

## T. Edward Temple

T. Edward Temple has had a varied career since graduating from William and Mary in 1937. With a background in both education and municipal government, he became commissioner of administration under Governor Linwood Holton, having served previously under Governor Mills Godwin. For some time he commuted to Williamsburg to work on his masters' in education and also served on the Board of Visitors. His interview is especially valuable for his candid comments on the years 1956 to 1964 on the board. After his terms on the board ended he was appointed to the State Council of Higher Education, and in 1973 he was appointed president of Virginia Commonwealth University, where he had been vice-president for development and university affairs and acting president. A few days later William and Mary presented him an honorary doctorate.

This interview was taped in the president's office at V.C.U. The transcript was approved as submitted to Dr. Temple, "believing that . . . changes will not necessarily improve it," he said. They were not needed.

## INDEX SHEET

Interviewee T. Edward TempleDate of interview March 2, 1976Place President's Office, V.C.U., RichmondInterviewer Emily WilliamsSession number 1length of tape 45 mins.

Contents:	Approximate time:
as student (1933-1937)	10 mins.
- effect of depression	
- memories of Earl Gregg Swem	
- J.A.C. Chandler, John Stewart Bryan	
W&M strength in public education	5 mins.
as member of Board of Visitors (1956-1964)	
- establishment of schools of business and education	4 mins.
- assessment of Paschall's term, appointment as president	4 mins.
- workings of Colleges of William & Mary	2 mins.
- support for Chandler on Board of Visitors	4 mins.
- Temple's appointment to Board	2 mins.
- A.D. Chandler and W&M and alumni and state agencies	5 mins.
- separation of Colleges of William & Mary	10 mins.

T. Edward Temple

March 2, 1976

Richmond, Virginia

Williams: I'll start with a few questions about when you were a student to put your association with William and Mary in context. Now when you came to William and Mary as a student in 1933 until your graduation in 1937, I wondered if you would talk about some of the evidences you saw of the depression upon the students you knew, including yourself.

Temple: Well, I recall, Emily, when I went to William and Mary I came off of a farm in southside Virginia, about <sup>forty-five</sup> miles from Williamsburg. I had never really been away from home; I graduated from a country high school. So when I went to William and Mary I suppose it was the biggest thing that had ever happened <sup>to me.</sup> We were in the depression at the time. I recall that I had one suit of clothes that's all and when I entered William and Mary I entered because the dean had given me a job and a scholarship. I soon found out that that was not sufficient to carry me through, so I went back to the dean and asked if he could find another job for me. I guess his comment was, "We have other students here who need jobs also." There were some logs behind the old power plant at the college, and he said, "We can give you a job cutting up logs if you want that," and I accepted that. Most of my four years, I suppose, I spent

doing all kinds of jobs, usually working until midnight and doing most of my studying after midnight. So that was really the impact of the depression upon me and a lot of the other students who were really working their way through school. <sup>6</sup> Jobs, of course, back in those days were very difficult to find.

Williams: You had said that one of your jobs and one that you apparently derived a great deal of benefit from was working in the library for Earl Gregg Swem.

Temple: That is right. That was one of the first jobs I had -- working for Dr. Swem. I got to know him so well -- truly one of the great men at William and Mary, a real scholar. And the impact of that man upon so many students I suppose will never really be known. I can only cite my own case: being so closely associated with Dr. Swem and Mrs. Swem, having the opportunity to do some proof reading of the Virginia Historical Index, going to historical meetings with Dr. Swem, and being the scholar that he was, I learned a great deal just riding with him, going places, and being associated with him in the library. <sup>///</sup> truly I think he was one of the great scholars of his time and made an outstanding contribution to William and Mary and especially to the development of the library.

Williams: What kind of a man was he?

Temple: A very small man physically, rather chubby, very serious, very seldom did he joke, very precise. <sup>[He]</sup> expected everyone  
^

who worked for him to be as disciplined as he, Dr. Swem, himself. I might tell an interesting story: one morning I was driving Dr. and Mrs. Swem to Richmond. A young lady who lived at Toano was to meet us, and she was supposed to have gone to Richmond with us. The appointed hour for leaving was 8:00. The college bell rang, and the young lady was not there. Dr. Swem said to me, "Drive on, Ed, drive on." And Mrs. Swem said, "Why, Emily's not here." And Dr. Swem's response was, "No woman is going to hold up the progress of the College of William and Mary," and we drove on to Richmond and left the young lady. I tell this story because it was symbolic of the preciseness of the man. He was so disciplined himself, and he expected people associated with him to be the same way. I guess that was one of <sup>his</sup> the impacts upon my own life. I learned something about self-discipline, I guess, as a result of being associated with Dr. Swem.

