

ERNEST W. GOODRICH

In the midst of the Great Depression, Ernest Goodrich of Surry decided that he could afford to attend nearby William and Mary. After graduation he earned his law degree at George Washington University and has served for many years as commonwealth's attorney for Surry County. From 1964 to 1972 he served on the Board of Visitors, of which he was rector from 1970 to 1972, and it is this period which receives the most attention in the interview, conducted in his law office in Surry. Mr. Goodrich read and approved the transcript.

## INDEX SHEET

Interviewee Ernest W. GoodrichDate of interview January 30, 1976Place Sunny, Va.Interviewer Emily WilliamsSession number 1Length of tape 98 mins.

## Contents:

## Approximate time:

as student at W&M during Great Depression - facilities, financial conditions, student strike, student employment	10 mins.
comparisons: J.A.C. Chandler → J.S. Bryan	5 mins.
comparison of students in 1930s and 1960s	5 mins.
postcollege work, jobs held, service on alumni board, interest in law school	10 mins.
1950s at W&M	2 mins.
as member of Board of Visitors (1964-1972) - and student issues	5 mins.
- character of board, importance of state support	5 mins.
- students (cont'd.)	10 mins.
- building program	3 mins.
- search for new president (1971)	12 mins.
- branch colleges	17 mins.
thoughts on position of rector, important issues, accessibility of board	8 mins.

Ernest W. Goodrich

January 26, 1976

Surry, Virginia

Williams: Now, Mr. Goodrich, you were class of '35, I found. Did you go to William and Mary continuously from '31 to '35? I know that some students were not able to go the complete four years. What effects of the depression did you observe upon the students? who were there when you were there?

Goodrich: I did <sup>[go from '31 to '35].</sup> Let me begin by saying this: when I started in the fall of 1931 there wasn't any money anywhere in this area. As I recall, I went over to see Dr. William Hodges, who was dean of men at that time, and talked to him, and he said I needed <sup>\$50</sup> ~~fifty~~ dollars to get started, that if I could get there and was willing to work, he'd see that I stayed <sup>and</sup> there, <sup>and</sup> got my degree. I was always very grateful to Dr. Hodges for his help. So I started at William and Mary with \$50, and that's all I had. And there were many others in the same position I was in, probably not very many any worse off, but many just as bad off and very few that were independent financially.

I lived the first year in what was old Taliaferro Hall, which <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ later changed into the fine arts building and then torn down. I paid \$12.50 a semester for my room -- two of us were in a room <sup>which</sup> ~~that~~ was about eight feet wide and twelve feet long. We had a double-decker bed and two desks and two chairs and a basin in the corner. The bathroom was in the basement. We were on the third floor, so we had to <sup>go to</sup> the basement

to take a bath. (I believe we had a toilet <sup>third</sup> on that floor, but the showers were in the basement.) I was -- as many boys were <sup>working</sup> while we were going to school. I started out working in the dining room as a waiter. I worked there my first year, and we got our meals for waiting on the tables. In addition to that many of us did things outside. I used to work <sup>for</sup> in Dr. Davis, who was the head of the biology department; I worked in his garden. I worked in the garden of Dr. Fisher, who was head of the French department. His wife had a lot of iris <sup>es</sup> and I <sup>#</sup> worked in their garden for 20¢ an hour. I <sup>as</sup> also did other types of work, and I said many other boys were doing the same thing. <sup>of</sup> Course, they weren't getting fat checks from home like the kids do now. During that year I ~~suppose~~ ~~number of things~~ -- I think it was that year. ~~It~~ may have been my second year, but I believe it was that year. -- We had a strike at William and Mary. Well, it was ~~years~~ ~~ago~~. <sup>This man</sup> ~~cause~~ who <sup>provoked it</sup> lived in Taliaferro Hall, -- a man named King there who was an old <sup>er</sup> man -- I <sup>d</sup> say he was 30. It seemed then he was older. He'd come back to school and ~~he~~ was head waiter in the dining hall, and <sup>a lot of</sup> ~~all~~ the boys didn't like him. They had an ~~alterc~~ ~~ation~~ one night and a boy -- <sup>it</sup> could have been serious -- got a meat cleaver, messing with it, and <sup>some</sup> ~~a~~ boys got hurt. As a result, they shipped three or four of the boys that were involved, and the feeling was very strong that they should not have been shipped, so they had these meetings of the student body and everybody stayed away from class, and <sup>The</sup> newspapers were playing it up. It so

happened that Dr. Chandler (<sup>who</sup> J.A.C. Chandler, who was president) was away at the time, and Dean Hoke <sup>^</sup> was dean of the college, was at a loss really how to handle it. They finally got Chandler back and he cleared it up, but it was one of the first strikes ~~around here~~ at William and Mary, I suppose. (Well, they had some, I think, <sup>was there,</sup> when Thomas Jefferson but ~~that~~ <sup>this</sup> was over disciplining some of the students <sup>that</sup> and the rest of the students felt weren't to blame.) <sup>[working in]</sup> My second year at William and Mary I changed over <sup>^</sup> to the library, and I worked in the library <sup>for</sup> the same pay. <sup>^</sup> I got my meals. Incidentally, one of the things I remember so well about working in the library: I learned what was there, and later when I was on the Board of Visitors I tried ~~through the years~~ to get the college to inaugurate <sup>u</sup> a course and require freshmen to take it on the use of the library. They have an orientation, I know, to use the library, but that's not enough. Three-fourths of the kids go through William and Mary and never realize what is there in that library for them to use. Well, I became very much acquainted with that and had an interesting experience years later before the ~~new~~ <sup>#</sup> library was built. My daughter, who was in high school, needed some reference material, so I told her, <sup>we'd</sup> "Go over to William and Mary and get some books out of the library there." Before we went in I said, <sup>etc,</sup> "Pam, I want to tell you something. I'm going to be able to walk within two feet in those stacks where the books that you want are. As soon as we <sup>get</sup> the call number I can ~~I can~~ walk <sup>I can walk</sup> -- ~~because they hadn't~~ <sup>if the books haven't</sup> moved anything -- right to where <sup>^</sup>

those books are." She didn't believe me, of course, but I could do it because my first year <sup>[in the library]</sup> I placed books back in the stacks, so I knew where every book was. I had another interesting experience <sup>(to show some <sup>thing</sup> of the times)</sup>; I've forgotten <sup>it was</sup> whether <sup>^</sup> between my sophomore and junior year or junior and senior year; I think it was between my sophomore and junior year. The librarian, who was acting then -- a woman named ~~Dr.~~ Margaret Galphin -- Dr. Swem was on leave of absence -- asked me if I would come back about ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> middle of August and clean the library from top to bottom, which I did. I wiped off, dusted every book in the library over a three-week period, and I got 30¢ an hour for that. ~~I got an increase in money but~~ <sup>I</sup> used that then to pay my tuition that year. My junior year I worked <sup>at</sup> ~~in~~ the desk in the library from 10:00 to midnight and on Sunday afternoon. The interesting thing about the <sup>10:00</sup> ~~ten~~ to midnight period was that the women had to go in at 10:00 so there were only men in the library 10:00 to 12:00; ~~see~~ a lot of the men did their studying after taking the girls home. ~~There weren't any girls in there. That's not true any more.~~ There were several student assistants working in the library and, of course, other places because even in '31, '2, '3, '4, '5 and on up to '38 times were tight and very difficult for a lot of the students. <sup>^</sup> In my junior year, ~~another~~ <sup>the most significant</sup> thing that happened was the death of Dr. Chandler, ~~and~~ <sup>I</sup> remember very vividly his body lying in state in the Wren Chapel. He was tough, ~~but~~ <sup>I think</sup> well beloved by the

