

## Nelson Marshall

Nelson Marshall was director of the Virginia Fisheries Laboratory when asked in 1949 by President John Pomfret to serve as dean of the college. After his investigation uncovering the athletic scandal of 1951 he resigned, protesting the handling of the matter by the Board of Visitors. A more complete description of the situation may be found in this interview, conducted in his office overlooking the Narragansett Bay at the University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island.

Dr. Marshall approved the verbatim transcript, adding answers to the questions in the margins.

INDEX SHEET

Interviewee Nelson Marshall

Date of interview April 14, 1975

Place Dept. of Oceanography, Univ. of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island

Interviewer Emily Williams

Session number 1

Length of tape app. 55 mins.

Contents:	Approximate time:
becoming <sup>23</sup> dean of <del>the</del> college, 1949	4 mins.
athletic situation by 1951	} 5 mins.
background	
role of Board of Visitors	} 7 mins.
investigation	
Board's reaction to investigation	9 <sup>5</sup> mins.
Marshall's resignation	4 mins.
Vandeweghe's role	3 mins.
role of press in investigation	2 mins.
Marshall & Board of Visitors	10 <sup>2</sup> mins.
view in retrospect	10 mins.
role of William & Mary in late 1940s, tie with divisions, problems in being state institution, ↓	
Virginia Fisheries Lab, place of athletics	

Nelson Marshall

Emily: This interview with Nelson Marshall was recorded on April 14, 1975, in Kingston, Rhode Island.

Emily: I had wondered in 1949 you became dean. Now most of your predecessors as dean of the faculty (or dean of the college as it was then) were older members of the faculty, which you were not; many of them were people from humanities; you were associated with marine ~~marine~~ biology. How was it that you became dean in 1949?

Marshall: Well, in 1947 I became director of the Virginia Fisheries Laboratory, which later became the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, and in the capacity of director I was also a professor of biology. I had a good deal of activity relating to the college and particularly to the president of the college. When he was looking for a new dean, because of our experiences of working together and <sup>apparently</sup> his satisfaction, he asked me if I would do that. So I didn't come from outside the college, but I was not closely within the college, either.

Emily: Was there any kind of division between Dr. Pomfret and the Board the way there had been in 1947 when he recommended Dr. <sup>Phalen</sup> Faeland and Sharvy Umbeck was appointed by the Board?

Marshall: I didn't even know <sup>that happened</sup> in the case of Dr. <sup>Phalen</sup> Faeland and Sharvy Umbeck, so I don't believe there was any division at all, <sup>and</sup> my impression is that this <sup>was</sup> is a joint recommendation of Sharvy Umbeck and Dr. Pomfret, and I don't think there was any division. I wasn't aware of it.

Emily: Some people have criticized Dr. Pomfret. They say he wouldn't assert himself and that this was part of what eventually led to his fall. How did you find working with him?

Marshall: Well, I guess he didn't assert himself very strongly and yet there was a very high quality of intellectual influence that issued from his status and role, and he pretty much counted on subordinates who had jobs to do to assert themselves and work for him. I can see why people make <sup>^</sup> I can see why people criticize in that way, but I'm not sure how many of them would find a way to assert themselves if they were in the same situation he was in.

Emily: Turning for a time to this athletic situation, it has caused me to wonder what there was in post - World War II ~~was~~ William and Mary that could have allowed a situation to develop that the athletic program found itself in in 1951? You had been, as I found, on the athletic committee, so you ~~were~~ must have observed this as it happened.

Marshall: Well, the answer to this, I think, depends ~~on~~ to some extent ~~on~~ on what role athletics seems to fit into in a university or college. Athletics, <sup>of course,</sup> is a rallying point, and it's a way that a college can get on the map without necessarily being a first-class college. But it gives a good many people who are behind the college a lot of satisfaction. Of course, this is all well known to you, I'm sure. So you can well see a group of boosters and ~~this~~ in this instance, <sup>spearheaded</sup> spirited by a Board (Board of Trustees) which was very, very athletic booster by nature with

perhaps one or two exceptions in the whole Board roster, they were just nuts on athletics. So ~~they~~ the bigger the better as far as they were concerned. Umbeck shared this kind of thinking, apparently (I'd have to say

*apparently*) I'm sure that nobody was trying to create scandalous, overtly, or <sup>substantively</sup> or ~~substantively~~ dishonest-type things, But at the same time they weren't trying to hold the reins and make sure <sup>that</sup> this was not happening.

