

But it began to be clear that undergraduate teaching and research didn't go very well together. This was a disappointment. But it looked as though we had some choices to make. And I insisted that if we went into graduate work we should do it cautiously, with the resources in hand and biting off no more than we could chew. The other members of the department, I think were more eager to move on to full-fledged graduate work. Then we also had some conflicts in the department over the use of a textbook by Morgenthau, whom Chou felt was no longer the leading theoretician of international relations. On the other hand, Frisch felt that Morgenthau had made such a great contribution from the philosophical side that we ought to use Morgenthau. So these issues began to accumulate. I know that I had been department head far too long anyhow. Although there were some advantages of continuity in the headship, the condition of the department changed over the years, so it was almost a new department, yet I thought that one man shouldn't stay in as long as I was staying in. And I think it was 1966 when I resigned. I think this was agreeable to the administration as well as to me and probably agreeable to the department just as well. I think it's a part of the history of the department that at that time such conflicts were developing in the department.

Williams: You had said that a goodly number of the items about teaching in the government department were contained in the government department reports. Are they filed here?

Moss: There was a set of them in the department of government. And

whether they're there, I don't know. And of course they were reports made to the dean of the college. Now I'm not sure that the dean of the college kept files of departmental reports for maybe twenty departments. And every year this would have become an enormous volume. So I don't know what has become of those. I did keep copies.

Williams: You had been talking earlier about the government department from the teacher's standpoint. The students at William and Mary -- have you found them to be responsive over the years to national trends? I'm thinking specifically of such items as the civil rights or the protest movement of the late '60s, though there were issues earlier, perhaps not as sharp.

Moss: I would say that in the whole time that I have been here I've never known students not to be interested in politics, or at least there have always been a sufficient number so that the department of government flourished in terms of student enrollment. And a great many students said they didn't know if they were particularly interested in the technical side of political science but that they wanted to be taking courses which have some relevance to what was going on in the world, and they thought they found this in political science. Our enrollment was always at a fairly high level. And at one time it was conspicuous in Virginia for being perhaps -- Spicer made a report to the Virginia Social Science Association in which he said, in effect, that ^{at} William and Mary a larger percentage of students took the courses in government and concentrated in government

than at any other institution in Virginia. Whether that broad claim is valid or not, the enrollment in government was always pretty good, and we never had any swing away from government. Sometimes there was competition from some other department that was doing something very interesting. We would have some of those tides, but government stayed high.

Williams: Was there a big increase in respect to the veterans who came back after the war? Was there an increase in enrollment in government courses at that time?

Moss: I would say that this should be checked against the enrollment figures. My belief is that the veterans as a group did not have a significantly larger or greater interest in government than the other students. The veterans were very serious students. They were behind in their careers because of the time taken out. They were a little more mature; they wanted to get this thing done. Now at the same time the intensity of the war experience had led them to feel an emotional intensity about a great many problems. Some of these meant problems students. But in many other cases they felt, "Well this is serious business. We've got to ignore that; this has got to be done."

Williams: You haven't found William and Mary to be a backwater in politics?

Moss: No, this has not been true. Now of course, it may have been that the students who didn't come into government had this

characteristic. But if you take, for example, Hugh Haynie, the cartoonist -- a superb cartoonist, and one of the best, I think. He was a student here. I don't think he took any courses in government. He was very much of a fine arts major. At the same time he was interested. No, I would say that William and Mary was never a place where students lacked an interest, and of course, during the college crises they were very much interested.

Williams: William and Mary students have often been criticized as being conservative, perhaps because of their backgrounds. Have you found this true?

Moss: Well, perhaps I should talk about that a little bit. The backgrounds are conservative in the sense that these students have come from a part of the population that has recently gained status, and they want to secure that status. A good many are the sons and daughters of civil servants in Washington, for example. They have a kind of conservatism that is unwilling to espouse causes that you might call revolutionary. Now we have never had a group of students here (any significant group) who were bent on revolution. What we have had in the recent years, along with other institutions, where I think students were motivated primarily by their anxieties about the war and their personal positions in relation to the war in Vietnam -- they were conservative in that sense.