Williams: While you were a student the Civilian Conservation Corps (the CCC) had a camp on campus and I know made some improvements to the college. I wondered was there any mingling with the students on the part of the workers?

Temple: Yes, and interestingly enough I went to work for the Civilian Conservation Corps in the summer. At the time I was stationed at Yorktown. I did some work at Yorktown as a guide. I later worked at Jamestown as a guide; had a great ex-

experience, and learned some history incidentally during that period of time. There was a mingling of the students on campus with those who were involved in the CCC camp. At at the time that I worked (during the summer) we had students from other institutions. I recall two or three young men from George Washington University and from other places in the country who joined us there, and we just had a grand time working, not making very much money but having a very interesting time and a real learning experience. And incidentally I was doing some research at the college at the time for the <sup>[National]</sup> Park Service at Yorktown, having just left as a student -- or actually my first year of working there I was a senior, I guess -- I had access to the library. I knew how to use <sup>it</sup> and enjoyed the research that I did there.

Williams: The president at the time you went was J.A.C. Chandler, but for the balance of your years was John Stewart Bryan. As a student did you sense a real change in William and Mary from Dr. Chandler to Mr. Bryan?

Temple: Right. Probably one of the most pronounced changes took place during that period of time. John Stewart Bryan was a wealthy man. I recall our Christmas parties; they were delightful. We had never been accustomed to anything of that kind on campus. The students used to say that John Stewart Bryan had done so much to -- I'm not sure that I can define the word sufficiently to explain what it meant

at the time -- but we said that John Stewart Bryan was "liberalizing" William and Mary as it had never been liberalized before ~~because~~ under Dr. Chandler the student body was pretty well disciplined. Dr. J.A.C. Chandler was a great president; <sup>one</sup> of the finest contributions made to the College of William and Mary was made during his term as president of the institution. Dr. Chandler had come out of a public school situation, having been superintendent of schools <sup>here</sup> in Richmond, and he was able to make that transfer from public schools to a college environment; He did it well. But the student body was pretty well disciplined at the time. I recall one week two students were suspended because they had whiskey in their room. Dr. Chandler was in Philadelphia, the students went on strike, and the only student who attended classes those one or two days happened to be Dean Hoke's son. (Dean Hoke was dean of the college at the time.) But believe you me, Dr. Chandler returned to Williamsburg; We had a meeting of the entire student body -- the men in old Phi Beta Kappa Hall, and he set us straight. He got everybody going back to classes. I just think that's just possibly an interesting sidelight to the kind of man he was. Well disciplined himself <sup>[He]</sup> and ran the institution in that manner, but made a terrific contribution to William and Mary as its president. <sup>4</sup> Of course, John Stewart Bryan was there only for a short time, and then following

him was another gentleman with whom I had no contact  
 at all. <sup>[John Pomfret],</sup> During those years following John Stewart  
 Bryan's departure from the college there was a gap of  
 time <sup>when</sup> I very seldom ever went back to the campus.

Williams: You went on into public education. Dr. Chandler was  
 also a public educator. I wanted to ask you this:  
 I've heard it said that for many years William and Mary  
 had something of a grass roots system of support because  
 of its position as a teacher-training institution. This  
 support came from the district superintendents, from the  
 superintendents of schools, from principals in Virginia.  
 Was there a level of support that William and Mary could  
 command on the state level?

Temple: Absolutely. And that has been true up until about a decade  
 or fifteen years ago possibly. William and Mary did have  
 the support. I guess <sup>2</sup> the large percent <sup>age</sup> of the school  
 superintendents were alumni <sup>of</sup> <sup>at</sup> William and Mary. A large  
 number of the high school principals and even elementary  
 school principals were. William and Mary had the best  
 school of education in Virginia at that time, largely  
 dominated by Columbia University people. In fact, during  
 my time as a student, when I was taking education, I  
 think all of my major professors were graduates of Columbia  
 University. I guess that that was not good because we  
 got only one perspective, and that was largely John  
 Dewey's philosophy of education. During that time



the progressive school came into existence (in the late '30s and early '40s). The whole concept of the progressive school was based upon John Dewey's philosophy ~~and that was~~ that you let the child do pretty much as ~~the~~ ~~child~~ wanted to do in the classroom with not too much guidance. It was free expression. I did my practice teaching at the Matthew Whaley School; I taught social studies one semester, and to apply that concept there was not as difficult as applying the same concept to the teaching of chemistry to a senior class; that was most difficult. But William and Mary did have the support across the state of the school people, very extensively as compared with the other institutions of higher learning in this state.

