MARY EDWARDS

Mary Edwards was a William and Mary student from 1969 to 1973, a crucial period in the student movement of that era. While here Mary was one of the more articulate student leaders (she was the first student chairman of the Board of Student Affairs), and in this interview she discussed student concerns of the period. At the present she is a reporter for the Newport News Daily Press.

90
C-58

INDEX SHEET

Interviewee Mary Edwards

Date of interview April 9, 1976

Place Tucker-Coleman Room, Swem Library

Interviewer Emily Williams

Session number 1

Length of tape 92 mins.

Contents:	Approximate time:
attitudes of student unity and rights	13 mins.
triggering factors at W&M →	11 mins.
James Blair sit-in (1970)	
student suspensions (1970)	
student reaction to administration and vice versa, rules	
participation in student movement	10 mins.
administration considerations	2 mins
Board of Visitors and students	10 mins
"Bateman issue" - visitation, Flat Hat	14 mins.
post-spring 1970 feelings	10 mins.
"Counter-Conference"	
"May Day"	
antiwar movement slowdown	
changes at W&M - rules	1 min.
- new president	6 mins.
issues before B.S.A. (1971-1972)	14 mins.
BSA authority over students	
student fees	
representation	
concerns of	
vis-a-vis S.A.	
other concerns of W&M students, changes in responses	9 mins.
B.S.A. chairman as student, evaluation	2 mins?

See back of sheet for names and places mentioned in interview

Mary Edwards

April 9, 1976

Tucker - Coleman Room
Swem Library

Williams: I found a quote that might be a good point to start off on. It was made by Winn Legerton at Charter Day or a convocation.

She said that students were united only by their recognition of rights as students, and I wondered if in the four years you found it true [or] if you found it true at one point and not at another?

Edwards: There ~~is~~ was doubtless a lot of variety in feeling among the students. The thing that comes to mind first when I think about those times is a tremendous, exhilarating, heady feeling of unity with students on this campus and a feeling that you ~~were linked~~ to students on other campuses. There ~~was~~ undoubtedly that. I think that is very important to note because not only was that an impetus for what happened here, ~~and~~ something which motivated people and propelled the action, but it ~~is~~ brings up something that I think is essential to recognize, and that is that much of what happened was self-indulgent. Now, I don't mean to belittle it in saying that because I think nevertheless everything that was done was necessary. I don't mean to speak in such

vague terms. When I say "everything" I guess I mean the letter-writing campaign, the speeches, strikes, demonstrations, the sit-ins, the talks, the letters to the editor, the editorials, everything The Flat Hat ~~runs~~ was -- and many people objected to that at the time. It was extremely controversial. Everything any student did anyplace, I think, was right and needed to be done. I make that a very blanket kind of approval still. ~~because, well,~~ I recently read a very interesting article in Harper's, the January 1976 issue, I think. It was called " Silence on Campus" by a professor in California, and he was talking about how he dislikes the present environment--students who are ~~were~~ apathetic---how he much preferred the days when students were enraged, despite the excesses of the time, he said. And that really caught me because I believe there were no excesses. I firmly believe that, ~~and it's because~~ one of the things that united students was a terrible frustration in the face of apparent insanity on the part of the government and policies in general--things which could not be explained rationally and which were intolerable. Of course, students are a young bunch and inexperienced at dealing with this. ~~of~~

s it

I

~~felt in those times, but at any rate,~~ I think that students generally felt helpless and frustrated and angry ~~in~~ and wanted

~~wanting~~ to express that. You want to leave your imprint on things. So in the face of that how can you possibly say that some things were in excess? I don't believe so. The total impact of those years I think has altered the course of the country. Those feelings could not be ignored. That's the important thing. So at any rate, I think that you're talking about the rights of students uniting students —