Now there was one thing that happened which I confess I'm still puzzled about, and I must say I was shocked about. During the same period in the '50s (I guess it was the '50s, yes, the period went up to the election of Kennedy as president) there was a group of students at the college that called themselves conservatives, and who were belligerent about this. I would say they were very much like the Nixon-type people. I had the feeling they were the type of students who we wouldn't in the past have ever expected to come to William and Mary. They were bullheaded in the extreme; they didn't think they were in the classroom to learn anything from the professor, but rather to educate the professor in the principles of conservatism. Now these were exactly the same kind of students that I had had in New York University who were Communists. They were bullheaded, thought they were there to instruct the professor, and could persuade other students to become conservatives. It wasn't possible to educate them. You would have had to use a baseball bat to get their attention to a really serious problem. Any problem that came up was immediately transformed into an issue over conservatism. We later on had some of the same things with the students who were in philosophy as logical positivists. They didn't want to begin any discussion until they had solved all the problems of definition. But this is an interminable thing, so that if you went along with them, you would end the course still discussing problems of definition. Well, I must

confess that I did not really understand how to deal with these people, either in the form of logical positivists or in the form of proselytizing conservatives among the students. To me this wasn't scholarship; it was shocking. You had to have them in the classroom, but what could you do with them?

Williams: How large a following did this group have?

Moss: It wasn't very large. I couldn't give you specific numbers, but my contacts were with a group of only about a dozen, and they were of different degrees. There was one man -- I've forgotten his name -- but he could write fairly well, and he was determined to write as a conservative and to swing the world to his conservatism. I could never get anywhere with him at all, and yet I felt that if he could write, if he was interested, than there ought to be something I could do about this. Later on he went into some of the organization work among the conservative Republicans. I remember the day after the Kennedy election I saw him on the street, and I said, "Well, Irish eyes are smiling," and he straightened up, and he said, "American Eyes." Well, that is a sample.

Now I do think that a larger and larger number of students were inclined to accept that conservative point of view, so that when Nixon ran in '68 you had, I think, perhaps the majority of the student body which was in favor of Nixon. I tried very hard to build up some support for Humphrey. And we had a rather interesting thing (maybe I should tell this because it's a little light, a little clue). Nixon came here to put on a

particular television show that he wanted as a part of his campaign material. He wanted to use the Wren Building and to have a group of students ask him questions, and then all this would be televised and go out over the country as the College of William and Mary being the host to Nixon. I thought that this was very wrong, that the college had no business allowing itself to be used this way, but I think the publicity people (I don't know) maybe thought that, "Well, how do you get on national television unless you are on the coattails of the presidential candidate? Sure, take this." I thought it was outrageous. Then the young Republicans were going to have a sort of welcoming rally in front of the Wren Building, and the administration had said that there were to be no student protests or activities of this sort in front of the Wren Building, but apparently the Young Republicans were going to be allowed to do this. Then on top of that Nixon brought his own students here. He didn't call on William and Mary students to take part in this discussion, but he had a team of students that were part of his organization that would be there looking like William and Mary students in the Great Hall. And our students were utterly indignant; even the Nixon supporters were indignant about that. So we put on a rally for Humphrey in which we carried banners and all the rest of it there in front of the Wren Building. Nixon was so intimidated that he abandoned his plans for traveling all over the town in the coach. His television people were afraid that he would get some bad publicity

on this. And they eventually dropped all that they had done, and I was told that it cost them \$250,000 (this may not be true). Our students who had taken part in that felt very happy that they had delivered a body blow at their opponent. There weren't many campuses where you could have brought together Humphrey supporters in that election, but we did. Now I would say that this is characteristic of William and Mary students.

Williams:

I thought maybe we would move on to another one of the projects you have been very interested in -- that was the foreign exchange students -- and ask you how the exchange program began? You perhaps had a part in that.

Moss:

Well, before the war and without my having anything to do with it, the administration had made an arrangement with University College at Exeter (in England) for an American student exchange with an English student. I think probably that this originated with the people of Exeter because they had a number of things of this kind going. The war, however, interrupted that. Maybe one or two students came, but there was no great impact. When the time came to renew that, there was some discussion. I don't know quite how I got into it originally. I was interested in British politics and was interested in British education, and so on. I have been over there a good deal and would be happy to see something develop along this line, especially with British students or with French students. And during the war we

had been very much isolated from internal affairs in European countries. But this was one of my interests, and so I was anxious to get back into it. I think maybe we had had some initial action regarding the Exeter business being restored, then in 1947 I had an opportunity to go over to look into summer schools in Europe in connection with an organization (I've forgotten the name of it -- I thought it was a fly-by-night organization) -- but at any rate it paid about half my expenses. I could pay some and the college put me on the summer school roll while I was going across, so I got my summer school salary and could manage it. And among other things we went to Exeter to see about what could be done there. I gave a talk at Exeter, spent several days, and helped in the selection of an Exeter student to come to the United States, at least I met her. And my plan had been to establish a William and Mary summer school very much like what the law school has done now, and possibly have another one at Aix-Marseilles in France, but the thing fell through. One trouble was that there weren't enough students who had enough money to go at that time. It was just the first beginnings. At any rate, it got started, and we had this Exeter student who, you might say, sort of made an impact on the community because she was very much of a character. A lot of people knew her or knew about her. A less colorful person wouldn't have made that impact. So we followed this with several other Exeter students, but nothing had come of this business of a summer school abroad for William and Mary students. And

