

"Who's in charge here?" And of course, the answer was,  
"Nobody."

Ⓐ [But back to the story about Nixon], Nixon sneaked out the side door of the Wren Building to avoid confronting the students, who were heavy Humphrey supporters--that's what I mean by "fairly politically liberal;" you know, middle to left. Humphrey had a great deal of support there. When he (Nixon) sneaked away from that building and drove down that side street, it was like circus fans who had had their show taken away from them. There was a real roar from the crowd, just an angry roar. The students were angry that he didn't have the courage to come out and face them. It was a sign of what was to come later, I guess. And then that he used the Wren Building to make his commercial without talking to a single William and Mary student--boy! Why did the administration let him do that? See, there's another touchpoint. Why didn't they say, "No way. Either William and Mary students will be included, or you can forget using the Wren Building." It was prostitution of the highest order. Incredible, just incredible.

I remember Jerry Rubin came once and got a very mixed reception. Everybody was all excited about him until he showed up. He wasn't much; even his supporters

admitted that. (He had) a lot of rhetoric, but not a lot of thought behind it. <sup>#</sup> A lot of people were <sup>a little</sup> stunned by how poor he really was.

Williams: Did you ever feel In relation to these national issues a kinship with students on other campuses, a pan-student feeling?

Ramsey: I think this would come later. After Kent State I can see how a person would feel that way. Columbia and Berkeley <sup>no,</sup> it was way too far out for William and Mary. There is always some panstudent feeling, but Virginia campuses were very quiet. I can't say there was much panstudent feeling. I couldn't see myself as one with Mario Savio. It wasn't as much "us against them" as it later got to be.

Williams: You know that historians are always looking for turning points: can you feel that you were at William and Mary from 1965 to 1969 at the beginning of something?

Ramsey: At the end of something. I think that what I was at the beginning of isn't finished yet. When I went to William and Mary it was still in the 1950s; when I left we were in a different age. That's both good and bad. At the time <sup>#</sup> I never realized it; I did not see the transition. Now looking back on it, it was a transition in many ways: the relationship of the student body to the faculty

changed dramatically. Speaking of "us against them" the faculty and the student body was very much together on this; there was a great feeling of solidarity between those two groups. I felt very comfortable with a great many of the faculty members at that time. (Listing of particular people: Dr. Martin Garrett, Leonard Schiffrin, Margaret Hamilton, Dr. Sherman in history, Dr. Shoemaker, Dr. Orloff, Richard Curry.) I think these people had the ability to communicate well, and they gave the impression of caring a great deal about their students. (Description of English instructor Mrs. Andrews, also cited <sup>as</sup> very good. Dr. Fehrenbacher in English was also mentioned as a good professor others had.)

At this time (in 1965) girls were not used to seeing <sup>equal or</sup> women who were intellectually superior to men. And William and Mary had some outstanding physical education teachers who dignified the whole concept of being a woman and using their brain. <sup>My classmates were like that:</sup> The typical girl who goes to a coed school is looking for a husband, and Lord knows many of my friends found them. But that's not the impression given by most of the girls at William and Mary. They were very intelligent, single-minded, ambitious women. They had minds of their own. There were girls like "Boopsie" in the "Doonesbury" cartoon--the cheerleader, vacuous,

absolutely no mind. But then I didn't go to school with all that many of those kinds of people. A lot of the girls were very impressive people. I think this could really forge a person's outlook on life to go to William and Mary from a small high school and run into <sup>it</sup> these people who respected you for your mind and respected what you thought and demanded that you work to your capacity.

It gave me a truly worthwhile education. If an education is really good, ~~one~~ <sup>one</sup> never stops inquiring. Those people and some others that I probably should name made you want to keep learning and thinking. I think that in itself says something good about the college during the '60s and '70s, when colleges were so under attack for being machines that turned out B.A.s and B.S.s on an assembly line. I did not get that impression from these types of professors (and there were others). They were much more interesting people than that. It was not just a school where you went through the mill. I think

some of the student criticisms of the '60s are invalid; I think many students didn't know why they came, and if you didn't know why you came, naturally you'd think

you were a number. A student who really had a desire to do more than go through school besides the fact that his parents put him there could have gotten a very worthwhile experience out of William and Mary. The people I met there were outstanding.

They demanded the utmost of you at all times, and that was an outstanding kind of environment in which to live. I guess that's why I liked the place. In all the troubles of the '60s I think this is sometimes overlooked: that there was a lot of learning going on there--at least for me. I know there were a lot of people who did not feel the intellectual challenge; there were some people who were disappointed in their education, and they probably had good reason to be. But I feel fortunate; I felt I did get a good education, maybe not in every area, but then not in every area could you educate me. I didn't know how good my education was until I got out of school, and I went to school with some people of extremely high caliber. For that I think we owe Dr. Paschall a great deal, and this is something that many students felt when I was there. The guy didn't handle some things very well, but he sure could get the money to build the college into a major state institution. A lot of students were not unappreciative of that. But times change: if he had quit in '67, his name would be a very different one. Those last two or three years were a tarnishing influence. He did a great deal for that institution.