Williams: How could they use it for William and Mary's progress?

Was there a way to mobilize it on the state level?

Temple: Well, <sup>there</sup> it was. I think some of the finer contributions to public school education... I guess those things were motivated largely by the influence of William and Mary. I recall one of my school superintendents ~~who~~ had done his undergraduate work at William and Mary, a classmate of former Governor Tuck<sup>s</sup>, and found the need when he became superintendent of schools <sup>[he]</sup> found the need to go back and get his masters' degree <sup>so</sup> here he was -- a man about fifty returning to William and Mary on weekends to get his masters'. But <sup>#</sup> I guess what I'm saying here is that

there was a terrific impact of the College of William and Mary, especially the department of education, I guess it was called then, upon public schools in Virginia because the better educators came from William and Mary, and that, of course, is no criticism of the University of Virginia or any other institution in the state that had schools of education or departments of education. But it just so happened that the influence of William and Mary over that period of time that Dr. J.A.C. Chandler ~~I guess it started then~~ -- when he became <sup>was</sup> president, coming out of a superintendency here in the city of Richmond, <sup>-- I guess it started then.</sup> and I think this was one of the things he brought to the college: an interest in the department of education and the contribution that it could make. I recall as a student we were constantly having superintendents coming on campus to interview students, you know, who were preparing for teaching, <sup>[and]</sup> principals <sup>[were]</sup> coming on campus. At one time I thought that every principal and every superintendent in the state graduated from the College of William and Mary. Of course, that was not true; it seemed that way sometimes.

Williams: But no longer, you say, would you feel William and Mary commands this base?

Temple: No, except to say that the college has a very fine <sup>[Education]</sup> department at the present time, and I have great admiration for the current dean. It has a good school of education, but

the competition is so keen from my own institution now, (Virginia Commonwealth University) and the University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. They have a very fine, outstanding school of education <sup>[at William and Mary]</sup> so the competition today is very keen; ~~it~~ was not back in those early days.

Williams: I'll skip on ahead to when you were on the board because what I have to ask is related. One of the first items that faced the board when you got on it was whether or not to establish a school of business and a school of education at William and Mary. (This is <sup>in</sup> the late '50s.) The board turned the ~~Admiral~~ down on this; why do you think they did this?

Temple: I think possibly there were several reasons. I recall very vividly that we did turn him down. There was a feeling amongst some members of the board that we were not ready to move in that direction. There was a great concern on the part of some members of the board that professional schools in the college would erode the liberal arts concept that we had held to for so long, ~~And~~ as I think back, I think maybe that was erroneous. That was one of the reasons. A second reason--and I do not know how much importance to attach to it -- was the fact that the Admiral was at odds with some members of the board at the time, and that might have impacted to some extent upon the board in making its decision. I'm

not just sure how important that was. I think the first thing I mentioned a moment ago would possibly be the more important of the two, and that was the fact that members of the board were not inclined to move to professional schools in the college.

Williams: A few years later, after Dr. Paschall came, the school of education was implemented before the school of business. Could you account for this change: Was it a change in attitude, or a change in the board members, a change in the president maybe?

Temple: <sup>Very much.</sup> The basic reason for that change was the fact that Dr. Paschall -- his background had been in <sup>#</sup>public school education, having been a teacher, a high school principal, and finally ~~became~~ superintendent of public instruction, and this was a new thrust for William and Mary. I think <sup>Dr. Paschall</sup> was attempting to regain for the college some of the prestige that we had in professional education back in the days of Dr. J.A.C. Chandler, and the fact that the school of education came before the school of business. I think again is obvious because of Dr. Paschall's own background and <sup>the</sup> environment out of which he came. So I would assign that as the major reason. Of course, <sup>[when]</sup> Dr. Paschall came to the college -- it was sort of a fresh appearance. Paschall was a very aggressive man -- maybe "aggressive" is not right, maybe he was more progressive. He was able to articulate with members of the General Assembly, communicate with them, articulate the

mission of the college. I think his inaugural address set the stage for what he had in mind. Possibly no man had ever served in public office in Virginia who had a better relationship with the General Assembly of Virginia than "Pat" Paschall, and I think the evidence of that is seen on the campus of Williamsburg today when you look at the very fine buildings on the new campus, for example, and what he did in preparation for the buildings that have been built even since his retirement. So it was a new and fresh approach to things at William and Mary.