The rights of students were not the only issues. Winn, I believe, was perhaps zeroing in on a consciousness that was there to be ~~explained~~ exploited at the time. It's part of the movement that's, I think, culminating in the great consumer awareness now. What are my rights? that's something that used to be ignored. People didn't ask those kinds of questions. But in the '60s, with civil rights, people began asking those questions, and it bit by bit extended to every part of life. Now there's not one thing you can name about which those questions have not been asked, and I think that's a very healthy thing. When I was in school, I guess before I came [to W&M] -- I came in 1969 and I graduated in January of 1973. When I came the Flat Hat was in the habit of printing a certain essay by a college professor (not here), but I'm sure you're familiar with it -- "The Student As Nigger". That was printed with regularity, and it was an inspiration to people because it put an entirely new perspective on

being a student. It's the student versus ~~espirete~~ authority. "What are my rights as an individual in this situation when I am subject to the authority of the college?" This school was a very interesting school to be at during this time because the authority and the tradition of the college of William and Mary is such that it was perhaps more difficult to rail against than at some other school. Maybe that's not true, but I think the environment here -- the atmosphere -- the tradition, all of that -- the general quiet of Williamsburg made it very much like waging a war in a fish bowl, or ~~and~~ treading water. This sense of unity with other students was a product of stories read in newspapers and what happened in newspapers, watching the news on television, and perhaps most of all a feeling of intuition -- what other students were going through. ~~Because~~ here in Williamsburg you don't have much contact with other students. One of the things that was happening at that time is that there was ~~no~~ an attempt in Virginia to get students together, united on different campuses. I was involved in that, and this is the first time I've ~~felt~~ thought about it in some time. I can't remember. I think it was the Union of Virginia Students we were trying to establish. We had a meeting or two here, and we had a meeting at Virginia Tech. Students from Old Dominion, from here, from U. Va., from Tech -- it looked promising for a while, but I think as with a lot of things it started to fizzle in the fall of 1970. We were still making some

attempts at that point. There were some meetings that year, but by the second semester there were some people from Tech who were graduating, and it began to loose momentum. It became apparent, I think, that the whole movement was loosing momentum. The reasons for that are very interesting, ~~but I won't go into that.~~ we'll go into that if you want to.

Williams: I would like to let me ask you about this union -- was it something of a feeling of wanting reinforcement, that "other students in other colleges stand for what I stand for?"

Edwards: ~~The very act~~ There was that, but it was really directed at this idea of rights of students because in Virginia the educational policies are set at the state level and of course by the individual schools ~~and~~ at each school it seemed students had so many problems and rules they objected to -- there was so much to be done that it made sense to form a lobby ~~and~~ we intended to get together, express all our grievances, work out possible solutions, present them in coherent, articulate form in the places where ~~it~~ they would count the most. We thought in the legislature and before the boards of trustees. The whole idea of the movement and of various movements now (for instance, the consumer movement) is to first and foremost make a noise about your problem. You have to express it and get it out in front of ~~you~~ people. You can't expect the powers that be to give you something out of the goodness of their hearts; it doesn't work that way. Often times I think they will come

around if only they are well versed on what your problems are and your feelings and just how important it is to you. -- The fact that you aren't making a noise just for the sake of making it, but that you are expressing yourself on something, you have to point up a problem and you have to convince someone that it is worth pursuing and changing. That was the whole idea of it.

Williams: It's a complex period. As your talking, I'm thinking ~~that~~ we could speak of the Statement of Rights and Responsibilities and the rules at William and Mary -- ~~and~~ these things -- did they trigger this feeling here at William and Mary, do you think? Or could you isolate what the triggering issues were? The war, obviously, on a national scale.

Edwards: Right. Okay. But you raise a very good point because the times in which there were demonstrations, obvious group manifestations of this unity, this feeling -- those times were when there were local issues to trigger that feeling. Now the most important one, of course, was the suspension of four students in 1970. They were found -- two women were found with two men in a men's dormitory. They were suspended immediately, and that sparked incredible rage on the campus. ~~And~~ it was true anger, and it ~~did~~ not only encompass those people who were viewed as being on the left side of things, but it also touched the Greek system, ~~and~~ people were furious about this, feeling that here was the concrete issue in which the students' behavior was being -- well, of