then the Institute of International Education -- oh by the way, the Fulbright business was developing at this time, and since I was active in this I was made Fulbright advisor, and I was fortunate in getting some appointments for William and Mary students. It was going rather well. And I may say that in 1950-'51 I went over as the Fulbright professor at Manchester, myself. I say this went fairly well. Then in 1952 the Institute of International Education wanted to have a summer school session for incoming foreign students, particularly to deal with their English, but also to introduce them to the American community. Why not have a summer school session to give them an intensive introduction? And I think because of Williamsburg and the interest of Colonial Williamsburg in the project they came here. I had charge of this during the summer, and the first summer it came off very well. We had our trials and tribulations, but still lots of things clicked the way they were supposed to click, and so we were quite happy with it. Particularly the foreign students were highly cooperative and appreciative of what was being done. They were good, and the staff was good, the conditions in the college were good, the interest in the community was good. Now this began a kind of deterioration that I think might have been expected. The first foreign students were very good; the next group were not quite as good. By 1955, when we had one, I think they had declined quite a bit. Then the college, after a first burst of enthusiasm, ^[with] the administration supporting us very well, I think that they felt that this is on its own feet, so let it go. So we couldn't get quite the dormitory that we wanted, and we didn't have the first con-

sideration we had the first year. And then the community had become accustomed to it, and some of the local people began to exploit this opportunity with foreign students. So by 1955 it had deteriorated a great deal. It wasn't that that was a bad year. In fact, we did one very good thing that year: we persuaded a man at Hampton Institute, who was a Negro member of the faculty there (Dean Hugh Gloster), to come up and do the teaching of English for the Japanese students. He was a great asset. (He had had experience teaching English to Japanese in Japan.) There were several other things that year that came off well. But still I think that from a historical standpoint it's interesting that something like this could get on its feet very nicely, and then in the process of being sort of integrated into the bad and the good in the local situation it lost some of its quality.

Now I should go on to say that as a part of the history, that after all I was head of the department of government and this interest in foreign students was occupying my time much more. I might have to make a choice. And so I told the dean that I thought that the foreign student business ought to be set up on a better basis and asked that something be done. He declined. I think there were a good many reasons: William and Mary just wasn't really committed to an idea of a large group of foreign students in an important program here. And I wasn't interested in doing it unless it was that. So that

settled that issue, and I resigned as foreign student advisor. Now it's being revived a bit, but I do not see that there is much prospect that William and Mary will develop an extensive foreign student program unless somebody comes in with a great deal of money to give for it.

Williams: How was this being funded in the '50s?

Moss: The federal government took care of the expenses. Now there were reports written on this which were turned in at least to the president of the college, I think probably to the dean as well. They described what went on.

Williams: And at the same time there were William and Mary students going to Europe?

Moss: Oh, well, now that's another point. This summer school business did not really tie in with our regular session program very much. Very few William and Mary students went abroad, except on the Exeter and the Fulbright business. However, after the queen came here (I've forgotten what year) and the administration and the college as a whole had a better association with the British counterparts, Dean Jones took an active part in this, and he established the relationship with the Draper's Company. I believe he had had some earlier contact, but he was very good at developing this at Exeter and at St. Andrews. I would say that he's responsible for this.

Williams: Moving on to another favorite topic of yours, I think, and that is faculty organization. I had said to you that I thought it was about the time that you came to William and Mary in 1937 that

the first set of faculty bylaws were written. What degree of faculty organization did you find when you came down to William and Mary?

Moss: William and Mary has a background of faculty organization which I think hasn't been adequately appreciated. In the first place, historically the faculty was the college. It was the faculty that, for example, owned the Botetourt statue. The faculty was set up in the charter; the college was described as a "president and six masters". The faculty was the college. Now of course, the nature of American development has been such that that almost medieval role of a collegial faculty disappeared. It disappeared even in the colony where members of faculty originally not allowed to marry did marry, and they were not allowed to take part in business, but you could not keep them out of business affairs. So it ceased to be a monastic institution, but there was a germ of that kind of thing. It was the appreciation of the faculty as a body, as a corporate body. I don't know much about the faculty in the period of the mid-nineteenth century. But during the regime of the first Chandler, I think it's very interesting that faculty meetings took place. There were faculty minutes. There was faculty initiative. It was an active faculty under Chandler. Now it may not have been as free a faculty as you wanted. It was cautious. Chandler tended to punish people -- I think he was kidding some of the time. He was a promoter, and if things weren't going the way

he wanted, he tried to push for something. But still, that faculty was an active faculty keeping minutes. You can go through the minutes over in the archives.