They'd rather not get too concerned. And I don't think, for instance, anyone on the Board ~~even~~ wanted what had unfolded, <sup>they also</sup> ~~but some of them~~

weren't willing to look into it too critically, either. And because it was <sup>sort of</sup> a Southern very nice plaything to have <sup>these</sup> a great athletic team<sup>s</sup> and all that, What it was doing to the college as far as they could see was

just getting them more and more publicity. So they didn't face up to ~~some~~ some of the realistic phases of this, namely <sup>that</sup> a little college of <sup>one thousand or twelve hundred</sup> about ~~1000 to 1200~~ men couldn't be <sup>supporting an</sup> ~~supplying our~~ enormous football

team and basketball team to play the likes of Michigan State without some extremes in the way they went about it. When I first ~~first~~ became dean they also asked me to serve as ~~faculty chairman~~

chairman of the faculty committee on athletics, but as soon as I began to really ~~know~~ <sup>we were</sup> want to know what ~~I was~~ <sup>we were</sup> dealing with I ~~was~~ <sup>we were</sup> asked

not to serve as chairman of the faculty committee on athletics -- I wasn't asked not to serve <sup>but</sup> I was replaced. The thing that sort of

triggered my reaction <sup>or</sup> ~~to~~ sensitivity of what this situation was doing to the College was when a couple of very <sup>prominent</sup> ~~dominant~~ students (men students) came in and made a number of statements concerning things that were essentially dishonest that were <sup>undermining</sup> ~~underpinning~~ the college and ~~they~~

*Why and at whose request?*

*I suspect there were some subtle hints from certain members of the Board prodding Pampet to get me out of the way because it became clear quite early that I would not be a pushover relative to athletic pressures.*

they were doing such things as undermining the honor system of the college (because supposedly the honor system was a very sacred, etcetera), and yet of people who were responsible for the honor system aren't and so forth were party to things that were not right, and they were being pushed right through over their heads.

They told me this; They gave <sup>a</sup> some number of examples and then told me that I couldn't do anything about it. My reaction was either I do something about it; or I resign, <sup>in objection to</sup> and justify the fact that I couldn't. So that's where <sup>we</sup> it all started.

Emily: So you knew <sup>that</sup> there was something wrong and went to Dr. Pomfret and said there should be an investigation undertaken?

Marshall: Yeah. I think that's all in here <sup>[APP Bulletin]</sup> about the sequence of dates.

Emily: Yes, dates...

Marshall: And Dr. Pomfret's position was (the best I recall) -- of course, he didn't want to give a <sup>ies</sup> he didn't want to harbor dishonesty and that sort of thing, <sup>and cover</sup> and of course, under those circumstances I would have, it would be my right to pursue this matter. So we went from there in pursuing the matter. It was kind of a tough sort of thing. Just as any one of these things was: people covering people and then we had to push them pretty hard to uncover ~~the~~ things.

Emily: Did you know when you started about Dean Lambert having found the high school transcripts being changed?

Marshall: <sup>Yes</sup> That was probably the most tangible thing. Did "Cy" tell you about that?

Emily: Yes.

Marshall: I knew <sup>at either</sup> the value there before I started or very soon. That was probably the most you could cover for all kinds of things, but you couldn't cover for that, that was so tangible.

Emily: You then went, as I'm sure it says in this AAUP <sup>[see introduction]</sup> thing, and it's documented elsewhere, you you listed a number of irregularities, and you took a report to Dr. Pomfret in the spring of 1951, and then how did he react? And how had you expected him to react when he had concrete evidence in front of him?