course, it was a matter of legislating morality. And it was "student as nigger" or student as human being; that's what it amounted to. that was the issue, the crux of it. As a result there was a demonstration in James Blair Hall, and the ~~newspaper~~ Daily Press underestimated the number of people involved. the newspaper article I brought says there were sixty-five students. That's ridiculous; there were about three or four hundred students, many of whom were sitting inside. The rest were outside. That was a funny situation because people were furious. They wanted those students back in; they wanted the rules changed. It had come to a point -- you can't rail against national policies, ~~pit~~ pick apart the gavernment, and at the same time ignore what's happening to you on your own campus and the ways people are hemming you in and making you adhere to rules which don't have any good foundation, any reasonable explanation, ~~and~~ in the face of that you can only voice your strong objections; you can only rebell. So that's what was going on. And I remember that night as a feeling of tremendous unity on the campus. It was also a very bizarre evening. It started out with a few speeches in James Blair Hall, and people started to sit-in. There was never any question of violence; that did not enter into it. It was a peaceful protest, although certainly the papers blew it way out of proportion. ~~And~~ the campus police turned out and the state police ---oh, there were

state police all over the place! They were everywhere. Then we went inside and sat down and completely filled the bottom part of James Blair. There was no room to walk. Somebody came in selling hot dogs. (There were ~~only~~ always a few people out to capitalize on the situation.) A lot of these things that happened had great spirit of camaraderie. They were fun and don't let anybody kid you about that. The issues were serious, but there was something very thrilling and heady about being together in a group situation. (I say ~~think about~~ that in retrospect. It may be something I wouldn't have admitted to at the time.) I remember Mr. Lambert came in and Carson Barnes. (Mr. Lambert was dean of students at that time; it was before he was vice-president. Carson Barnes was dean of men.) They came in and they ~~would~~ talk to students, the students would listen for a while and then outshout them. There was no stopping it once it got started. ~~The funny part was that at 11:00, the campus cops came around and they locked up the doors to James Blair and put chains on them just like they always do at 11:00, despite the fact that there were about 200 students and a couple of prominent college administrators there inside. I remember Mr. Lambert and Carson Barnes knocking on the door to be let out.~~

Williams: At that point what was the student view of Dean Lambert? He seems to have been the trouble shooter in the administration.

Edwards: I recall the phrase "the power behind the throne". Paschall was hardly ever to be seen. I never saw Paschall but from a distance of fifty yards, smoking his corncob pipe. Lambert was the one who was visible, always at convocations; he was the one who would speak to Flat Hat reporters. He was a troubleshooter. I think he handled the whole thing extremely well, actually. I didn't realize it at the time because in my freshman year I didn't know him at all; ~~and~~ I only knew his reputation, and I knew that everyone had a tremendous antipathy towards college administrators, and he was considered to be one of the policy setters, and therefore he was one of those to be ~~appraised~~ opposed — whether or not there were grounds for it. He had a difficult situation ~~right then~~ on his hands. But the college really did some stupid things during that time. There's no question about it. ~~There was a time~~ In my freshman year, ~~a sit-in~~ following this demonstration at James Blair Hall there were several sit-ins in the dormitories, such as the Bryan Complex. There was a sit-in there. ~~People~~ Women sat-in there -- people from other dormitories. It was open rebellion against the college policy restricting activities of the opposite sex. ~~And the college went through and demanded.~~ Representatives of the college went through the Bryan Complex demanding students' ~~ID~~ i.d. cards. They were taking away students' ~~ID~~ i.d. cards; they were suspending the students. There were ten or eleven, I can't remember -- do you know?

Please insert:
I later came to understand that Mr. Lambert was so successful and enduring as an administrator because he always — even in the face of rapid and incomprehensible change — respected individuals as persons and treated them accordingly. We are speaking of a time in which the behavior of students was alien and frightening to those of his generation — and he never lost his balance or his wits.

Williams: The dorm-in?

Edwards: Yes.

Williams: Ten, I believe.

Edwards: Uh, huh -- who were suspended, including an English student -- an exchange student. That was an infuriating thing. And that was typical of the reaction of authority of all types to students of that period: they strong-armed students. They would not listen. Students, on the other hand, made it very difficult to listen. It was such a clash of tactics, That's true, but then there was a point to the clash of tactics. And of course college policies were so unbelievably restrictive! You know, now, despite the apathy of students on campuses everywhere, I think very few students would put up with the kinds of regulations that were here during that time. When I was a freshman the curfew for women -- there was no curfew for men -- curfew for women was at 11:00, it had been 10:00 the year before I came. There even had been restrictions a couple of years before I came -- in 1969 in dress; women were not permitted to wear pants or shorts. If they wore shorts they had to wear a raincoat over them. It was unbelieveable! I just cannot imagine it.