Now you also have the A.A.U.P. paralleling the faculty, but as a somewhat secret organization under J. A. C. Chandler. With that background and with a great deal of stirring in a new regime, there was an opportunity to write faculty bylaws and to clinch this business. And I think that a lot of the credit goes to Miller and perhaps Fowler and Mr. Bryan. They did a good job of saying, "yes, the faculty must have a constitution in the way of bylaws, and it must be an active, participating faculty." Now what was in the beginning, and over the years from 1937 through the Pomfret administration -- Pomfret believed in faculty organization. In fact he understood a little more how to make use of it. And I would say between 1937 and 1951 that you had good, sound faculty organization -- some amendments to the bylaws perhaps, although I don't remember what they were. There was an appreciation of parliamentary procedure. There was a sense of responsibility among the faculty members. I would say that our main problem was the tension between the education/extension atmosphere and the purist liberal arts atmosphere, so that the liberal arts faculty outvoted any of these schools, and they built up a feeling that nothing that they brought forward would ever be approved without contention. They would not be able to win.

The feeling on the part of these schools was that it was hopeless. Anything they brought forward would be disapproved. While there were some departments, like home economics, that hung on through the years, still a predominately liberal arts faculty just wasn't going to go along with these people. And this had something to do with later developments, especially under the Chandler regime.

Pomfret had introduced divisional organization, four divisions for the college: the sciences, the liberal arts, the humanities, and the social sciences, and education. And with a chairman for each of these groups. Now under Umbeck (and I'm not sure how this first started), these chairmen were brought together as an advisory group. I think I should give you an example of their work because I think you may not find it in the minutes anywhere. The department of philosophy and psychology joined these two subjects. And in the atmosphere of the 1920s or '30s this might have been a plausible, reasonable arrangement, but the fields of psychology and philosophy were so different in the later 1930s that it was an absurd kind of business. And any real development of psychology depended on its getting out from the department of philosophy. So a man named Foltin was brought here. He was a Czechoslovakian refugee who had a good background from a European standpoint. He was trained broadly, but from the standpoint of psychology and the social sciences this European training was a very superficial

and naive thing. For example, there was a heavy emphasis on psychoanalysis in Foltin's point of view, and the feeling of Dick Henneman in psychology and perhaps of Lambert (though I don't know whether he had much to say about it) was that this just wasn't psychology. This man Foltin had no business being the head of the department of psychology because he wasn't a psychologist. You might call him a sociologist (but he was a charming fellow, and we all liked him very much). So a movement got underway to change this. And the American Psychological Association became involved. If I remember correctly, a young woman whom I think was employed in the psychology department protested to the ^{American} Psychological Association. I'm not sure, but this is what I heard. At any rate they had some hand in it. And it was clear that Foltin had to go as head of the department. Now Umbeck as dean had the responsibility of doing this. So he turned to these four chairmen of divisions, and he said, "Now here's the problem, and I want your advice on it." And we gave him the advice, and the advice was that Foltin did have to go. Foltin, I think, took the position that if he couldn't be head of the department of psychology, he would leave the college. And he did leave the college. Well, the dean wanted the members of this committee to sign a statement that this change should be made. And I objected that it was the responsibility of the dean to make the decision, that it was our responsibility to give him advice and that he could refer to it. He could say that he had acted on the advice, but it was not up to

us to take the responsibility off his shoulders by signing a statement. Some members of the committee may have signed this statement. I know I did not, and I don't think that it ever actually had any official status as a statement.

Well, now, this had begun with Sharvy Umbeck. Sharvy left to take a ^[college] presidency, and Nelson Marshall became the dean. Now Nelson Marshall also used this committee in the same way for advice. And before I left in 1950 -- I think it was in the end of the session of 1949-50 -- he said that he had this problem of the athletic crisis. I think that he told us that there was an issue of grades having been altered in the case of entering students. He didn't tell us everything about it. What he said was, "This looks to be a coming crisis, and something has got to be done. I want your advice." And we, I think, gave him advice that essentially was to the effect that athletics had gotten out of hand. Now I left for England at the beginning of the quarter in September or in early October 1950, so I didn't see any of the further development of that, but I make the point now that there was such an active advisory committee from the faculty under Nelson Marshall that it had a role and that was important.