Marshall: Well, I can't remember the matter, I can't remember exactly. The matter was the investigation was picked up by the Board, that is the Board. I suppose what you'd say is if I suppose what you're wondering is that if Dr. Pomfret knew this much, why didn't he act? And what actually happened was the Board reviewed the cases, in which case by reviewing the case and facing the reality of it, they had to act. They did not try to probe too deeply, that is, they weren't for covering anything but they when it became known what had happened I think they were quite happy somehow (and I've forgotten just how) quite how certain resignations were submitted and so a lot of dirty linen didn't have to be exposed too much, the coach (McCray), you know all these names, McCray and Wilson submitted their resignation, and Pomfret sent in his resignation, which was sort of like, well, he submitted it, but he very fortunately was able to submit it in terms of going to another position, which made that much

better, although publically <sup>by it</sup> certain had some appearance <sup>that</sup> of the Board  
 had found the Board had <sup>gotten</sup> him out of the way, and his lack of having been  
 on top of the situation sort of made him <sup>the</sup> goat. To turn it the other way,  
 if Pomfret had fired McCray and Wilson I'm sure everybody <sup>and his brother</sup> would have  
 given Pomfret a <sup>very</sup> rough time. Pomfret, if he depended upon me and my  
 information, probably could have sustained his position, <sup>(if he had fired these guys)</sup> but no doubt the  
 Board he would have lost all his rapport with this Board. They'd have had  
 to sustain <sup>him</sup> but he would have lost all rapport with them. They were nuts  
 and they would have had to recognize the truth of what he had to say, but  
 at the same time they would be working with him, <sup>effectively</sup> and accepting ~~it~~ as a  
 Board-president relationship. And of course, really that's what happened.  
 in my case. They couldn't deny what I had to say, but I'm sure they  
 didn't want me around there very long.

Didn't you mean "wouldn't" ?  
 wouldn't is correct

probably better way "made even all this"

Emily: It was a "no-win" situation, in other words.

Marshall: Yes. I'm sure ~~the~~ I wasn't the kind of dean they wanted around, <sup>of course;</sup> and that's a subjective view, <sup>that's my opinion only,</sup> but I think you'll find plenty of people who concur as far as the Board is concerned. I guess the faculty wanted me to stay.

Emily: The faculty did support your position, right?

Did the faculty back you?

Marshall: Actually (and I don't know if this is in the record or not) the way Chandler was installed in private services, closed services in the office, a small group, <sup>it was</sup> it's the same day I resigned, but just before he took office. He did ask me to stay; He called me up. I don't know if whether

You - I think the faculty's action is in the AAUP article; probably also in the late Sept - early Oct minutes of faculty meetings

that's in the record or not, but he did ask me to stay.

I just couldn't do it.

Emily: Why not?

Marshall: Well, he represented a slap, a gross insult to the faculty, and I didn't want to serve the representation on what had become a very divided situation, faculty vs. the Board. I didn't want to take the commands of the Board and then oppose them on the faculty's position.

*impose*

Emily: As you say, you did resign in October, then, but you had offered in April, when you first submitted your report, to resign. Did you do this to try to get Dr. Pomfret to do something about it, or was it simply the fact that you objected to this sort of thing, as you said earlier, and if you couldn't do something about it, you didn't want to stay?

Marshall: Yeah, it was the latter, <sup>You know,</sup> it was the latter. I don't remember too much about that April offer of resignation. I think <sup>in scanning through this [AAUP Bulletin]</sup> I came into this and I saw something <sup>about</sup> it in there <sup>in there?</sup> But I'm sure it was <sup>the feeling that</sup> the original. I'm not going to sit around here and accept <sup>if</sup> what they wouldn't agree to our probing <sup>it</sup> and cleaning up <sup>where</sup> <sup>our</sup> necessary, <sup>or</sup> I wasn't going to stay. It was essentially a protest offer of resignation, and you seem to <sup>and</sup> I suppose this reflects <sup>what</sup> a lot of people are telling you <sup>you</sup> I keep coming back to this Dr. Pomfret weakness <sup>and</sup> I'm going to <sup>you</sup> opened with that and have come back to it. In the context of what he was dealing with, I'm not well, he could have done it two ways. He could have moved in and <sup>ed</sup> affectively clean up, but I think he would have been lost, <sup>he</sup> he would have lost out anyway. I think in his wisdom, which would not be my wisdom, he chose the slow way, which didn't put him in <sup>a</sup> very good light. It's obviously not my way of operating, and though people are critical of me <sup>for</sup> of blasting away

on what  
and I think <sup>was</sup> that ~~is~~ necessary.