Dr. Paschall and I had done graduate work <sup>together</sup> at William and Mary ~~together~~ and on one occasion in summer school several others were sitting talking one day at lunch, and Dr. Paschall filled his pipe with tobacco, as was customary, and stood up, and I ~~guess~~ he said with all of the pride that a man could make an expression, "You know, gentlemen, I'd rather be the president of the College of William and Mary than to be president of the United States." And as I looked at him, tears came in his eyes, and I said, "Pat, I guess you're sincere, aren't you?" And he <sup>repeated</sup> said, "I'd rather be president of this ancient old ~~college~~ than to be president of the United States." It was my opportunity to place his name in nomination for appointment ~~to the~~ ~~board~~ when the board made a unanimous decision to appoint him as president of the institution. I recall at the time Governor Almond was governor, if my memory serves

me correctly. We ~~announced~~ after <sup>the</sup> a board meeting. The governor was in Williamsburg for some affair, and we (Several members of the board) talked to Governor Almond ~~several members of the board~~ and told him that we had that afternoon been in session, and we had selected Dr. Paschall as the next president. I guess Governor Almond said to us that he was disappointed because he did not want to lose "Pat" Paschall as superintendent of public instruction but congratulated us on our good sense in <sup>#</sup>selecting Dr. Paschall as the new president of William and Mary.

Williams: Had you discussed this, I assume, with Dr. Paschall before the meeting?

Temple: Yes, very much; yes, we had. And there were many people who were considered, <sup>#</sup> people outside of the college. There were several alumni who were very influential, <sup>[and]</sup> well qualified to have been president at the time. But I suppose in my association with alumni of William and Mary, no man was more dedicated, more loyal to the College of William and Mary than "Pat" Paschall. He had a dedication that you seldom ever see. He loved that college. It became, really, his life for thirteen to fourteen years when he served as president. He and Mrs. Paschall were married in the Chapel, so almost everything from the time he came into William and Mary as a young student until his retirement -- his whole life had been spent in association with William and Mary, <sup>#</sup> even in the days when he was teaching in high school at Victoria and became high school principal he

returned to William and Mary often. He said he felt he was going to the shrine everytime he went to Williamsburg.

Williams: When Dr. Paschall was nominated, Admiral Chandler (it seems from the minutes) supported this appointment very definitely. Is that a correct impression?

Temple: Yes, <sup>outwardly</sup> Admiral Chandler supported Dr. Paschall. Admiral Chandler had made an incorrect assessment of Dr. Paschall; he thought that Dr. Paschall was coming to William and Mary and almost become a staff person to him. Dr. Paschall did not see himself in that role; ~~he~~ saw himself as president of the college. Back in those days I think a great error was made. The new chancellor, Admiral Chandler, had his offices on the campus at Williamsburg, and I guess at this particular point I want to speak in complete candor. It's the judgment of one person who loves the college, <sup>has</sup> been associated with the college for a long time but it was very obvious from the very beginning that Admiral Chandler was not going to permit President Paschall to perform as a president. I recall in those early days that the Admiral constantly circumvented the president by going to faculty, by talking to faculty, <sup>in some cases even</sup> suggesting to faculty ~~even~~ that he, the Admiral, still ran that institution. I recall one of the early visits <sup>[of Dr. Paschall]</sup> to Danville, where I was city manager. Dr. Paschall came at the invitation of my wife to speak to the Wednesday Club in Danville, <sup>and</sup> spend the night with us. Dr. Paschall said to

me at the time that some changes had to be made at the college in the organizational structure, that he could not function as president with Admiral Chandler on the campus tampering with and interfering with day-to-day administration of the college. The Board of Visitors did not have this in mind. The Board of Visitors -- I think we were very clear in trying to delineate the responsibilities of the president versus the responsibilities of the chancellor. Some members of the board were very unhappy about what was transpiring. We sought to change it and did change it.