[#]Alright, now the next change came in connection with the selection of the new president, and I may say in connection with this crisis, too. I think that Nelson Marshall was in continuous contact with this committee, but I wasn't here at

that time. I won't go ahead into some of the story of the presidential crisis except to say this: that one of the incidents was the selection of a group of faculty members by the then-superintendent of buildings and grounds, Bemiss, to go up to Richmond and talk with Shewmake, who was the rector. Bemiss was a friend of Shewmake's, and Shewmake, I'm told, had asked him to get together some faculty members who could come up and consult with the board. Well, the faculty was outraged. Does the rector select the faculty members? Does he even delegate it to a man who is not an academic, but who was a business manager? This is outrageous! When we come to such a thing as choosing a college president the faculty ought to be the one to decide who its representatives will be. Therefore, while there was some evolution in this, the faculty did select a group to confer with the board. Now as soon as that was out of the way in November, the faculty turned to this issue and said, "Now look here, we can't have a situation where an ad hoc group chosen by somebody else speaks for the faculty. We've got to have our own representative," and therefore, they set up the faculty advisory council, composed of four heads of divisions and I think three other faculty members elected. The heads of divisions too were elected, at that time. I think. So it was an elected faculty group. I think their feeling also was that this would be a stabilizing element. After all, here was this new man who had never been president of the college. If the

faculty tried to act through the whole faculty every time that it acted, it couldn't be very effective. The thing to do was to have this executive committee of the faculty that would work with the new president. And I was on that at that time, and I think I was the chairman of it. We invited the president to dinner down at the lodge. We had a private dining room, and we sat down there for a better part of an evening talking about the college and trying to become acquainted with each other. It was an agreeable evening in which we could have said progress had been made. But actually I don't think that we got on the same wave length with the new president.

At any rate we were off to a start with this kind of a faculty organization and I think that it worked rather well. I think we got along. What it did was to make the faculty more effective than it might have been otherwise. There was one feature of it which may not have been clear at the beginning, but which was certainly a part of the picture: that the dean might be the chairman of this council, but that the elected faculty member would be the vice-chairman and that the vice-chairman would ordinarily be the effective chairman. In other words the dean was a member of all the committees automatically. But the feeling was that we would want a faculty member to be the person who was effective as chairman. Whether it was during this term of service or the next one, I don't remember, but I did act as the effective chairman with the title of vice-chairman. In other words I sometimes called meetings without

the dean. In fact I may have sometimes gone to the dean and said, "Now I think that we ought to have a meeting; I know you don't want it, but the members of the committee think there should be a meeting, so we're going to have one." I don't remember that happening, but that was the kind of thing that would have fitted that atmosphere. Now a little later on, there came another time when they wanted a reorganization. I think Chandler had initiated this. There was an effort to exclude department chairmen from the membership of this committee. And of course this might be an attractive thing to a good many faculty people, but I thought it would be a disaster, and at least as far as I was involved personally, why, I wasn't going to accept exclusion from the committee. This was a role I had been playing and intended to play. I would have resigned as head of the department. But this proposed change was defeated on the floor of the faculty. I think that some rather naive faculty members had accepted the Chandler version of this. Another thing: Chandler was not happy because this wasn't under his control. (This is still talking not about Chandler, but about faculty organization.) He very much wanted, for example, that George Oliver, who was head of the department of education, should be selected for this committee, and a group of faculty members proposed George Oliver's name. We all liked him, but George Oliver has been a faculty member who supported the athletic department in the crisis of '51, and he was head of the department of edu-

cation. And we declined to elect him. I don't remember that after that there was any effort to control the committee, any direct effort; there may have been.

The committee at that time did advise the president on the choice of the dean. The committee went to the president and recommended that Marsh be the dean. Later on when Mel Jones became dean -- I think it was inevitable, that he was an obvious person, the only one who could be on both the president's list and the faculty list -- but the faculty affairs committee did say this is what ought to be done. And when Fowler was chosen, the faculty affairs committee recommended Fowler among others so that it had a role now. It also under Pomfret, I think, had a choice of Baldwin as head of the biology department. But what I'm saying is that it did have an effective role in making these decisions. I think maybe we could say that some of these decisions would have been made the same way, anyhow. But it was done with the advice of the faculty. Now what this has meant is that these persons selected were assured of a reasonable measure of faculty support. Had one of them been chosen without this step being taken, he would have been fair game for some faculty members who opposed him and would have built up opposition. The dean was not purely the president's man, even though we knew that neither Marsh nor Jones was persona non grata to the president. Both were acceptable to him.