But women's curfew was at 11:00. You had to get special permission in order to be late. If you wanted to stay out overnight you had to sign a card which not only said you were going to be gone, but where you were going to be, who you were going to be with, their address, their phone number, when you were going to be back; I think you may have had to put a reason for leaving. It was incredible! We were really treated as a group as if we were not adults, had no integrity, had no responsibility for ourselves. And I think the fact of the matter is that if you rob people of their responsibilities for taking care of themselves or making decisions for themselves they are going to suffer in the long run. They are not going to learn how to take care of themselves. Just think of the terrific contrast there was. Here you have the college as an institution. Theoretically you are supposed to go through these four years and then be prepared to cope with the outside world. You are going to go on and do something of significance with your life. That is the theory of it. You're bettering yourself. If you are treated as a child, especially during a time when you as a citizen are trying to express yourself on matters of vital importance to this country, when you are concerned with moral issues -- and to be treated as a child! You can see how that spanked rage, and how the suspension of students could trigger almost anything. The college administrators were

With the Vietnam War at high pitch, there was a sense of the proximity of death. Men were worried about the draft. Both men and women were attuned to the senselessness of war and killing. It seemed "the system" was telling everyone when and why to kill and to die – and also how to live each moment of the day.

aware of that. That they could have very easily had a riot on their hands. It was that close. But the students of William and Mary are first and foremost a very practical group, and I don't ~~remember~~ recall many people ever broaching the subject of true violence. I do recall it, but it didn't happen very often, And those people were ~~not listened to very carefully~~ disregarded. The chief problem of those times, I think, on this campus and other campuses was the fact that you had rage --Everyone knew that--You had rage, and it was growing. You had it in front of you. The question was what to do with it? It's not very surprising that some of the ways in which rage was used were ineffective ways, were threatening ways, were self-defeating ways. Because when you have something like that, it's immediate; ~~and~~ it can't be ignored, and you must do something with it. You have to channel it. It is not the kind of thing that lends itself to waiting. And on the whole I think the students here handled it pretty well.

Williams: Would you say -- now this harkens back to something you said about the articles, about the people in the sit-in in '69. I know very well from that period there were a number of people, say, of my parents' generation, your parents' generation, who said, "Well, it's just a small minority who are just making a great fuss". Can you identify how widespread this feeling was?

Edwards: I'm glad you asked that. I wanted to -- I started to work this in a few times before as I was talking. In all my statements about how students felt and their rage

and so forth I'm not talking about the whole campus. I would say it was about 50-50 in terms of life styles. Fifty percent of the campus was attuned to what was going on at other campuses, was actively looking outside this community, was experimenting, ~~I would~~ let's say. And I mean that in all senses: with behavior, with drugs, with thinking -- all kinds of ways. The other fifty percent of the campus was extremely traditional, and their concerns were traditional; they were very self-oriented, just as students are now. I think you can draw that distinction in the late '60s and early '70s; the students ~~who made the impression~~ in the student movement, ~~the movement that we're talking about, those students~~ were other-oriented. The students now seem to be more self-oriented. Although there are always students like that and I'd say fully half the campus was concerned with Greek affairs, football games, with parties and drinking beer, ~~and yet~~ the interesting thing was that the activities of the other half of the campus affected those students dramatically. It came up in classrooms because professors picked up on all of this, of course. Professors lent a great hand to the movement. There were professors who gave a great deal of their free time to conduct seminars on the issues of importance to students. So it came up in the classroom; it came up in course assignments, in class discussions, in many, many things that happened in the academic life of the college, and it also came up in the social part for the other half as well.

Could you say to what extent the professors supported the movement?

Did you feel that only the younger faculty members were in support?

How do you think the faculty in general felt about those of their number supporting students?

About professors —

I didn't mean to suggest that professors endorsed a specific slate of stands on issues - (or students either, for that matter!) I mean that during that period there was a general awakening to the world outside the campus and to the world of the campus itself. People asked themselves how they should feel about things, and set about informing themselves. It was my impression that professors were delighted with the attitude of 'seeking' they found among students. It was conducive to discussion, to learning. The process of questioning is the process of learning.