student body. I don't think there's <sup>question but what they had a</sup> any real affection for  
 him, and of course, he did a remarkable job at William and  
 Mary. <sup>10</sup> Dr. Bryan <sup>1</sup> or Mr. Bryan, as I believe he preferred to  
 be called because he had an honorary degree and not a Ph.D. -- ~~of~~  
~~course,~~ <sup>[He was]</sup> he brought a whole new image to the college. <sup>1</sup>  
 marvelous man whom I learned to love a great deal.  
 It was some <sup>2</sup> what of a plaything with him in a way, but he  
 improved the image of the college considerably. I'm sure  
 that some of the other people have indicated that he  
 inaugurated the dance outside in the Sunken Garden and  
~~had a~~ I remember one year ~~in my senior year and I be-~~  
~~lieve the year after I was out I went back~~ <sup>he</sup> had Hal Kemp,  
 who was one of the leading band <sup>3</sup> leaders back in the '30s.  
<sup>Kemp</sup> He told me that <sup>the Sunken Garden</sup> that was the prettiest setting in which he  
 ever played anywhere in the world <sup>was</sup> ~~in the Sunken Garden.~~ They  
 had a platform down in the bottom <sup>of the garden and</sup> ~~one of them~~ up  
 on the top there <sup>was</sup> ~~they had~~ an huge urn with flowers flowing  
 out of it. It was a very beautiful setting. And he re-  
 established having <sup>4</sup> a Christmas <sup>1</sup> boar with an apple in his mouth  
 in the Great Hall and all those things. ~~And he brought a~~  
 lot of outstanding people to the campus because he had con-  
 tacts all over the world. ~~I know~~ I was president of a forensic  
 fraternity, and we wanted to bring somebody there. I went  
 over to see Mr. Bryan, and he said, "Let me call up my  
 friend," ~~I can't think of the guy's name; he was at that~~  
~~time~~ Frank Kent." Frank Kent was editor and I guess part

owner of the Baltimore Sun. He made a telephone call to Frank Kent and asked him who'd be a good one to bring down to the campus. Kent mentioned several of them; "One of the best would be Joe Bailey from North Carolina, Senator Bailey."

So Mr. Bryan called Bailey up, and Bailey said he'd be glad to come. ~~He came and~~ <sup>she's</sup> ~~one of the nicest ladies I ever met~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~at William and Mary~~ <sup>who's ever been</sup> ~~was Mrs. Duke~~ <sup>she's</sup> ~~Arthur Phelps' wife now~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~Mrs. Duke she was~~

then. She was hostess for Mr. Bryan and a very charming person. She <sup>entertained Bailey</sup> ~~looked after things.~~ We had

~~but to me it was a whole new world of being able to hear~~ people of that caliber. While I was there we had Clarence

Darrow. Then we had the secretary of war under Wilson, <sup>Newton D. Baker</sup> who <sup>spoke</sup> ~~incidentally I got to know a friend of mine -- I can't remem-~~

~~ber the man's name now. He spoke on the constitution and spoke for about an hour without changing his voice and kept everybody interested; I mean, he was a marvelous speaker.~~

~~What was his name? Newton D. Baker. He was secretary of war under Wilson, and I say I worked with the boy later on who married Baker.~~

I remember in those days we had a lot of outstanding <sup>[people]?</sup> we had Gertrude Stein there. <sup>(Remember --</sup> the lady with who said <sup>"A rose is a rose is a rose."</sup> I didn't appreciate her at that time, I must admit, but I guess some people did.

And we had a symposium there; a wealthy man from New York brought in for two or three days some of the <sup>†</sup> outstanding foreign relations people and I can't remember the ~~name.~~

~~big Italian~~



<sup>7</sup> ~~but~~ I think <sup>example</sup> ~~that~~ one of the ~~things~~ that sums up the period ~~as far as~~ from the economic point of view: I had a very good friend there from Boston, a Jewish boy whose father had been a moderately wealthy man during the '20s and he lost everything he had in the Depression, and this boy was having an awful difficult time to stay in college. I remember one night in the library before I closed up he came over to talk with me. He said, "You know, I want to tell you one thing. If I ever have any children and send them to school, I'm going to give them all the money they want so they can just have a big time ~~because~~ I missed it all ~~because~~ I haven't had any money." I think it reflects on the economic situation during that period.

<sup>Some</sup> The comparison between the '30s when I was at William and Mary and the '60s when I was on the Board of Visitors I think would be interesting. ~~Just before~~ ~~well,~~ <sup>During</sup> the time I was at the college <sup>Hitler</sup> was beginning his rise in Germany. The feeling in this country in the early '30s, following World War I (which had been over for twelve, <sup>or</sup> thirteen years) was to disarm, disarm, disarm, and they did do it. The country was disarmed and the whole attitude of the academic community <sup>it</sup> seems to me looking back -- certainly the general attitude was, <sup>that</sup> "no more of this fighting business. All you do is make the rich richer and the poor poorer." ~~One of~~ <sup>when</sup> ~~the subjects for debate~~ I was on the debate team <sup>at</sup> of William and Mary, my senior year and we debated up the coast of to

Boston College, along the coast ; Boston University  
 and Holy Cross -- ~~we didn't debate Harvard~~ -- New York  
 University and Fordham and Columbia and University of Pennsyl-  
 vania and George Washington and Rutgers -- from  
 Washington all on up the coast. The subject that year was  
 that munitions makers were the cause of the war (or some variation of that),  
 and we debated very strenuously the question of whether the  
 big powers ~~(who had industrialized like Dupont and these~~ <sup>others</sup>  
~~people)~~ weren't the ones that really fostered the war so they  
 could sell their product. ~~So what happened~~ a senator from  
 North Dakota or South Dakota -- one of the Dakotas -- named  
 Nye -- Senator Nye -- ~~made~~ <sup>had</sup> public hearings on that very ques-  
 tion, ~~so we debated that question and~~ <sup>and</sup> during my senior year  
 there was a nationwide strike on the part of the college stu-  
 dents in a protest against war, and <sup>in</sup> many of the colleges the  
 kids stayed out of class for a day or two in ~~that~~ protest.  
 And I'll never forget when the question came up at William  
 and Mary about the strike Mr. Bryan called me in and asked  
 if we couldn't work up something where instead of the stu-  
 dents striking they would ~~meet and adopt~~ <sup>meet and adopt</sup> a resolution, which  
 is what we did. But a lot of my friends in college -- and whom  
 I've heard <sup>say</sup> it said and I probably <sup>said</sup> say it some myself -- that they'd  
 never fight and never go into the armed services. -- In  
 less than seven years some of those boys gave their lives to <sup>for</sup>  
 this country. So this Vietnamese ~~these things~~ is nothing  
 new. ~~I mean~~ <sup>I mean</sup> your generation and those a little bit older

than you in the forefront of the '60s thought they were the only group that ever had any feelings about intervention in a foreign conflict. Well, that's been true of college students from time immemorial, ~~Nothing~~ new about it at all. These boys that vowed they'd never fight eventually gave their lives for the country and gave it willingly. ~~I mean~~ it was just a change after they got out, a change in their attitude and their ~~maturity~~. College students had <sup>ve</sup> been debating those things long before the present generation.

Williams: <sup>So</sup> Since students of your generation were very conscious of <sup>the</sup> world situation.