Emily: This whole business really got rolling in <sup>#</sup>the summer. There was a faculty committee appointed to hear McCray and Wilson, ~~and~~ <sup>faculty</sup> a committee that never really functioned, ~~but~~ <sup>did</sup> McCray or anyone in the athletic department, did they ever admit that there was anything wrong? I haven't found any record of this. Do you know of it?

Marshall: No, they weren't forced to admit it, which is, as far as I'm concerned, is all right. They submitted <sup>their</sup> resignations, and people <sup>didn't</sup> want to -- there was nothing <sup>to be</sup> gained, that I can see, <sup>reminds you of</sup> another ~~Watergate~~, there was nothing <sup>to be</sup> gained by any overt admission on their part, <sup>that</sup> as I can see. The records were sufficient, the information was sufficient, <sup>that</sup> they felt they should resign, and the general feeling was, "let it go at that." So that's ~~that~~ <sup>about</sup> where it got to.

Emily: ~~You mentioned~~ the Board got into this the same time as a former coach, Al Vandeweigh, had a letter published in the Daily Press from you clearing him of having done anything. Had McCray tried to put the ~~cap~~ <sup>cap</sup> on Vandeweigh and tried to make Dr. Pomfret believe that to get rid of Vandeweigh would get rid of the irregularities in ~~that~~ <sup>the</sup> department?

Marshall: I wouldn't be surprised that McCray was looking <sup>for</sup> every escape that he could find. Vandeweigh, you say Vandeweigh published something in the paper?

Emily: He ~~wrote~~ <sup>let</sup> it out to the <sup>Da</sup> Daily Press the day the Board of Visitors opened their hearings was how it happened, <sup>though</sup> The two were not connected. <sup>happened</sup> One ~~had been planned~~ before the other.

Handwritten note on the right margin: "I don't know if they..."

Marshall: Well, Vandeweghe was ~~a~~ sort of an informant. I know of nothing that Vandeweghe did himself that was wrong. He certainly was at odds with McCray and Wilson, <sup>and</sup> I'm sure they weren't trying to uphold him any. They might very well have been trying to use him as an escape. I guess I can't really tie that all together. I do remember that Vandeweghe gave me a fair amount of information. I don't remember charges that other people made concerning him, and I don't remember any accusation being upheld. We weren't...

Emily: Against Vandeweghe, accusations?

Marshall: Yes. There was no reason or anything else to be probing Vandeweghe. I think (if I recall correctly) that he was no longer on the ~~U.R.I. faculty~~ the College of William and Mary faculty.

Emily: Right.

Marshall: So I'm being very confusing ~~in~~ in answering that question, but....

Emily: I think the answer's in it. Do you remember this letter?

Maybe I'm pushing you on something that you don't really remember.

Marshall: You are. I do--I tell you, there's one thing I remember: (this is subjective) but I remember that the local press (Richmond) they put sportswriter types on it, and they were all by their profession and everything else big buddies of the athletic crowd at William and Mary, and they were suppressing things. They really were. The thing that really forced the matter and made

it impossible for the board or anyone else to keep turning their backs to what was involved was when the Washington Post, I believe it was, sent their reporters<sup>in</sup> to find out what in the world was going on at William and Mary. From then on-- and if recall properly they didn't send a sportswriter. They sent a general reporter. So the two things were different. Someone came in to inquire from out of the area and from a nonsports clique, and from then on the matter was not squelched in the <sup>way</sup> ~~manner~~ that alot of people wanted. <sup>it to be squelched</sup> Now where Vandeweghe's letter fits into that, I don't know.

Emily: <sup>Would</sup> ~~Did~~ the Post reporters <sup>have</sup> come to you? Would they have known of your investigation; or was it still a secret?

Marshall: They didn't come to me. I don't remember where they went. They may have gone to Vandeweghe.

Emily: I wonder where did they get their information?

Marshall: I don't know. There was a guy--I think the reporter's name was Shirley Povich. Have you ever heard of him?

Emily: Yes, he was <sup>a</sup> Washington writer, I'm sure.

Marshall: He wasn't a sportswriter, was he?

Emily: <sup>May have been</sup> It could be checked, but I know he did write for the Post. I've heard the name before.