Williams: This is a dangerous statement <sup>make to</sup> to a college president, but I'm sure you've heard it said that after the board that appoints a president retires, that president begins to lose some of his support that he had when he came into office. When you went onto the board in the late '50s, did you sense that the admiral no longer commanded the support he must have commanded in 1951?

Temple: Well, the board that appointed Admiral Chandler gave him 100 percent <sup>support,</sup> <sup>so far</sup> as I know ~~every single member~~. One member of the board who was instrumental in bringing Admiral Chandler to the college was a former roommate of the admiral's. <sup>As</sup> as I understand it -- and I was not on the board at the time the admiral was appointed -- but there was little or no effort on the part of the board to search for candidates <sup>that</sup> at a board meeting in Williamsburg this member of the board who had been so closely associated back in student



days with the admiral said, "I know a man that can get the college out of the trouble it's in." (You will recall that the college had been through a period of turmoil in athletics and other things.) "His name is Alvin Chandler. I know the man. He is not retired from the navy, but possibly he is at a point that he could retire and not lose too much in terms of service by doing so." I was told later that this man went to the telephone and made a call to the admiral, and that was the beginning of the interest on the part of Admiral Chandler in the College of William and Mary and becoming its president, and the board made the appointment; <sup>it</sup> was done without any search committee; it was done without any input from the faculty and <sup>so</sup> far as I know without any input from the staff of the college. It was back in those days wholly a board matter; they attended to it in just that manner and they made the admiral president of the institution

Williams: Now, though, by the time you came onto the board did he still command this 100 percent support?

Temple: Well, there were some of the same members on the board who had been reappointed, and from those members, yes, he did get the same amount of support. But I suppose several of us were new members, and <sup>it</sup> happened to be one of those. I felt a loyalty to William and Mary, no particular loyalty to any one person, except as that person might perform, and then I was loyal to the person but to be loyal per se just

for the sake of being loyal I had no commitment to the admiral and several members of the board found themselves in the same position, and this is not to say that those of us who were new members of the board did not want to support the admiral in every way possible when it was feasible to do so. It is a known fact that the admiral was not very much enchanted with my appointment. In fact, word came to me at the time I was being considered by the governor, that Admiral Chandler wanted to know who this fellow Temple was anyway--never heard of me, and possibly that was true. But he made comments to some of my friends which led me to believe he was trying to block my appointment to the board, but I guess I forgot about that when I went on the board. I went there with a firm determination to give the best service I could as a board member for my four years. I was appointed for four years and then reappointed for an additional four years, and then, of course, my service terminated under state law.

Williams: Why did Governor Stanley appoint you specifically, do you think, in 1956?

Temple: Governor Stanley and I had been associated with each other over a long period of time in educational projects and also in the church. Governor Stanley was a Methodist and I was a Methodist just as a sidelight to this discussion and to pin it down more firmly in the Methodist church we have district lay leaders for every district in the Virginia con-

yes  
YET

Is "Virginia Conference" its title?

ference. I was the district lay leader for the Danville district, where I was then serving as city manager. Governor Stanley's ~~his~~ home was in the Danville district. I named some twelve or thirteen associate lay leaders, and Governor Stanley was one of those. He made a great contribution to the Methodist church, as he did to other things that he was interested in. I got to know the governor very well, and I guess it was that fact, plus the fact that he knew of my interest in education because we had talked about it on numerous occasions. I know of no other reasons. I certainly was not a wealthy person, so he didn't put me on the board for that purpose. But I think he thought possibly I could make some small contribution because of my own background and my own interest in education.

Williams: To go back to this subject we began, and that is the Colleges of William and Mary. It was at Admiral Chandler's initiative that this system was formalized and set up in 1960. Why do you think that he wanted this made formal? William and Mary had had the branches in Norfolk and in Richmond for many, many years. Why this new set-up?

Temple: I think it was simply because the admiral was looking to the development of a large system, an educational institution that would become larger than any institution of higher education in this state. To be very honest, I felt the admiral was trying to build an empire in higher education. One never knows what the motivation of another is, but what transpired

after that led me firmly to the conclusion that's what he had in mind; that if he as then president of the William and Mary system could control a large branch of William and Mary in Richmond, which was a large metropolitan area, a large branch in the city of Norfolk, which was another large metropolitan area, using as a foundation for this development and growth the old college at Williamsburg... if I may use a common expression, he had it made, and that's precisely what I think the admiral attempted to do.