Many professors incorporated this into their courses: they assigned books, for example, which stimulated questioning and underscored the other-orientation of their students. Among those books were Future Shock by Alvin Toffler (I had that in a business course), The Population Bomb by Paul Ehrlich, Native Son by James Baldwin, The Trial of the Catonsville Nine by Daniel Berrigan; Nuremberg and Vietnam: An American Tragedy by Telford Taylor; The Feminine Mystique by Betty Friedan; and many others.

Students were urged to write papers about the causes that moved them, or the literature or poetry that appealed

to them. A number of students wrote analyses of the songs of Bob Dylan.

Then, too, several professors took active part in demonstrations (which were always quite peaceful) and panel discussions on the issues of the time. I remember a sociology professor taking the mike and addressing a crowd of 500 or so in the Sunken Gardens after the murders at Kent State. There was a history professor who often spoke on panels and at rallies on American foreign policy. Actually I remember quite a few of them — and they were not all young.

I have no idea how the older, conservative faculty members reacted.

Except in one case - A young woman psychology instructor was a very militant, outspoken feminist. She questioned policies openly in faculty meeting, and met with much opposition. After 1970 she transferred to Richmond College on Long Island and became involved in very radical politics. I believe she was angry when she left, but I don't know the circumstances.

Just talking about drugs--I suppose we're going to get into this at some point.

Williams: Yes, we may as well.

Edwards: Drugs were not the exclusive domain of the half of the campus which was active in the student movement. Drugs also made tremendous inroads, I mean tremendous inroads into the other half I've been talking about (the beer party, football game, Greek half). I remember some incredible experiences. There were very few times I went into fraternity houses when I was a student here. Most of those times would have been my freshman year, ~~when I was going through a lot of changes.~~ And at that time I knew more people in the fraternity complex. ~~There was a time in the spring of my~~

P. 15 omitted at Ms. Edwards's request.

EJW

~~things like harder drugs.~~ the harder drugs. Well there was some heroin on campus, but very, very little. And there were some fraternity people, a couple, I think, who were addicted to heroin. It was a very sad thing. But there were hallucinogens; there was an awful lot of marijuana and hashish.

Williams: Was it easy to get?

Edwards: Yes, very easy to get. And quite a bit of speed. People who wouldn't use any other kind of drug used a lot of speed to do their work. So there was that. Now drugs began being very current around that time. Maybe the year before -- in '68 -- drugs really got a foothold on the campus. By the time I got there I know that drugs had quite a foothold, and it increased through that year.

Williams: And maintained it the four years you were here?

Edwards: Yes. For sure. But there was a trend away from hallucinogens and toward marijuana and moderate drinking of wine and beer. (That was also reported in Time magazine as a national trend.) I saw things change quite a bit while I was there, because when I first arrived, of course, there were all those restrictive regulations ~~and~~ people were very ~~exce~~ accepting at first of that, especially young college women on campus. For the first time they were much more acquiescent to blind authority, I think. A lot of people went ahead and ~~signed~~ for example filled out those overnight cards accurately and completely. But by the end of the year people were

signing out to outrageous places, or there was a rebellion of that sort. And the housemothers didn't know what to do about it, so they had to ~~go on and~~ more or less leave ~~us~~ it alone. ~~Then through the rest of my years there until~~ finally things were changed toward the end of my junior year and at the beginning of my senior year. Finally those regulations bit the dust. But before that, every night people would rip off the cards that you had to turn to signify that you were in the dormitory for the night. You had a blue side that signified you were out; then there was a white side that signified you were in. So you had to come in every night. The housemother would check it and so forth to see who was out and who was in. Well, those things would be stolen, and you would find them in the attic of the dormitory or in the trash baskets or cut up or --- and all kinds of things ~~were~~ used ~~or dented as~~ to be done to those cards. People would write things on the back of them or draw pictures, have notes of protest on the back. I don't think that the issue can be exaggerated. Those regulations were a sore point on this campus, and it undercut the authority of the administration tremendously. It was a wedge that the students could use, and the students used it to the hilt, as they should have, I believe. The administration as a whole did not react intelligently to the problem, ~~part of that~~ in all fairness, the administrators have much more to think about than gratifying the students or even concocting intelligent policy for

Emily, I wish I had stressed this more.... Administrators did have a lot more to think about than the way students were discovering their own adulthood.