Marshall: I'm not sure, again, but I am very sure that the general change from suppression of the problem and the moves to keep it covered and not really get to the heart of it rather abruptly ended when it changed <sup>d</sup> from the local sports press to the outside press. <sup>But they didn't</sup> ~~From then on,~~ come to me, and I don't know where they get their information. From then on, though,

why, no one was going to let the matter rest until it was settled. Of course, the Board ~~of Visitors~~ had to pick it up. <sup>Some of them</sup> ~~Someone~~ said very frankly to me that it was a bitter pill for them; they didn't want to <sup>^2</sup>out they had to clean it up. On the other hand they didn't deny but that they were very pro-big-time athletics. <sup>[John Garland]</sup> Incidentally have you talked with <sup>^1</sup>Pollard?

Emily: I'm to call him Monday when I get back to Williamsburg.

Marshall: Give him my best when you do. Are you going to see Pomfret?

Emily: I hope. He is being approached now. It's the consensus of people like Fowler and Lambert and Miller that, well, "Yes, he probably will get around to talking to you, but it will not be immediately." For one thing he has a very heavy writing schedule, but it's proposed. There's money in my budget to go to California to see Pomfret.

Marshall: I tell you, my impression is that ~~you're us that~~ you're getting a biased <sup>^1</sup> somehow a pretty biased <sup>^1</sup> view of Pomfret.

Emily: That's why I talk to <sup>^1</sup> many people, so I can--so anyone <sup>^1</sup> who hears this, reads this, or anything can balance off the views.

Marshall: That's awfully easy to say that Pomfret was weak and that he could have cleaned it up. I don't suppose there was any question that he could have cleaned it up. But the consequences might have been. . . . It looks pretty much as <sup>though</sup> <sup>^1</sup> I cleaned it up, and I'm not sure the consequences were all for the good.

Sure we cleaned up the athletic thing temporarily, but we put the college in such a high state of turmoil, <sup>that it took</sup> and a number of years to recover.

Pomfret may have been a much wiser man than I am. I don't think that should be overlooked.

Emily: At one point (this is <sup>on</sup> what you're talking about) at one point I found a quote in the Board of Visitors' minutes: Judge Shewmake said "we were going to clean house." Now from what went on after they made this statement, it seemed you were there (I'm sure you don't remember the specific point), but from your reply you seemed to feel that you were threatened by the Board of Visitors. I was wondering if you did, in fact, feel that your position was <sup>an</sup> extremely uncomfortable <sup>one</sup> there?

Marshall: I didn't feel threatened by the <sup>b a</sup> Board then. Up until that <sup>at</sup> up through the time of the <sup>at</sup> faculty meeting in which we got a report from a committee that was supposedly working with the Board to find a new President, through that I had real hopes that we would find a new president that mutually represented the Board's concerns and the faculty's concerns. I had every reason to assume that I could work with such a person. <sup>Whereas</sup> we sure had some hard differences of opinion, with a new leader to iron it out, we would. I really expected that. I had great hopes, and I think the faculty did, too. I've forgotten the dates, but it was something like on a Thursday we were told that the Board was working with the faculty, <sup>or something that</sup> and on Friday night, the Board appointed a new Presidently secretly, obviously negotiating with him behind the faculty.

Emily: You did then, as you said, resign just before Alvin Duke Chandler was sworn in. And looking back on this segment of your time at William

and Mary, would you do it again?

Marshall: Yes. I don't see what else I could have done.

I may have been unwise in prejudging what kind of <sup>an</sup> administration Alvin Duke Chandler was going to offer. I did prejudice that <sup>that</sup> and ~~it~~ may have been unwise. But I think that ~~I~~ in prejudging, I don't think I had erred. To

prejudge <sup>is</sup> ~~to~~ <sup>at</sup>, but I don't think guesses as to what were going to happen were wrong

By the way, have you interviewed him?

Emily: I'm supposed to later in May.

Marshall: Where is he?

Emily: He's in Virginia Beach.

Marshall: Retired?

Emily: Yes, ~~Yes~~ he's retired now.

Marshall: Have you talked to Hocutt, John Hocutt?

Emily: No, <sup>though</sup> Charlie McCurdey and Dean Lambert both said it would be a good idea, that perhaps he'd be in Williamsburg since I can't hop up to Delaware quite as easily. Perhaps he would be in Williamsburg <sup>sometime between</sup> from now ~~and~~ until August of 1976.