Another thing to say about faculty organization at this time was that the faculty had a high sense of the importance of parliamentary procedure. Faculty meetings were conducted with dignity and with always a high regard for the rules of order. Sometimes they didn't always really know what the rules were, but they abided by the rules which were being applied. For example, Robert's Rules of Order did not permit the tabling of a motion to end debate by a majority vote. It required more than a majority vote, and yet I think that no member of the faculty had read that rule, and so time and time again matters were tabled on a mere majority. Simply by changing the tabling motion a little bit they could have had the same effect of a mere majority. I just want to point out that it wasn't just the people reading the rules and applying them. It was a sense of, "Let's do this in the proper, dignified way." When Chandler first came, on one occasion he found that parliamentary procedure was being applied, so he didn't quite know what was going on, and it didn't fit to what he wanted to do. So he exclaimed, "Let's forget all these folkways and get something done!" Well, for him to stigmatize the faculty's dignity and the rules as mere folkways just turned them off like that. And so after that he was pinned to the rules. They didn't exactly throw the book at him, as they say in the Navy, but what they did was to see that our following the rules of order was a means of stabilizing a situation, which the president often charged with emotion. I think that was important. This has been very much of a faculty

tradition at William and Mary. I would say that William and Mary probably had one of the most effective faculty organization in the country, and I'm sure that this was true as far as the state of Virginia was concerned. While there were things about the University of Virginia's faculty organization that were pretty good, I think we had a truer faculty organization than they did.

Williams: Now the 1964 self-study charged that under Chandler the faculty organization had disintegrated. Would you rebut that, then?

Moss: No, in this sense: Ignacio Siloni says that you can be free in a dictatorship if you rebel. The president's actions were, I think, ones disruptive of the faculty organization. We were constantly thrown into difficulties by his relation to faculty organization. But what this did was to stir the faculty to a greater insistence upon the organization. (I think the language you quoted was what I wrote; I wrote that part of it. I say I wrote it, ^{it} it went through the committees, you know, and so on, but I was the one who drafted the original.)

Williams: While you were on this faculty advisory council, did you find that the admiral accepted it for its function?

Moss: To begin with, he certainly did, I say accept it -- yes, for example, when we went to him to propose Marsh as dean, there was no question. "Yes, gentlemen, sit down. I'm very much interested in your proposal." I don't think he said, "Well, now, don't just give me one name. Give me three or something," which might have been a higher degree of cooperation. He accepted it. He certainly didn't do anything to destroy it. Now

I do believe at one time he came into some of the meetings; he sat with us. He may have done this a good deal. I remember one issue coming up in which he was delighted with the position that I took. A letter had come from the people at Mary Washington urging that faculties should create an organization which would help the cause of higher education in the legislature. And on that occasion I said, "No, I don't think that we should do it this way," and I said something about our being more interested at the moment in William and Mary's own situation and so on than in general organization for higher education. This was in a way a selfish position: Let's get our own status settled before we get involved in these joint things. This was a ground on which he and I could agree, and he quickly said, "Yes." But he was in the meetings, at least some of the time. Now later on I think that he wanted to change it (the council) or destroy it or something; he wasn't comfortable with it. I don't recall very well the steps taken: this proposal of George Oliver for a member, the proposal of reorganization that would exclude department heads, and some other things of that sort took place. I would say that on the whole it failed and therefore wasn't remembered. I think there was a tendency to have a decline in the performance of the council with the idea that we ought to spread these things around the faculty, and there was a tendency sometimes to choose men who were not very effective. You had to give the sciences somebody, and who could you dig up in the sciences who could play the political role? They thought of the man that they liked well rather than the man who

might be very effective or who might challenge the administration. So there were ways in which it became less effective. But then later, that is to say during the later Paschall years, it became very effective once again, especially after Fowler became dean of the faculty. [#] And maybe I should say something there: all along, all through the years, I think that Fowler has been the person who did a great deal to make the faculty more effective. Some people thought of him as being dictatorial, but what he was saying was, "This faculty is going to fight effectively and not fool around. Come on, take the vote", or something like that. And sometimes he would ridicule some of the nonsense that does go on in a faculty these days: "Come on, do this." Well, I think it was in this spirit that he played a larger role as dean in the faculty affairs committee. He was a chairman, and he was the effective chairman, so the vice-chairman might be the one to report to the faculty but not the one to call the meeting of the committee. But you had some people on there who during the Fowler period were effective. And I should mention another thing about this faculty affairs committee or council, (whatever you call it): in the beginning we had the very definite understanding that our concerns had to do with the whole college -- everything about the college that the faculty could possibly be concerned about -- and at the same time that we would not establish ourselves as a functioning committee to investigate a particular problem. In other words