Williams: Then the system depended very much on the personality of the admiral.

Temple: That's right, very much so. Admiral Chandler made a number of contributions to the college. He was a great organizer; he was able to get the General Assembly during that period of time to make appropriations to the college, all in all I think Admiral Chandler did a good job as president. He did not communicate with faculty well. He did not articulate. He never really was able to transmit, or to translate, I should say, the mission of that institution to the many publics that William and Mary was interested in as an institution, to the external publics, and he was certainly unable to do so within the institution. And that was a major weakness at that time, something that some members of the board felt very keenly. I recall it was during the time that Admiral Chandler was president that the queen came to the United States (in 1957), a very beautiful occasion, and it

[Queen Elizabeth II]

was largely through his influence and the Jamestown Foundation<sup>s</sup> that the queen came to William and Mary, appeared on the campus at William and Mary. This type of thing the admiral did well. He knew a large number of influential people throughout the country. I spent a number of weekends at Williamsburg, as quite often when he invited people who might be interested in contributing to the college in one way or another he would ask certain board members to come down and spend the weekend. The admiral had that type of--I guess he had that talent that he could influence influential people to come to Williamsburg, but for the common man who was just an alumnus of William and Mary, who had little to offer in the way of financial support -- those people did not get too much consideration back in those days. And after all, every single person who graduates from an institution has, you know, a potential, and if you can get all of those people--it matters not how small the contribution may be<sup>^</sup> if you can get them all contributing it adds up to a lot of dollars. I think Tom Graves today has taken that attitude, and I think that's one of the reasons for the success in the development program at William and Mary today. He's trying to get all of the alumni interested in giving to the college.

Williams: One or perhaps many of the publics you referred to that the college needed interpreting to were the officials here in Richmond on a state level. What kind of relationship did the

admiral have there and I'm talking now about the period  
 1960 to 1962, when he was chancellor of the Colleges of  
 William and Mary?

Temple: I would say that he had a fair relationship with the members of the General Assembly. I guess he did the thing that was human to do; he picked out the leadership. He associated with the leadership. He didn't do too much to communicate with others, but largely through influencing the leadership in the General Assembly at the time that he was president he was able to sway the General Assembly -- and maybe that's not a good word -- to influence the General Assembly to make appropriations to the college. The admiral was always at odds with the state agencies that had any control or supervision over the college: personnel, purchasing, budget. At times I felt -- and this is just a judgment -- that he almost had disdain for people in budget and people in personnel. He just tolerated them and that was it. So to summarize, he worked beautifully with the leadership. He knew where the influence, the seat of power was, and that's where he went. Dr. Paschall on the other hand and Dr. Graves today seek out all members of the General Assembly. They work hard at it, contacting all of them. It doesn't really matter whether they're in places of leadership in the General Assembly or not; they want the support of all of them. And I think that's the difference between the people. But President Chandler was fairly successful in getting appropria-

tions, using his own style. So evidently his style was not all wrong.

Williams: When the colleges were set up then the board must have supported it and <sup>the</sup> state council must have supported it or it wouldn't have gone through.

Temple: Yes. I'm not really sure on my dates when the two institutions -- you're speaking now of R.P.I. and the Norfolk division --

Williams: Were part of the colleges.

\* 1960  
 Temple: When that merger came about I'm not really sure, and you'll have to refer to your dates \* ~~that~~ the State Council of Higher Education had come into being, ~~However, during that period of time I do recall the Council of Higher Education did come into being because I remember the early days that Dr. Bill McFarlane was the first executive director of the council but the council back in those days was extremely weak. It was not a good coordinating body. They were struggling. Dr. McFarlane was trying to find really the mission of the council, and I recall on numerous occasions McFarlane and I sat down to talk about the role of the council. I took the position as he did that the council should become a very strong coordinating body. Really we did not get too much help from the council during that period with reference to the separation of the two branches from the college at Williamsburg because the council really at the time was in the formative years, just beginning.~~

Williams: How then would you account for how this system was divided in 1962?