Goodrich: Oh, yes. <sup>as</sup> And I said they were determined this country should never get involved any more. You see, in 1928 -- you can check these dates out -- but I think it was 1928 that <sup>the</sup> Marines went down in Nicaragua ~~because they were bothering~~ <sup>to protect</sup> some of the oil refineries down there, and among a lot of college students there was a strong feeling, "Why in the hell should we send American boys down to protect some industrial interests?" And all during the early '30s particularly ~~there was strong feeling~~ that ~~we~~ isolationism was the thing in this country during that period. The great leaders -- Senator Borah and some of those men were all in favor of staying at home and looking after your business here, and it wasn't until ~~Roosevelt in the beginning~~ of '39 when Hitler started expanding and the early days of the war in Europe before Roosevelt started building up public opinion

so that we would go in inevitably. But I say <sup>as</sup> ~~that~~ the whole attitude of the students in the '60s that they were the only activist of any of the generations was just not true. We <sup>probably weren't</sup> ~~didn't~~ as demonstrative in the sense of destroying property and raising hell just for the sake of raising hell as they were in the '60s but certainly had just as strong beliefs as the kids of a later period. So student unrest is not merely a problem of recent generations. I graduated in 1935, and to show the condition of the time I went to Washington because I had a bachelor's degree with a major in law, and I took the bar exam and passed the bar exam that summer. I wanted to go ahead and get my degree, so I went to George Washington University at night and got my L.L.B.

I went to Washington in the summer of '35, and I wasn't able to get a job until the first of October. To show you some evidence of the time, the first job I got lasted about eight hours. I got a job washing pans at Shoal's Restaurant in Washington. I went to work 2:00 <sup>P.M.</sup> one afternoon. At the end of the day, about 9:30, 10:00, ~~my job was to clean out -- then they~~ ~~cooked french fries in huge kettles like~~. I had to drain the grease out of <sup>the kettle</sup> ~~them~~ and scrub it down and had to wash the <sup>all</sup> ~~all~~ pans and ~~all~~. I left that night about 10:00 and I said, "I can go back on the farm I was raised on. I don't have to do this kind of work. If I don't get anything else, I'm going back to the farm." So I never went

back to that job <sup>but</sup> the first real job I had was with the United States labor department. There were about fifteen of us in this department I was in, which was the United States employment service, which had been set up to help get jobs for people in the depression, and all of us were college graduates. We had a boy from Princeton, one from Davison, <sup>d</sup> one from University of Maryland, <sup>all</sup> from around--all college graduates. We started work at \$105 a month. <sup>Out of that</sup> ~~another~~ <sup>#</sup> guy I went to school ~~as well~~ with ~~as~~ lived.

Williams: And were glad to <sup>get</sup> give it back, probably.

Goodrich: That's right. Very glad to get it. ~~And, of course,~~ <sup>#</sup> at William and Mary we had a death on the alumni board in ~~the year~~ of '36 or '37. I was elected by the board to fill out that term; I served two or three years on the alumni board but during that period, I think the most significant thing that happened at William and Mary from my point-of-view <sup>that</sup> was the law school ~~became~~ in serious jeopardy.

~~and~~ a lot of people did a lot of work to save it and, of course, everybody is happy we ~~did~~ but that was a serious problem at that time. ~~Mr. Bryan stayed on as president and, of course, I was connected with the college but I went into the service in the 40s ~~to~~ 42, and I came back in 46. I taught over there. And their problems, I would~~

say during the warboom -- all the colleges had some problems, <sup>[during the war]</sup> but enrollment was cut considerably, but then it built back up

*during the war enrollment was cut considerably, but after the war it built back up rapidly.*

I taught on a part time basis in<sup>12</sup>  
the Law School from '46 thru '50 when the  
"G.I.'s come back.  
~~after the war, and that's when I taught in the law school. It~~  
~~was on a part<sup>2</sup>time basis.~~

Williams: Had you yourself ~~helped or~~ urged Mr. Bryan not to abolish the  
law school there in 1939?

Yes.  
Goodrich: A lot of it was due to an awful lot of work. We had a very  
strong man <sup>#</sup> on the Board of Visitors named Oscar Shewmake who was  
a lot of help in that. You see, the law school was so small;  
that I recall when I was in the law school taking work when  
I was an undergraduate (which you could do then) we had 30 or  
35 people in there. <sup>But</sup> We had some of the outstanding men teach-  
ing. I took <sup>thirty-eight</sup> ~~30~~ hours at William and Mary. I went  
to George Washington in '36 ~~I started in the spring of '36~~ <sup>at</sup> George Washington. George Washington was ranked among the  
top ten or twelve law schools in the country; <sup>a fine</sup> it was <sup>1</sup> law school  
then. They took every credit that I had from William and Mary  
and gave me credit; I didn't lose anything by transferring my  
credits. ~~they were respected.~~ Woodbridge, of course,  
was a giant <sup>at W+M</sup> there and everybody respected him so I never lost a  
single credit by transferring to George Washington. <sup>011</sup>

Williams: So the quality was there.

Goodrich: That's right. Of course, we didn't have all the exotic courses  
~~involved~~ <sup>that</sup> they have there now, you know. The law school now  
teaches all kinds of law, but the basic law then was excellent.

~~I say I know George Washington wouldn't like~~ but  
~~it was~~ and said they took all the credits that I  
~~had. I got 38 hours credit for the work I had. But during the~~

What arguments  
did you use?

\*1942

H 50s <sup>04</sup> course we had some changes in the administration. Pom-  
 fret came there, I guess, before '50. \* He was an excellent  
 president but more a scholar than he was an administrator.  
 Then Alvin Chandler came in and had problems with the  
 faculty, as you always do when you bring a man in who is  
 not from the academic community, but I think he did a good  
 job there. I think the military <sup>of</sup> probably is not the best  
 training ground for a college president, but he was devoted  
 to the college, and his father, of course, had done a magni-  
 ficent job ~~so~~ <sup>of</sup> During those years while I wasn't as close to  
 it as I was during the '60s ~~because~~ I was living nearby,  
 and <sup>of</sup> course I was there fairly often. <sup>of</sup> I don't agree that the  
 '50s were a period of complete apathy on the part of the  
 students or the college. There were a lot of accusations,  
 but <sup>of</sup> I don't think that's true. I think that following the war [World War II]  
 a lot of people matured a great deal and became more realists ~~than~~  
~~and~~ dreamers, and I think the '50s showed that. By the '60s  
 (that generation) the war was pretty far removed, ~~and~~ they were  
 a whole new group of people with ideals that they thought were  
 entirely different, <sup>as</sup> and I say they weren't, because the same  
 thing happened following World War I. The '20s were a period  
 quite different from the '30s <sup>in other ways</sup> other than economics, but ~~for~~  
~~of the college student~~. In the '20s there was more "rah, rah"  
 than ~~it was~~ in the '30s, ~~and~~ I think the '50s was perhaps  
 not an activist period like the '60s, but I don't think that  
 was necessarily bad.

Then I was appointed to the board in '64 and served until '72. Walter Mason was the rector preceding me. He was sick the last year, so I had to fill<sup>#</sup> in the last year <sup>and had</sup> two years myself. I don't know how to describe that period. William and Mary <sup>never</sup> ~~no way~~ experienced the violence that some of the universities have experienced. It came to us somewhat later and in a milder form. I think the first change that was of any significance, to me anyway, was the students' insistance<sup>e</sup> that they be treated as adults and be accorded within the college community all the rights and privileges of a citizen in the community at large and they insisted that in loco parentis, which had been applied to the academic community for many, many, many years, ~~that that be~~ abolished, and, of course, they saw that it was abolished. In other words, no<sup>#</sup> longer should the college be any type of a guardian of their morals or activity. You can debate that ~~some~~ question ~~at~~ some length whether that's smart or not, and I think if you take a vote of a lot of kids that were there at the beginning of this and at the end of it many of those would now say that a seventeen year-old girl -- and I've had some tell me this -- is not ready to have complete freedom without any restrictions because there are few that come from home where they have complete freedom <sup>when</sup> and they are catapulted into an environment where they don't have to come in until they want to, they can go anywhere they want to, it's quite a responsibility. ~~I had a little girl say~~

How about  
if we leave  
it is essentially  
what you just said.



about six months ago and she went to William and Mary, failed, or had to leave, came back, but she said that she had gone to a working school and that when she came to William and Mary with no restrictions on them that she wasn't ready for them and she couldn't cope with it. So I think it's debatable whether the disappearance of in loco parentis is a good thing or a bad. But anyway, it's gone.