# Emily: I just have two more questions, and then I'll let you get off of this. You voiced the concern at one time, <sup>or</sup> you said you didn't relish the role of <sup>an</sup> the investigator. But if you hadn't investigated the situation, ~~what~~ do you think would have happened? That's a hypothetical question, but one that should probably be answered ~~to~~.

Marshall: I think <sup>we</sup> they would have survived. ~~I think~~ I don't know how I can answer that question because it's just <sup>so</sup> unacceptable to me to have allowed that to have existed. <sup>ever</sup> I just have no way of thinking about it. I would have either investigated or left. And if I left I would have left in protest ~~and not~~ for being somewhat compelled to refuse, to refrain, from covering my own responsibilities as dean of the college.

Emily: If you hadn't been there, though, what do you think would have happened?

Marshall: <sup>If</sup> someone else would have been dean who would have just ridden with the situation, you mean? Oh, I think it would have carried on -- The college would have maybe with time there would have been new people, maybe a cleansing of our souls would have worked <sup>without</sup> out marks of the Revolution without drastic change. It's conceivable they could have had a dean <sup>not</sup> like me, who would have been much more philosophical and more like a politician, that could accept things that he knows darn well aren't right,

but that's not my nature. It might have been better for the college.

I think frankly I feel very, very strongly that the right thing to do was ~~what we did~~ <sup>insisting on a cleanup</sup>; I think

the wrong thing is to fail to take advantage of the lessons learned through the cleanup, and that was the Board's fault. Do you see what I mean?

Emily: Yes.

Marshall: In other words, October of that year was a golden opportunity for <sup>[end]</sup> ~~highlighting the~~ error at William and Mary, was just lost because of the board.

Couldn't understand <sup>↑</sup> but the word here, but does that sound right? } you

That's a personal opinion, yet some of the facts behind it are, I think, are quite well documented. By the way, have you interviewed Judge Shewmake? Is he still alive?

Emily: He's no longer living.

Marshall: Isn't he? <sup>Ware?</sup> Who is?

Emily: Of the board that appointed Chandler, James M. Robertson is still alive, though he has not accepted my request, and John Garland Pollard ~~is~~ has been ill, but he is going to see me.

Marshall: If you see Pollard, you're going to get one side of it; you're not ~~to~~ going to get the board position, <sup>as you well know.</sup> The only place I know of to get it would've been Shewmake or Ware, and I've forgotten the rest of them.

Emily: Maybe Pollard could at least explain what his colleagues on the board felt, <sup>even if they weren't his feelings</sup>

SIDE 2 —  
Marshall: First of all, while I have been quite willing to answer questions that you have had relative to the athletic problem and its consequences, almost all of this is in the records, and I don't think I have much to add. I think there was a tone at William and Mary in the late '40s and early '50s prior to Dr. Chandler's administration that was quite important. I think that there was a real, substantial, growing pride <sup>in the institution, particularly</sup> among the faculty. The status of the College of William and Mary--it was assuming a very important position in the country as a leading (primarily) liberal arts

If these were incompatible, did the administration want to build them up? Why or why not? What was done? SEE OVER

college, with a few supplementary ties. It had a law school, which is, of course, beyond the scope of liberal arts; <sup>we had</sup> some ties with advanced history beyond what would normally be beyond the work of a liberal arts college, tying in closely with Colonial Williamsburg. We had the tie with what is now the Virginia Institute of Marine Science so it wasn't a liberal arts college in the tightly restricted sense, and yet the central thrust of being just a high-class liberal arts college was very much on the minds of the faculty; I think on Dr. Pomfret's mind, and on my mind. We'd like to think of ourselves as being in the league with places like Swarthmore, <sup>Haverford,</sup> just the best of the liberal arts colleges. We thought this was a role to take very seriously. There were some incompatibilities, <sup>in organization</sup> as far as this was concerned, one being that technically speaking, <sup>at all</sup> we had two branches that were not of that character. One was the Richmond Professional Institute, and the other was the Norfolk Division of William and Mary. These branches were of a different bent, <sup>altogether</sup> technically speaking we had a real, direct academic responsibility for these branches. Technically speaking, if I understood it correctly, I <sup>academically</sup> was dean of the college, and was responsible for these institutions, but that was a kind of a very, very vague point, and certainly if I ever went to the Norfolk division or to the Richmond Professional Institute, the attitude was, "Fine; we're willing to talk with you, but we're running these places."