we would forfeit our right to be interested in everything if we consumed our time with one of the problems. I think a mistake was made in dealing with some of the later athletic developments. This was during the Paschall period, I believe. And with Fowler's active role in this, the faculty council itself undertook to investigate the athletic situation. I think this was a great mistake; I think I said so at the time or referring to it later. But there has been a tendency for these people on the council to say, "Now this is wrong. Let's look into it." And before they know it they're consumed with meetings on a particular problem and other problems go by the board. I say this hoping that the future generation will take this into account. As a matter of fact I would say that there ought to be a history of faculty organization of William and Mary. It would be a reference point, because with a change in the personnel a great deal of what was learned in the process was forgotten. The present faculty council ought to go back and see what the history of the faculty council had been.

Williams: Now right about (I think I have down in my notes 1959) what was called the faculty advisory council was abolished. Did the faculty affairs committee begin immediately or was it just a continuation or ...

Moss: There has never been a time, as far as I can recall, since Sharvy Umbeck set up the divisional group as an advisory body that there hasn't been a faculty affairs committee of some kind. Now you do have this, and I think this is important to

include (I don't know whether it was Paschall or Chandler who was responsible): the setting up of the schools as independent schools with faculties of their own, pulling them out of the general faculty, and having an arts and sciences faculty separately immediately created a void, so that while the faculty affairs committee continued to be such a committee for the liberal arts faculty it was not technically one for the whole college. But because this is the largest faculty -- overwhelmingly -- its faculty affairs committee very often acted as though it were the committee for the whole college, and I think properly. I think that it was all right that they did except that it wasn't technically according to Hoyle. Now I think that this change and the failure of Graves ever to call a general faculty meeting of the whole faculty has been unfortunate from the standpoint of faculty organization. Now people are working on it and trying to develop a faculty senate and something of this kind. And I took part in some of this discussion, but the question of representation makes this very, very difficult. And I don't know how they'll come out of it.

Williams: Do you think that the faculty with the different schools has become fragmented?

Moss: Yes, not only has it become fragmented at the university level with the separate schools, but the faculty has become fragmented even within the arts and sciences because the rapid development of the sciences as a part of the three fold division and you might say -- I'm going to say exaggerated (I hesitate to

use this) -- but I would say that under the impact of Sputnik and the new physics and so on, that the sciences grew beyond their due proportion in the college and that they therefore had an impact on faculty organization. The people in the sciences, I think, are to a lesser degree and in smaller numbers politically shrewd and sophisticated. Some of them have been very much so, and in some kinds of politics they have been very sophisticated. But I think that they have had less appreciation of this general problem of faculty organization and they, having been engaged in promotion were eager to move forward, you see, in particular directions. You might say they were impatient of those aspects of the faculty organization that didn't seem to work in their way. During part of the time they were cozy with Chandler. I don't mean that some of the present leaders of the sciences were, but the man who was put in charge of physics originally was a man who had been chosen by Chandler and most people wondered how in the world he could ever be the head of the department of physics. He had come from Madison College, which was one of the minor colleges and certainly didn't have a distinguished department of physics. He came here rather quickly because Mooney had resigned. He lent himself to the development of the department in the direction which was called for by the president and perhaps also called for by the post-Sputnik movement. So maybe he performed a very useful function here, but he didn't have the confidence of people who had been active in the faculty organization.

Remember that there has been an increase in the size of the faculty, which has made a difference. This has made it quite difficult to effectively carry on faculty organization. The faculty was not quick enough to adapt itself to this. One of the adaptations made was that the quorum required was rather small so that those people who were really interested in faculty affairs constituted a kind of faculty senate. And then when there was an acute issue, why there would be a tremendous influx of the people who hadn't been to a faculty meeting for a couple of years. Now this is the way the British parliament operates. I'm not too critical of it; I think that maybe it was a fairly good arrangement, but it did have the fault that the faculty affairs were left more and more to a very small group. Now President Graves I think mistakenly insisted on a high level for a quorum, so that then they had faculty meetings when they couldn't get quorum. Previously it had been a very small number -- I forget what the quorum was, maybe thirty or fifty in a faculty of three hundred and something. But then they insisted that it be something like a majority, you see.

Williams: Has the local A.A.U.P. had any kind of role to play in faculty cohesiveness?