Williams: Could you characterize the general feeling of the board on this issue?

Goodrich: Well, the Board of Visitors at William and Mary when I was on the board and when I left the board could ~~basically~~ be characterized as a <sup>basically</sup> conservative group. We have had on that board some of the <sup>most able</sup> men that Virginia and the nation <sup>have produced,</sup> ~~that we do~~ but I suppose the outstanding man when I went on the board was a man named Walter Robertson -- not taking anything from the others. Walter Robertson was Undersecretary of State under Eisenhower. He probably knew more about the Far East than any man in this country. [He was] a man with great ability, and he made a great contribution on the board. Unfortunately -- or fortunately, depending on your point of view -- to some extent and sometimes completely the Board of Visitors of William and Mary is a political thing. The Governor and the legislature to some extent award their friends. I'm not sure that's bad. Some people criticised us a great deal, but the private colleges reward those who are able to make great donations -- and that's not a criticism. If a man has been able to accumulate \$50,000,000,

The background typing noises almost drown this out, but I think this is what you said.

and he's willing to give a university \$10,000,000, he can't do any harm being on the board, I can tell you that. But ~~the board at~~ <sup>connected with it</sup> William and Mary during the forty years I've been ~~there that~~ ~~board~~ has not been made up of wealthy men -- that is, the whole board. There's some wealthy men, perhaps, on it, but Washington and Lee University, ~~is~~ <sup>one of the fine private</sup> institutions, I would suppose ~~they're going to want on that~~ <sup>there's no one</sup> board <sup>who isn't an</sup> extremely wealthy ~~man~~ <sup>and able man</sup> and able man. But basically, to answer your question, the William and Mary board was when I went on it and when I left ~~it was~~ a conservative group. It was not easy for them to accept the viewpoint that the students were <sup>1-</sup> ~~fulfledged~~ <sup>fulfledged</sup> citizens and that you could not impose curfew on them or you couldn't do this or do that. We had one court case in particular where this young lady, after being warned not to do it it, went to this boy's room, and she was dismissed and went to court ~~and~~ <sup>the</sup> Norfolk district judge upheld her position. That went hard with the board ~~because~~ -- and I think it was wrong. I don't think you can equate the academic community with the outside community and, of course, I feel strongly -- and this is purely a personal view <sup>but</sup> ~~and~~ shared by many of my associates on the board -- that the college faculty should not exercise <sup>complete</sup> freedom of speech, ~~that~~ when doing so <sup>may</sup> ~~they~~ <sup>they</sup> adversely affect the college. I say this <sup>for this reason:</sup> no man's civil rights or freedom of speech <sup>should be</sup> ~~has~~ been taken from him because of the position he occupies, but if you are a professor at the College of William and Mary and you make a public

statement, it isn't just John Doe doing that; You are consciously or unconsciously reflecting something about the college. So it gives your utterance more importance than it would someone equally able as you but not connected in that way so I think that a man in the college community needs to weigh ~~very~~ carefully what he says publicly because it can certainly affect a state-supported institution. I know that one of the last times, I guess, that I talked to the student body as rector of the board -- we had a convocation. We had a young lady who was president of the student body, <sup>who</sup> ~~and she~~ preceded me, and she started out by raising cain because William and Mary was cowering or catering to the Virginia General Assembly, <sup>and</sup> ~~she~~ said that there ought not be any connection between any <sup>partisan</sup> politics and the college. Well, it so happened <sup>s</sup> that William and Mary has a very small endowment, extremely small. What we get from the commonwealth of Virginia is equivalent to an <sup>from endowment of</sup> income more than \$100,000,000. (I never figured it out, but ~~I~~ know it's more than that.) So, it's absolutely foolish to say that you ought to be able to raise cain with the individual members of the legislature that you disagree with ~~or that you should say anything you want to~~ when those people are the ones that make it possible for you to have a college <sup>and</sup> it's well enough to say that they ought not take offense <sup>that</sup> and they ought to have an open mind, but anyone who knows anything about human nature knows that if you've been giving me hell and the time comes for me to consider

something for you, it's going to be awfully hard for me to put that <sup>#</sup> out of my mind. So I think that the college community should ~~feel~~ <sup>be</sup> restrained in their public utterances, in their participation in <sup>partisan</sup> ~~important~~ politics because ~~important~~ <sup>partisan</sup> politics I think can hurt the college and hurt it bad. It's like you had a man who had \$50,000,000 <sup>made from manufacturing whiskey</sup> and wanted to give some of it to William and Mary ~~and after he was engaged in~~ ~~whiskey manufacturing~~ and you objected very much to whiskey <sup>e</sup> ~~and~~. You said, "I don't want that money." well, I used to tell my church people, "It ~~don't~~ <sup>es</sup> matter how tainted the money is, let's get it. ~~mean~~, we'll untaint it." In other words, don't belittle someone because in the end you may cut your nose off to ~~despite~~ your face.

Williams: This student question was one of the issues I wanted to talk about. What was the effect on the board of some of the tactics that I know the students used in the late '60s, early '70s: demonstrations, I think there were students who came before the board at some times. What was the effect on the board, if any?

Goodrich: As I said, the board in '64 was basically a conservative board; it stayed that way during the period of time that I was on it. The two years I was rector we had a young man who was appointed to the board by Governor Holton who was still a student, not at the college, but he was a student in law at the University of Virginia: Roger Hull. <sup>\*</sup> Roger came on with a bang ~~with the youngster~~ but made a valuable contribution to the board because he ~~had~~ <sup>could</sup>

\* Mr. Goodrich later said Mr. Hull was a young lawyer just out of school. He was attending the University of Virginia at the time, however

developed <sup>a better</sup> rapport with the students <sup>than</sup> ~~and with~~ the older mem-  
 bers of the board. Generally the board at William and Mary ~~has been~~  
~~then was~~ composed of old <sup>er</sup> people, and there's ~~sort of~~ a reason  
 for that: There's no money involved, no one gets paid any-  
 thing, and it takes some time <sup>for</sup> so a young man that's getting  
 started <sup>in life</sup> ~~is not able~~ really to devote his time to something  
 like that. But ~~as~~ the students began to press for more and  
 more freedom the board <sup>ought</sup> ~~vote~~ it. There's no question about  
 that. The board was opposed to it. The board was opposed  
 to any visitation between the rooms, and I think if you  
~~take~~ <sup>now</sup> with the board ~~down~~ there, a lot of them still  
 feel it's a mistake. The whole idea that you couldn't say  
 to a student, "You've got to do this" ran counter to what  
 the experience had been of those on the board in their col-  
 lege days and later in life. So there was a constant  
<sup>10/19/74</sup> ~~jawing of the issue~~ <sup>hasse</sup> between students and the board. ~~I~~  
~~tried~~ when I was vice-rector (this would have been June  
 of '68) I worked with Walter Mason in trying to set up  
 some channels of communication so that we could have repre-  
 sentatives of the students come before the board and let them  
 talk and air their <sup>position</sup> ~~opposition~~ <sup>on</sup> and I remember <sup>on</sup> one occasion: ~~one~~  
 of the more pronounced activists on the campus was seated by  
 me at luncheon ~~we had luncheons~~ -- and he made a very signi-  
 ficant statement, I thought. He said, "Mr. Goodrich, you know,  
 we don't think we know more than you know, but we think that out  
~~of~~ needling you will help expand your viewpoint and your