I never saw much evidence that either the Board or faculty were concerned with the quality of instruction. So long as the work was done in a satisfactory manner, they were not interested in the quality of the work. I think that was the attitude of the Board and the faculty. I think that was the attitude of the Board and the faculty. I think that was the attitude of the Board and the faculty.

... ..

Question: If these were incompatible, did the administration want to build them up? Why or why not? What was done?

Answer: I never saw much evidence that either the Board of Trustees nor anyone on the Williamsburg campus were greatly interested in the branches. Covering them seemed more like a relatively passive obligation dictated by the state. I certainly began to think the setup would be neater and more logical if we just operated as a single entity out of Williamsburg. I think Dr. Pomfret shared that view and was beginning to lay the groundwork for proposing such. I have heard that Chandler thought very differently, more along the lines of a multiarmed university.

But that's fine; I had all I could do to run William and Mary, and they had very, very capable people. <sup>I know that</sup> Dr. Pomfret and I started pondering in our discussions whether <sup>or not</sup> we could see the day and arrange for the day when we would just be the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg; <sup>period.</sup> Incidentally when I mentioned the things we had at Williamsburg that were over and above a straight liberal arts college, I mentioned the strengths that were unique: the work in history, the law school, and the tie with the Virginia Institute of Marine Science. I should probably also mention that we had a very substantial master's level education program (professional education), very appropriate to the setting. This was kind of the tone of things and the aspirations of the college, as I recall. On the other hand we were not independent, as some of the best of the liberal arts colleges are; we were beholden to the state policies, in other words state <sup>?</sup> ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~ <sup>control</sup>. And certainly that made quite a difference in our character.

Emily: In what ways did this hamper your efforts, to give an illustration?

Marshall: I think the athletic thing was one illustration.

I don't believe that a privately controlled board would have pushed so much for athletic prowess. Another thing was [that] we had somewhat double standards in admission, with lower standards for in-state and higher, very tight standards for out-of-state. I think it's very difficult for a state-type institution to be as <sup>you have to serve --</sup> --to promote the values of rather abstract things. <sup>1</sup> You're being paid by

the state; you have to serve the state. The professional schools become very important; professional outlets become very important. The move is increasingly to the <sup>ward</sup> practical, real, service, and so on. That's fine; I have no objection at all, but it somewhat lessens the freedom in the other direction. Of course, we had a big business administration program; I was talking about the specialties that we had over and above that of a liberal arts college. We had a very considerable strength in business administration; however, it wasn't organized as a separate school. Marsh was the head of the faculty <sup>[in the business program]</sup>. Maybe you have some question for me along these lines.

Emily: Yes, in connection with the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, it <sup>was</sup> ~~seems to have been~~ something of a coup (maybe I'm just imposing my own views) for William and Mary to have that tie rather than V.P.I., which was strongly science-oriented.

Marshall: It was <sup>a</sup> coup; it was largely a fact of geography. It would be very difficult to administer an academic program at the Virginia Institute of Marine Science from a place <sup>three hundred</sup> ~~300~~ miles away (or whatever that is). On the other hand, ~~from~~ from the standpoint of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, it was very difficult to develop a graduate program in a college which was basically not a graduate college. So there was an

incompatibility there, and I always thought, when I wore  
 my hat as director <sup>of the Virginia Lab</sup> that we ought to be working on ties  
 with the University of Virginia, <sup>-- that was my idea</sup> I was more interested  
 in that than I was with <sup>the</sup> V.P.I., possibly <sup>ility</sup> We did some  
 exploratory thinking in both directions.

Emily: For what reason U.Va., then? Was it their prestige?

Marshall: <sup>Yes? I think so</sup> Prestige, proximity, access was a little better,  
 it was the state university. V.P.I. was quite a ways  
 away, if I recall. But I know I had <sup>some</sup> exploratory discussions  
 with ~~quite~~ a number of people, <sup>this type of thing</sup>

Emily: It would have been severed from William and Mary and  
 given to U.Va. you mean, or just U.Va. and William and  
 Mary work with it <sup>jointly?</sup>

Marshall: Well, I understand that the later is what has happened,  
 isn't it? <sup>-- that both</sup> U.Va. and William and Mary work with it? Which  
 is probably a good idea. I think probably what is involved <sup>is</sup>  
 where you have ties with both institutions, <sup>may be--</sup> isn't  
 that it: ties with both institutions? <sup>Was there something else here?</sup>

I think also what has evolved, in which Norfolk has  
 its own university, makes a lot of sense to me. I haven't  
 heard what has happened to R.P.I.--it still exists, does it?