Moss: Oh yes, it has had a very important role. One institutional arrangement I should mention is that for many years the A.A.U.P. had its regular monthly meeting the night before the regular monthly meeting of the faculty, so that if something was coming up in the faculty meeting it could be discussed in the A.A.U.P.

meeting. Then here you had a group of faculty members who, having already exchanged views with each other, had a tendency to cooperate in the faculty meeting. I wouldn't rate this as being a caucus -- in other words it didn't make any binding decisions -- but it meant that many of the issues had been explored; that here were a handful of people (maybe twenty, not less than five or six) who knew each other's thinking. When they got up to speak on the floor of the faculty they knew what they were doing. Now that was an important thing.

A.A.U.P. has always been supportive of faculty organization, so that often some of the leadership came from the A.A.U.P. There were a few times that some of these people forgot that the A.A.U.P. wasn't the whole faculty, and they were reminded of this in the faculty meeting on a few occasions. It didn't happen very often. Most often the A.A.U.P. coincided with the most vocal and responsible group of the faculty leaders. Also, the national A.A.U.P. has been very much interested in faculty organization, and therefore the articles in the bulletin and talks from members of the national office have helped. There are things that were tried other places that didn't work; things we wanted to do we felt more confident about because they did work somewhere. I remember that Washington College up in Maryland appeared to us very similar to ourselves as having quite competently done some of the things that we wanted to do. The A.A.U.P. has played that role.

Williams: Has the organization over the years changed in any way? I get the idea from reading the minutes that it is a small group.

Moss: In the beginning -- you get this in the A.A.U.P. minutes, I think -- it was practically a secret organization with the president of the chapter expecting to be fired. I don't know whether that was exaggerated as a myth; I don't think it was, at least at the most critical time. On the other hand, I think that maybe this type of history was cherished somewhat and may have developed a little more mythical character. It had to be secret; they didn't allow women in the beginning (maybe because they talked too much or something). Now at the time that I came here it was an effective organization, with nice meetings that did have to do with serious things because Davis, who was head of the department of biology, had played a very important part, and I think people like Fowler and Miller were good A.A.U.P. people. But then A.A.U.P. in the local chapter and nationally has always fluctuated with crises. When a crisis occurs people flock into the A.A.U.P. and take an active part. When everything is going beautifully the A.A.U.P. chapter begins to decline, people don't come to meetings, things don't get taken care of, and sometimes when they have meetings they are trivial. I remember at one time that we were reduced to meetings at which a rather boring member of the faculty gave us a slide presentation of his vacation, which I thought was the limit. Over the years it has been maintained, with these fluctuations. Now for example, right now you would suppose over the Greene case that it would have been very active. Its executive committee was

active in⁴ regard to the Greene case. But they had a meeting at which the lobbyist for the A.A.U.P. was going to discuss what he would do at the legislature, and the president of the college and the business manager of the college and the vice-president for academic affairs all came to the meeting because this was important. We had seven members. Well, it was disgusting! I think it was just a case of where no one had said, "Well, we'd better make this a well-attended meeting." There isn't the necessity for activity that you have seen before. I think the Greene case might have stirred more activity, except that it was hard to know what to do, how to handle this. It didn't lend itself exactly to a faculty response. There was faculty anger at Senator Willey, and yet at the same time there was faculty feeling that there was something wrong with our own mechanism that this should ever have arrived. You don't want to unearth too many of these things; you might be more embarrassed than you would be otherwise.

Williams: Then if this is a small group it is because interest fluctuates, not because of any acceptance factor.

Moss: No, no, it's not been an acceptance question. We've had a membership that's been maintained pretty well, even in the face of increasing dues, but they just don't go to meetings sometimes.

Williams: I think you and perhaps the local chapter had something to do with setting up the state A.A.U.P.

Moss:

I told you a little while ago that the Mary Washington people had made an appeal to the William and Mary faculty to have some kind of state organization which would help higher education. At that time my feeling was, "Yes, not now, but we should have a state organization. It should not be just state institutions; it should be private institutions." At the same time over the country generally there was a tendency to develop state organizations of the A.A.U.P. as well as local chapters. I think this was inherent in the political situation. At first I felt that these state organizations were being primarily proposed as a criticism of the national office for what people thought was a lack of sufficient drive because there was some criticism of the man who had been the president for a long time. However, this soon developed a vitality that went beyond any criticism of the national office, so it was thought that we might do something of the sort here. Now I don't know who called our first meeting; it may have been the Mary Washington people. I may have given them some kind of signal that now we were ready for something, I don't know. But we did meet in Richmond as representatives from chapters.