perspective." And there's a lot to that. He was very frank; ~~He~~ didn't think he knew the answers any better than we did, but he thought ~~by their~~ pressing a point ~~of view~~ would help expand our own horizon, and I think that's legitimate. And I think by ~~and large~~ that's one of the things that's happened at William and Mary. ~~The~~ The thing that young people have to overcome is ~~this instant~~ <sup>the</sup> belief -- <sup>that everything can be changed overnight</sup> and we had an excellent example with a girl -- I can't remember her name now, but she was president of the student body when we had the president's selection committee. I was rector at that time, and I was determined we weren't going to have the situation we had when Admiral Chandler was selected and even when "Pat" Paschall was selected (but more so when Chandler was selected): that the academic community would have some input into it, not just the board. So we appointed a committee made up of students, alumni, faculty members, and board members. We had a good broad-based committee ~~and this girl was on there.~~ The selection of a president is one of the important functions of the board and a very time-consuming and very serious thing, and we had a lot of meetings ~~and~~ this young lady I remember after one meeting said to me, "You know, Mr. Goodrich, I found out one thing after being on this committee." And I said, "What is that?" She said, "You can't do it all today." I mean they wanted instant change in everything, and she'd finally realized that there <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ very few things that you can change overnight and not bring about chaos and catastrophe.

And I said, "You know, this is <sup>a</sup> more valuable lesson than you've probably learned anywhere else in your college career. <sup>if</sup> ~~You've learned that from this committee assignment.~~" <sup>But</sup> I think the board ~~it~~ it was difficult for some of the older members -- and I suppose I would be in that category -- to accept the fact that it was a new day and that these things were inevitable. You might slow them up, but the day when the board or the president ~~of the administration~~ could rule with an iron hand was gone, ~~I think it went~~ and I suppose it's a good thing. I think if you can get the students interested and work with them, you probably accomplish more than you do superimposing <sup>it from</sup> on top, although I'm still convinced that a certain amount of discipline ~~is needed~~ <sup>s</sup> to be imposed if you're going to develop self-discipline. It's well enough to say that part of students' development <sup>is</sup> to assume responsibility for their own conduct, but there <sup>are</sup> very few people <sup>who</sup> without some external help are able to develop self-discipline that's necessary if you're going to get along in life. ~~You've got to have a little imposed on you, except when people but the great bulk of people need some discipline imposed in order to develop self-discipline, and~~ that's what they've eliminated, in my judgment, too much in the college. I just <sup>think</sup> don't that say a seventeen-year old girl ~~is ready for~~ or a boy either <sup>is ready</sup> ~~to~~ to have complete freedom in what they do ~~and~~. And that's despite the fact, young lady, that a lot of the professors -- and, of course, a lot of professors aren't

dry behind the ears either -- that a lot of them keep saying, "This generation is so much smarter than the other generations -- my generation and back before -- that there's no comparison." In my judgment, nothing could be <sup>farther</sup> ~~farther~~ from the truth. They've been exposed to a great deal more. (My children have been to Europe twice and had all the advantages kids can have. When I was that age, I'd been to Washington, New York, ~~Washington~~ Boston.) <sup>≡</sup> but nothing gives you maturity but age and experience. You can't get it solely from television or from books. Therefore while the kids there at William and Mary today may be smarter in many ways than when I was there, they aren't a bit more mature than the class of 1935. ~~I need no conviction~~ <sup>ing</sup> ~~that~~ the fact they have been exposed to more things without really experiencing them ~~doesn't~~ <sup>- - -</sup> give them the maturity that comes with real experience and from age. But I think your generation will survive. I think William and Mary will survive. Dr. Paschall had some ~~awful~~ <sup>wonderful</sup> years there at William and Mary. He did an outstanding job of building the college, the physical plant. He had a great rapport with the General Assembly, and he did a magnificent job in building. I think Tom Graves is an ideal successor; I think Tom <sup>and is</sup> is going to ~~and~~ <sup>#</sup> continue to develop William and Mary in the academic sense, <sup>for</sup> the good.

Williams: On the subject of building, which you've started, would you account for William and Mary <sup>is</sup> suddenly getting the money for these capital outlays solely to Dr. Paschall's rapport with the



legislators? Is that the whole answer?

Goodrich: No, I don't think any man can take full credit for anything.

William and Mary had not ~~For many, many years~~ undertaken any capital improvement. We had friends in the legislature that felt kindly toward William and Mary, and ~~there's no question that~~ Dr. Paschall had excellent rapport with ~~the~~ leaders of the General Assembly. Of course, there was a difference in the constitution of the General Assembly then than it is now. There ~~are~~ <sup>were</sup> a lot of old timers there ~~that~~; a few of them had a great deal of influence over what the legislature did. Of course, ~~the fact that~~ William and Mary wasn't represented as well as the university <sup>[of Virginia]</sup> or V.P.I., but it was pretty well represented in the legislature and on "the hill." We had Bill Tuck <sup>(a William and Mary boy)</sup> as governor back toward ~~before~~ the end of the war, and of course, Tom Stanly <sup>e</sup>, who was later on the board and who was a great help in <sup>building</sup> preparing and getting money for the college, <sup>was</sup> well respected as governor. Some people said he didn't do anything, but sometimes you need a man who doesn't try to set the world on fire <sup>to</sup> trying to find out where you are. He was friendly toward William and Mary, and then he served on the board and was an excellent board member. He was on the board when I went on <sup>I think it was</sup>. But anyway, the combination of things -- without <sup>#</sup> detracting from Paschall's contribution. I realize he had a great deal of influence, but I don't think he <sup>thinks he is solely responsible</sup> had it not been for him we wouldn't have gotten it, ~~but~~ he came in as president at a time when there was money being made available for capital outlay. For a long time there hadn't

been any. I mean if he were president of William and Mary today, he wouldn't be able to get very much money for capital outlay because there isn't any. So <sup>without</sup> not taking anything away from him I think it was a combination of circumstances as well as his own manner in dealing with the legislature. That's the interesting thing about a president. ~~You know, you need~~ ~~it's~~ <sup>Why</sup> anybody wants to be a president of a college I'll never know <sup>and</sup> for a period ~~of~~ <sup>of time</sup> during the late '60s when we were interviewing, there were a lot of college presidencies open because there had been so much hell raised by the students that ~~didn't~~ <sup>no one</sup> anybody want to undertake the job of president, particularly of a state institution. He's got half a dozen <sup>constituencies</sup> constituencies to satisfy. He's got to satisfy the legislature which appropriates the money for the college; He's got to satisfy the <sup>parents</sup> college; He's got to satisfy the students; He's got to satisfy the faculty; He's got to satisfy the alumni and no man living <sup>can</sup> satisfy all ~~that~~ <sup>these</sup> groups. It's an almost impossible task, so he's constantly on a tight-rope trying to keep from offending one group while he tries to cater to the other.

Williams: Along the lines of what you <sup>were</sup> <sup>ing</sup> talk about when you spoke earlier of the presidential search committee (when Dr. Paschall was going to retire). Were you the one who initiated the idea of a search committee because as you said this was unknown in the past two presidents that had been selected at William and Mary.

