average in the country but falls short of its aspirations. It is doubtful whether the Commonwealth of Virginia will ever afford the margin of resources and provide the atmosphere of leadership needed to match those aspirations.**