Temple: I'm going to take some credit for it. Judge Hooker, formerly a member of the State Corporation Commission and now re-tired <sup>[was]</sup> a man who was very astute. He knew how to get things done. He was very close to the General Assembly and to all members of the assembly. Judge Hooker and I had talked on numerous occasions about the future of R.P.I. and the Norfolk division, as we talked about the future of the college at Williamsburg. We felt that these two branch institutions had been tied to the college at Williamsburg long enough. I guess the expression that we used was simply this: It's time now for these two institutions to be put on their own, with separate boards and they should grow up, and they should serve the communities of which they are a part. And then I guess there was a very selfish motive on the part of Judge Hooker and myself, and that was simply this: in asking for appropriations back in those days we had to ask for appropriations to three institutions. We felt at some time in the future the college at Williamsburg could be shortchanged and would not get the attention from the General Assembly that really the college deserved if it <sup>was</sup> to become the type of liberal arts institution that we hoped it would be. But the board at that time took the position that William and Mary should not exceed 5500 students and I recall -- if you go back and look



at some of the mission statements -- that we talked about it becoming "the best liberal arts college in the country." We really believed that, and we believe that William and Mary has attained much of that today. That's what we hoped for, but we saw this happening only by the separation of R.P.I. and the Norfolk division. I think history proves pretty well that we were right on that occasion, with R.P.I. today a part of one of the great universities in the state, Virginia Commonwealth University, and <sup>[Norfolk division, new]</sup> Old Dominion <sup>University</sup> College in Norfolk. Both of these institutions now are institutions standing on their own and serving the metropolitan areas of which they are a part. William and Mary has progressed physically, academically, and otherwise, so I don't believe anyone could objectively say that that was not the right move to make at that time, rather than trying to make William and Mary all things to all people by holding to these two urban institutions, when <sup>in</sup> effect William and Mary itself is not an urban institution.

Williams: Could I ask you how you acted on this belief?

Temple: Would you elaborate upon that?

Williams: How you acted on your belief that R.P.I. and the Norfolk division should be separated.

Temple: As a result of that strong feeling on the part of at least two of us at the time, we tried to persuade other members of the board, and there were many, many discussions and board meetings devoted to this subject. We felt that we first

wanted to convince other members of the board that we were right. In doing that, we were pretty slow to get them to act. We were not getting much of a commitment from other members of the board. So I recall one weekend Judge Hooker rode on the train with members of the General Assembly from Richmond to Roanoke -- and it was customary back in those days to take a weekend to go to Roanoke -- and when Judge Hooker returned he had a commitment from about -- if my memory serves me right -- 90 percent of the members of the General Assembly; in fact, he had their signature on the bill to break apart the William and Mary system as it was then constituted. That's how we started. I think some other members of the board who saw that this was happening felt that maybe they should get on the bandwagon, and then we began to get some support from other members of the board, and in the final analysis we had a majority support from the board. I guess it's possible some of those members did not feel as keenly as Judge Hooker and I did because their motivation was entirely different; it came as a result of pressure. Judge Hooker and I -- our motivation came largely out of a feeling that this was right to move in this direction if we were going to develop a system of higher education in Virginia. And then I hold to another bit of philosophy here that I think prevailed at the time: if the system of higher education in Virginia has been good, if it has offered anything, it has been partially because of

the autonomy of the institutions of higher learning. I hope we shall never get to the point that we pour all of higher education into a common mold as has been done in some other states. I like to think that eventhough there are certain standards for personnel, budget, and ~~so forth~~ guidelines for physical facilities that all of us have to abide by that there's no institution in Virginia like William and Mary. It's unique. There's no institution in Virginia like Virginia Commonwealth University; we are unique. We offer eighteen programs that aren't offered anywhere else in the commonwealth. The University of Virginia is unique, and so is V.P.I. as a land-grant institution. I want to see this uniqueness prevail, and I think that was one of the factors that motivated me back in those days. And then I mentioned a moment ago the fact that I served on the Byrd Study Commission on Higher Education; again, I took somewhat the same position and later I went on the Council of Higher Education and served and still held to the same basic philosophy. (I served on the Council of Higher Education at the time that Dr. Prince Woodard was the director, and interestingly enough Dr. Bob Ramsey, who has just come to us as new secretary of education, was the deputy director of the Council of Higher Education. You see, these good people somehow return to Virginia after they leave.)

T E J  
Revised

Williams: this perspective that you held in 1962 you <sup>ve</sup> seen borne out in your present job as president of V.C.U. ?

Temple: Well, it's been very interesting. I never anticipated that one day I would be president of this institution. ~~I guess~~ I had dedicated myself to government and thought I would stay in government for the rest of my days, but I guess fate somehow got me into the position I'm in today; I don't know why, but I'm here and enjoying it very much.