Goodrich: Well, I don't want to take ~~any~~ credit for it, but as soon as "Pat"

told me and when he announced it to the board I took the position that we wanted everybody to have an input in the selection because I knew -- although I hadn't been on the board -- the reaction of some of my friends on the faculty who were so chagrined with what happened when Admiral Chandler came in and to a lesser extent when "Pat" came on. We had never had that [a search committee] <sup>and Mary.</sup> ~~at~~ William, I think most state-supported schools, in particular -- really what they have tried over recent years to do is to satisfy the source of money ~~and~~ that's not a bad idea ~~because~~ if you can do it without sacrificing other principles. So it has been to some extent a political type of thing, and as long as you've got public money you can <sup>4</sup> avoid it completely. I ~~mean~~ you may say, "That's wrong" but that's a fact of life. But I don't want to take credit for doing it, ~~but~~ that was decided immediately that we would have a committee, ~~composed of~~ the various segments of the college community, which I think worked very well and the committee worked together very well. There was very little bickering in the committee. We had two or three students, three from ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> faculty, two from <sup>the</sup> alumni, five from the board: ~~twelve or~~ <sup>fourteen</sup> ~~1~~ on the committee. I thought it worked very well, and I thought the final selection was an excellent selection.

Williams: ~~When~~ you spoke of the constituencies that a college president has to satisfy -- that aside, did the committee start out saying, "Now, we need this type of man. Let's go out and look

for him." <sup>Was</sup> ~~Is~~ there a conscious attempt ~~at that?~~?

Goodrich: Well, I think one of the things we agreed on -- the committee -- first is we don't want an old man, that is, somebody retiring from something else, a man in his sixties, because ~~this was a~~ while it had died down some, we were still very conscious of the attitudes of the students and the young faculty members. The ~~attitude~~ of someone who is older, <sup>whose</sup> ~~that's~~ views were so set -- and yet we were not interested in, I don't think -- there may have been some <sup>[who were]</sup> ~~people~~ <sup>thirty</sup> ~~in~~ <sup>a</sup> ~~forty~~ year-old man to lead a place like William and Mary. So one of the early things was that he ought to be in his forties; <sup>we thought he</sup> ~~in that he~~ would have enough maturity without being too ~~entrenched~~ in his ways, ~~and, of course, there was no~~ (One of the last to be considered was a William and Mary alumnus.) There is some feeling, I think -- and I'm not going into specifics -- but I think there was perhaps some feeling, certainly on the part of the faculty and the students, that some outside ~~blood~~ would probably be good. You know, you can get very easily in the rut that the best ~~course~~ <sup>person</sup> in any position at William and Mary is somebody who's an alumnus of the college and whose father was an alumnus. ~~Well,~~ I think we ruled out any criteria: that he must be a Virginian, but I think we felt that <sup>selected</sup> ~~whomever was~~ <sup>we</sup> would need to be sure he had the ability to deal with the political situation in Virginia. We were not looking -- and I don't know that I can speak for the committee -- but we were not looking for a scholar per se, ~~among the outstanding scholars~~ because sometimes

scholars are not very good administrators. We needed a combination: a strong administrator and a man if he wasn't a scholar at least recognized <sup>ing</sup> scholarship <sup>who</sup> and could surround himself in the various fields he needed with men who were scholarly. And I think Tom Graves has done that. But other than that I don't know that we drew any real guidelines or profile of the man we wanted. I don't think we ever really <sup>did</sup> ~~do~~ <sup>did</sup> have you ever been over the mechanics of his selection with anybody else?

Williams: I have read what's in the board minutes, but no.

Goodrich: ~~Of course, what we did~~ I guess three or four hundred names ~~that~~ were considered, and they were cut down ~~and~~ then we got complete information on I don't know how many. It ended up then we had interviews with <sup>a fair number</sup> ~~39~~ and we broke the committee up into groups so we wouldn't have to be there so much ~~but~~ this was a time-consuming thing. Three or four would meet with some prospective candidate and interview him, spend a day with him, then they would report back to the full committee and then ~~we brought~~ <sup>we</sup> ~~it down to the names~~ <sup>submit</sup> ~~it~~ <sup>ted</sup> to the board. I think we did a <sup>thorough</sup> ~~fair~~ job, and we looked at a lot of people, and we may have been able to do better, <sup>#</sup> but I would doubt it. I think <sup>an</sup> Tom is doing excellent job.

Williams: Was the board impressed with the work of the committee? Of course, there were board members on the committee, I know.

Goodrich: I think so. I think they were well pleased. ~~Well~~ I think every board member whether he served on the committee or not

realized it was a serious undertaking and one that could not be accomplished very easily. I mean, it meant a lot amount of work. The search committee <sup>[members]</sup> certainly weren't involved. I think the board was well pleased.

Williams: When Dr. Paschall announced he was going to retire, hadn't there been an attempt by some of the board members to talk him out of it? Or is this not true? I haven't been told this on authority.

Goodrich: Well, I don't know that I should express <sup>myself</sup> ~~that~~ on this. I think it best not to say anything.

I think you better rely completely on the record of the Board of Visitors. ~~but~~ you get <sup>in here in</sup> a hint of an area where there may be some sensitive veins. My viewpoint might not coin-

→ cide with someone else's, and I don't think in this area -- courses, <sup>not a question of</sup> it's what I think. I think you'd better rely on what the official records show. ← The records show nothing.

Williams: Right, I've been through the board minutes, and that's why I asked you because it's ambiguous. They stated something about some of the members expressed a desire that he not resign.

Goodrich: That's true, I mean ~~that~~ that appears in the record, but there's not anything unnatural about that. If you're suggesting whether or not he was forced out -- he was not forced out, but there were some considerations -- if the board . . . Well, you rely on the board minutes. That's the best thing to do.

Williams: Let me ask you a couple of questions about another issue that faced the board while you were on it, and that's the branch

I'm asking your viewpoint.

colleges: Richard Bland and Christopher Newport. Would you -- I'm asking your personal opinion -- say that these two branch colleges have been an advantage or a burden to William and Mary? I know that there've been people who have said both.

Goodrich: I don't agree they have been a burden in the sense that you use the expression. William and Mary started V.C.U., started Old Dominion, started Christopher Newport, and started Richard Bland. I think they did a great service to the commonwealth of Virginia in creating these and nurturing them <sup>until they were</sup> ~~to be able~~ to assume full status. Now I would not argue that we may have spread our resources a little thin. The college in Williamsburg might have gotten more money for the college at Williamsburg if we had not done these other things. I'm not <sup>#</sup>certain that's true, but it's possibly true. But I think <sup>whatever</sup> with ~~all~~ the sacrifices that the college at Williamsburg made <sup>have been</sup> ~~that~~ it paid back many times in the service to the commonwealth of Virginia. Now I know a lot of the faculty <sup>#</sup>members have been dead set against anything outside of Williamsburg, <sup>and</sup> they take the position it dilutes the standing of William and Mary when you've got a <sup>degree</sup> college <sup>for</sup> under its control, <sup>a</sup> direction that is awarded after study that is not equivalent to that at Williamsburg, and it's probably true. But I think you've got to look at the overall picture, and I think ~~the fact that~~ V.C.U. <sup>today</sup> is one of the leading universities in Virginia; <sup>a</sup> ~~and~~ while it may not be on par with William and Mary so far as <sup>1</sup>