Emily: It's now called Virginia Commonwealth University; it's  
 a going concern in Richmond.

Marshall: Who's head of it? There used to be a man there by  
 the name of Dean Hibbs.

Emily: Yes, Hibbs left and George Oliver took over.

Marshall: Oh really?

Emily: I'm not sure if he retired, but he's no longer living, either.

*(George Oliver)*  
 Marshall: He was director of the summer session <sup>in Williamsburg</sup> when I was there.

Emily: He worked with the divisions <sup>a good bit</sup> in the '50s, from what I've read, and then when Hibbs retired he went to R.P.I., which became V.C.U., (I'm not sure of <sup>n</sup> the chronology on that ~~exactly~~)  
 I can't remember the name of the man who's now president, but George Oliver was sort of the last William and Mary tie, I think.

Marshall: George Oliver was director of the summer session when I was there, as I recall; <sup>I</sup> think that was his title. He also was the chairman <sup>f</sup> of the faculty committee on athletics, as I guess you've found out, when that problem arose. *What other questions do you have?*

Emily: Were you in on the founding of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, or was it already started when you came to William and Mary?

Marshall: It was started before I came. It used to have a board which consisted of the president of the college, the head of the biology department (which was Dr. Donald Davis), the commissioner of fisheries, and one other political appointee. *There were*  
*four members,* <sup>and</sup> The director was ex-officio. This guy Davis had an awful lot to do with starting it. They had a director before I came--a fellow by the name of Newcombe, Curtis Newcombe. When he left Dr. Davis served as acting director until I came.

You were commenting in the beginning that I was really quite young when I became dean--I guess I was thirty-five or so. But I don't know as that made a heck of a lot of difference <sup>one way or the other</sup>, unless there were (and *maybe there were*) some <sup>hanging around there that</sup> people who aspired to be dean and

and one was at Florida State University (I went to Florida State University after William and Mary). Florida State University was trying to convert from a woman's college to a university. They mounted a tremendous athletic program, and you just have to recognize (if you're realistic) that until they could put a football team in a stadium that could play the University of Florida, the people of Florida never recognized there was a university over there. And in this state there's an awful lot of people who ~~don't~~ <sup>didn't</sup> recognize U.R.I. until U.R.I. ~~gets~~ <sup>got</sup> in a football stadium with Brown University. As the head of our public relations department <sup>has</sup> said, "I don't care if we get beaten by everybody hither and yon, as long as we break even with Brown we're in fine shape."

to bring an outside young man in ~~maybe~~ ruffled their feathers. I don't know; it might have been the case.

Emily: The reason I raised that was simply from personal observation of the people who went before<sup>#</sup> and came after ~~them~~ <sup>[who]</sup> you have all been, if not the senior, among the senior faculty members.

Marshall: Well, Umbeck wasn't.

Emily: That's true, Umbeck wasn't.

Marshall: But you say that he was kind of brought in. Are you going to interview him?

Emily: He's dead, too. I feel like an obituary column sitting here; they're either retired or they're dead.

Marshall: Everyone I know is dead. Makes me feel a little shaky here.

Emily: But no, other than Umbeck--but Umbeck was brought in.

Miller, Marsh, Fowler, and Jones--they'd all been there for years and years before they became deans.\*

Marshall: My recollections of William and Mary were of a very high-class college, and I think that Dr. Pomfret represented intellectually that type of attainment. I don't know too much of what happened after I left; I gather there was a certain amount of trauma for awhile, but that maybe some of these earlier goals are coming more and more toward being realized. I hope so. The athletic thing is--well, so many colleges get caught in this trap of athletics (now I'm getting kind of philosophical), <sup>I was going to say</sup> but very little can be gained. ~~---~~ I can think of a situation where I saw a lot gained by just going crazy over athletics,

\* The exception was Miller, who had been here a short while before becoming dean.