scholarship is concerned, it performs a useful function, and I'd say the same thing at Christopher Newport. I think they're doing a marvelous job. Richard Bland did an excellent job in Southside Virginia. Now we had unfortunate problems involving in the state there, <sup>Virginia</sup> ~~which was unfortunate but they served a useful purpose.~~ Old Dominion -- ~~that and~~ <sup>largest</sup> at V.C.U. are the <sup>1</sup> in the state, I guess. And I will never say that that was wrong that we did that. I was in favor from the beginning when I came here on the board, <sup>of firing</sup> ~~cut them~~ loose when they were ready. I didn't think we needed to say we had this big empire, <sup>to</sup> but I don't think we were wrong in <sup>creating and nurturing them to maturity.</sup> I guess ~~it was~~ <sup>for</sup> some of the faculty that it is <sup>It</sup> ~~damning~~ <sup>or causes some erosion of the</sup> academic degree at William and Mary, <sup>It</sup> may have had some effect, but I think the good outweighed the bad. When I think of the money angle -- ~~There's a possibility we fared better because we were serving a community~~ <sup>where there were</sup> legislators -- for instance, in the Hampton Roads <sup>and Richmond</sup> ~~area~~ <sup>helped</sup> -- that <sup>felt</sup> William and Mary ~~and the Richmond area where we had a unit there that they were trying to help that.~~ <sup>They were also helping William and Mary.</sup> So I think William and Mary deserves a real vote of thanks for their contribution to higher education in Virginia. I mean, they've done an outstanding job. Now, we had -- when Tom came on as president a <sup>pulling in</sup> of our participation in continuing education. <sup>We</sup> ~~got~~ a lot of criticism on that. I don't know whether I agree completely with what he did or not, but in any event, an



institution has a responsibility to serve as many people as it can serve adequately and well. It should not spread out so thin <sup>that</sup> they're not doing a good job anywhere <sup>but</sup> I think ~~the~~ ~~fact~~ that other institutions were willing to fill the gap <sup>if</sup> <sup>were</sup> the conditions under which we pulled in; we wouldn't leave any community unless Virginia or V.P.I. or George Washington <sup>[or]</sup> someone <sup>was</sup> is going to fill the gap. I think <sup>it was</sup> the right attitude.

Williams: In the case of Christopher Newport I sensed, as I read the board minutes, some reluctance on the part of the board to go along with first the four-year <sup>escalation</sup> <sup>the</sup> installation or independence of Christopher Newport. I know it's gotten real support from the Newport News community. Is this an accurate feeling that I've gotten?

Goodrich: Well, I think this: <sup>it was a</sup> ~~that~~ the feeling on the part of William and Mary-- the academic community <sup>distinguished</sup> as <sup>distinct</sup> from the board -- that Christopher Newport was not ready for third- and fourth-year level work. The educators at the college insisted that they were not ready, and the board's reluctance to <sup>escalate</sup> the work there was based on the information given us by those who are supposed to know: the educators within the college. So, there was some <sup>real</sup> confrontation with the Newport News group because the board would not approve -- I don't know what year it was -- an <sup>escalation</sup> to a degree-granting status. It wasn't because the board was reluctant to see it happen, but it was because our information was that they weren't ready, they didn't have the resources, they didn't have the library, they didn't have

the faculty, and we didn't have the money to employ the faculty, ~~so~~ they didn't want to go about it in a fashion that would make the degree from Christopher Newport meaningless. ~~so~~ it was not any conflict on the eventual separation or the eventual degree-granting status; It was purely a question of whether <sup>they</sup> you were ready or not. I never sensed on our board when I was there any feeling that we ought to hold on to everything we've got. -- ~~I mean~~ we've got a big empire and let's hold on to it. ~~Never~~ that feeling ~~but~~ the board members, contrary to what some people may think were conscientious in trying to follow the expert advice made available to <sup>them</sup>. Sometimes the expert advice is biased but <sup>by</sup> and large I think ~~if~~ Mel Jones ~~and those who were~~ (Mel was dean of the college then) ~~and~~ ~~others~~ think they sincerely felt if we go too rapidly we're going to destroy the institution, if we bring it along slowly and nurture it carefully <sup>#</sup> that it will develop into a first-rate institution ~~and~~ I think that time has shown this to be true. I noticed in the paper, I think <sup>it was</sup> the last board meeting or the one before, they took no position on the separation ~~and~~ creating their own Board of Visitors. I think the board of William and Mary could care less if they are separated (if they are ready) and can stand on their own two feet -- let them go. ~~I mean~~ Old Dominion was accorded that status; V.C.U. the same way. I've never sensed any feeling ~~on the board~~ <sup>of</sup> any of the <sup>board</sup> members as I recall wanting to retain <sup>[the branches]</sup> some of the board members actually ~~ten~~ ten years ago ~~we~~ would like to have pulled back into Williams-

burg and concentrated on William and Mary. I don't think there's any question about that, ~~because~~ especially those who'd gone to school there. That's where their experience was, and they were interested in that part of William and Mary and not Newport News or Richard Bland.

Williams: Even though this was not carried out, the board did vote to escalate Richard Bland; that's another subject. But was the recommendation from the faculty then that Richard Bland was ready? (This would have been, I imagine, after the first Christopher Newport suggestion.) In other words, why was there a feeling that Richard Bland was ready?

Goodrich: ~~Well~~ of course, that came after Christopher Newport. As I recall, the action taken in regard to Richard Bland was based on the study that was being made by the faculty committees and probably of the accreditation agency or whoever makes its study, ~~but~~ simply it was based on information coming to us. It was not, as some people may have indicated, an attempt to slap at Virginia State. As a matter of fact, the rapport between the head man at Richard Bland named (Carson) and the president of Virginia State was very good. It's unfortunate that the race issue became involved in it and of course, the whole set-up of the H.E.W., and their attempt to eliminate any all-white or all-black schools not based on any sound educational theory but <sup>purely</sup> turning on a question of quotas which to me is a serious mistake.

Williams: I remember reading in the board minutes -- I think you were the one who said this when you were rector that you had read in the paper that Governor Holton wanted to make Richard Bland a community college. Why was this not done?

Goodrich: Well, I don't recall all of the ramifications of it now, but you see, we had set up under Governor Godwin's administration a system of twenty-three (I think it is) community colleges. The original theory was that these were going to be primarily technical institutions to help train kids that were not really college material <sup>in the</sup> and liberal arts <sup>sense,</sup> ~~Unfortunately, I think~~ ~~once these colleges were set up and we had one not far from~~ Richard Bland, John Tyler -- ten or fifteen miles. As soon as they were organized and the educators began to get in there, instead of concentrating on technical aspects of it they became little junior colleges ~~is what they were becoming~~ and I think it's still going down there instead of going the other way. But Governor Holton's idea was to eliminate any problems <sup>concerned between</sup> as far as race was <sup>Virginia State,</sup> -- actually between the federal government <sup>and</sup> Richard Bland, ~~that they'd~~ ~~and~~ put it in the community college system. When they established John Tyler, one of the questions that was discussed at some length was whether you need a community college this close to a two-year junior college, Richard Bland, and whether or not Richard Bland had the ability -- had the grounds, didn't have the ability, but had the ground <sup>for</sup> expansion -- why that would be <sup>+</sup> ~~a~~ <sup>center</sup> ~~a~~ <sup>for a</sup> combination junior

and community college. So, I think it's safe to say the board was opposed to any change to make it a community college, <sup>in the</sup> community college system. Of course, there's a real need ~~and leaving race out of it,~~ for a four-year college in the area that is served by Richard Bland. It's well enough to say that we've got a four-year college five miles away, six miles away -- first, they don't have the room for expansion there, the physical room. Second, ~~regardless of how much they expand~~ a certain of people ~~that~~ are not going there, and if you want to say, "Well, if you don't go there, we're not going to be worried about you." ~~and then you don't need to live with it any more.~~ But I happen to believe that there should be some freedom of choice and that you shouldn't say to a parent whose child is ready for college, "Either you go to Virginia State or you don't go." I respect people who think that's the right attitude, but I think our board -- and I think this was unanimous on our board -- felt that Richard Bland could serve a useful purpose and relieve some pressure on William and Mary. We were getting -- and still getting -- a hell of a lot more applications than <sup>we</sup> they can take care of. I think we felt that they had a good foundation there and over two or three or four years <sup>could</sup> develop a four-year program. It could become a degree-granting institution that would relieve some pressure on William and Mary just like Christopher Newport's going to do and has done and would serve a useful purpose there. And it could have all kinds of exchange programs with

Virginia State and not have any competition in the sense that you may say ordinarily a public institution would have.

Williams: Can I close by asking you a few questions about your thoughts on the job of rector? You were rector from 1970 to 1972. Was your view of the position of the rector a leader or as a moderator or neither of the above?

Goodrich: Well, I don't know what ~~the records show~~, but I think it's partly leader because I think that you have to exercise a certain amount of leadership in a position of that kind. If you're suggesting that <sup>I</sup> ~~it was to~~ impose upon the body my own views on a particular subject, I don't think anybody has accused me of ~~that~~. Have you interviewed Rick Deane, who was on the board?

Williams: No. Would he be a good one to interview?

Goodrich: Well, he's an outsider; he came on the board. He's president of <sup>the</sup> Bank of Virginia, chairman of the board. He's still on the board. But if you do interview him, ask him his opinion of my period as rector. He always ~~said~~ (and I appreciated it) ~~He~~ was impressed the way the meetings were conducted.

Williams: I don't think I've interviewed anybody who would have been on the board when you were rector.

Goodrich: In any event, I think the rector has a responsibility to provide some leadership, but I don't <sup>he has a right</sup> think to use it to foster his own individual views necessarily. I tried as rector to get everybody to speak their mind and participate. ~~Any~~ <sup>I think</sup> ~~person that~~ everybody has a contribution to make.

And we were fortunate: We had a good strong board. You see, we haven't had the <sup>heavy weights</sup> in the sense <sup>of</sup> that big names nationally that sit on some of the boards, but we had a hardworking board and conscientious board. It was a wonderful ~~Very~~ experience to me to work with a group of men like this. I don't know whether that answers your question or not.

Williams: Yes, it does. Would you say that the board meetings then are the place for a great deal of give-and-take, or is this hashed out informally? I'm thinking particularly -- at least <sup>to all</sup> appearances, the <sup>volume</sup> body of work expected of the board has grown in recent years. Is the committee the place for this, or is it the board itself?

Goodrich: We set up while I was on the board committees to deal with the various aspects of the total job, and those committees would meet the night before the board meeting and would come in with their recommendations. Of course, the board discussed and had a good give-and-take session on what the committee <sup>s</sup> had recommended. You actually can't <sup>very well</sup> ~~go around~~ handle all the details without the committee system when you've got an institution that spends \$20,000,000 <sup>or</sup> 25,000,000 a year now. ~~So,~~ it's big business and you need some detailed analysis <sup>[committees]</sup> that you ~~we~~ used to meet Friday and Saturday, and they would meet the night before; some times it would be midnight or after before they were finished and sometimes the board meetings would go on over into the evenings the first day. I think one of the dangers of the board is involve itself too

much in the day-to-day operation of the college. It's a  
 temptation sometimes to -- and that's <sup>#</sup>some of the reasons  
 that the faculty and the students <sup>something</sup> -- <sup>^</sup>they haven't understood --  
 they want free access to the board and bypass the presi-  
 dent. They're <sup>^</sup>putting the board in an impossible position  
 because the board cannot operate <sup>the</sup> college. They must dele-  
 gate the responsibility to the president, <sup>o</sup>and they lay down  
 the broad policy, <sup>o</sup>and we've had our squabbles over some inter-  
 pretation of some regulation or when there's some dissatisfac-  
 tion with some decision, and students feel they can <sup>o</sup>appeal from  
<sup>o</sup>on the president <sup>to</sup> of the board every <sup>#</sup>time they disagree with  
 something the president does, then you're <sup>^</sup>putting the board  
 in the position of interfering in the day-to-day opera-  
 tions of the college, and the board can't operate <sup>it</sup>. In  
 other words, the time is consumed in trying to hear all the  
 grievances beyond the ability of the board, <sup>o</sup>to  
~~provide~~ and from a standpoint of operation of an educational  
 institution, it's not good. ~~I mean,~~ <sup>o</sup>the board should not  
 under any condition attempt to interfere in the day-to-day  
 operations of the college. There was a <sup>e</sup>tendency to do that  
 particularly during that period when we had student unrest.  
<sup>o</sup>students wanted <sup>to come to</sup> <sup>^</sup>on the board on every little thing.  
<sup>o</sup>you can't do that. If you do that, you might as well  
 establish a committee to run the college and get rid of the  
 president. Then they'd have the same attitude toward the  
 committee, you see. I'm sure that everybody who ever ~~sat~~ served



on the board felt that it was a rewarding experience, sometimes frustrating, but that's true in whatever you undertake.

Williams: Is it important for the rector of the board to be in the confidence of the governor? You've spoken of the reliance that a state college has on the state.

Did you  
yourself find  
-one  
to be true?

Goodrich: Well, everything <sup>else</sup> being equal, I would say that not only the rector but every board member that had the confidence of the elected officials in Virginia could do a better job for the college. It's probably more important for the rector because he's the one <sup>that's</sup> ~~that's~~ in ~~it~~ day-to-day contact with the college, if the president has some problem, he calls the rector to talk with him about it, so the fact that a rector or a board member is a close personal friend of the legislators and the governor is an asset, ~~and~~ that's the way human nature works. ~~And~~ that's not a bad system. People, you know, think that because you may have an entrée somewhere that I don't have that that's bad, but that's the way human life is. That's true throughout life ~~and so~~ <sup>a period of</sup> We have had over <sup>1</sup> ~~thirty~~ years, of course, problems because of that. You've had people that were not friendly toward William and Mary that were in positions of power: We just had a big hullabaloo about it in connection with this Greene appointment over there and Ed Willey. That's the way human nature is. I'd like for William and Mary always to have somebody on that board who's a close, personal friend of the governor and all the legislators because if they

are . . . I'm willing to trust their judgment in matters concerning the academic affairs of the community.

that board is going to listen to the educators and those who know how to run the college, <sup>It</sup> and they can help the college in other ways <sup>then they're on</sup> ~~in their~~ asset to the board.

Williams: In the eight years that you were on the board, 1964 to 1972, if you had to pinpoint the most important issue that faced the board in that period, what would you say it was?

Goodrich: Unquestionably, the selection of the <sup>new</sup> president. ~~I mean~~ I think that would be far <sup>and</sup> above the most important thing that happened. And I think we deserve some credit that we came through that period of student unrest without any serious, major confrontations. ~~I mean~~ it wasn't just happenstance. I think it was because of the studied effort on the part of the board to avoid that and to try to improve the relationship. I know I had a committee <sup>of the finest</sup> and one professors over there, named McCulley in the English department, was on one of the committees we worked with. He said to me one day, "You know, Mr. Goodrich, this is the first time I have ever spoken to a board member." He'd been at <sup>#</sup> William and Mary twenty years! Well, you know, there's something wrong if there's that much gap between the faculty and the board. Now obviously you can't have a board meeting and have it like an open faculty meeting but it shouldn't be that kind of gap, and I think during the eight years I was there that gap was closed considerably, and I think that many of the

faculty ~~were~~ -- certainly those who were leaders had -- when  
 I left -- pretty good rapport with the board.  
<sup>They</sup> and felt at ease in discussing the problems. Of course, for  
 my last two years we had <sup>at</sup> practically every board meeting --  
 not all but certainly any time they wanted it -- the faculty  
 committee appear before the board and discuss some of the  
 things that were bothering it. I think two of the outstanding  
<sup>things while I was a member</sup>  
<sup>of the board</sup> was, of course, ~~was~~ having to select  
 a new president and improving the relationship between the  
 academic community and the board. I think we did a good job,  
 not to everybody's satisfaction, but I'm pleased with what  
 happened.