In most of this conversation I am relating the students' attitudes as I saw them, and I did not attempt to put the whole thing in perspective. I guess the point I was trying to make is just that from the student point of view, these feelings of outrage had not been expressed before and it was felt that anything short of violence was justified in the service of expressing those views. Naturally a great deal of immaturity came into play.

the college. They had to respond to the Board of Visitors, which was extremely conservative, and to the alumni. The Board of Visitors itself was something. From my very first year students were agitating for a place on the Board of Visitors, which we never got. We wanted at first just to -- eventually we did ask for actual student representation, voting representation on the board. At first we started out just wanting a student to be present. We had great difficulty in even securing an invitation from the Board of Visitors for students to attend a meeting and ~~ask~~ answer questions -- great difficulty. You know, there was a woman on the Board of Visitors who was so reactionary and narrow-minded that it defies the imagination. I was part of a group of students -- this was -- I can't remember if this was my sophmore year or my junior year. I believe it was the end of my sophmore year, and I had just been elected to junior ~~vice~~ class president for the following year, that's what it was. It was in the springtime, and there was a group of six or seven students who had been chosen to go into see the Board of Visitors. When we walked in, this woman got up and walked out. She would have none of us. She was incredible. There was a person on the board named Roger Hull who was young and very attuned to the concerns of students and yet ~~he~~ who could deal effectively with administrators and the other members of the board. Roger was the saving grace of the board in the students' eyes, and there was another woman on the board at the time, her first name was Nancy.

Williams: Mrs. Falck?

Edwards: Nancy Falck, yes that's right. She lent a sympathetic ear. There was Blake Newton, who almost became president of the college. It was an eleventh-hour decision, I understand, to get Graves. And he [Newton] also was fairly sympathetic. The rest as I recall were not to anything students wanted to do.

How much did the students know of this contest? Not much.

Williams: How about Harvey Chappell?

Edwards: He had the reputation for being very conservative, and he was called a "no vote". When student leaders sat down to work out the board, it was "yes votes," "swing votes," and "no votes." He was a "no vote".

Williams: So ~~The~~ communication could have been better with the board, and you think the thing that would have ~~really~~ made it better was student representation on the board?

Edwards: Oh, yes. That was an ideal, of course; We realized that. but we wanted to get our say. It was a matter of putting our case before people who could hear ~~here~~ it. Students had been ignored as thinking members of the community, And we simply wanted to express ourselves in matters that affected our own lives. We were contributing members of the community; We weren't just parasites. We felt that we should be considered responsible members and should be permitted to have a say. That was what it was all about. We had the hardest time getting one inch of the way with anybody.

Ideally we wanted a voting member on the board. Barring that, we wanted a non-voting student member. And if that were not forthcoming, we wanted a channel of regular communication with the Board.

Williams: Do you think the board was dealing realistically with what

the situation was here on this campus or any other campus?

Edwards: I don't think so, but then people of that generation and that mind-set were so schooled to believe that students and other people in the society are there to be manipulated -- that's the wrong term -- I don't mean to say that ~~but~~ because I don't honestly believe they ~~saw~~ thought of it in those terms. I mean that "students are there to respond to what we tell them to do. They ~~are~~ have to hop to it. You don't listen for a student's point of view. ~~They can~~ I think they thought that they could simply shut us out. They gave us the silent treatment . when we did bring issues before them and when things happened on this campus that they had to deal with, I think that they attempted to use the same method, and I don't think that that is realistic at all. They didn't realize at the time, ~~but~~ that this was not simply a short-term, spur-of-the-moment, shorting out of the campuses. People I think held the view that campuses were shorting out all over the country, unpredictably and spontaneously, and that it would all go away. ~~And since~~ In a sense it went away, but it left an ~~injurious~~ enduring effect. Students will no longer take the same kind of crap that they had to take. On the whole I think that the board -- the board was paranoid about what was happening, and they overreacted; when they weren't resisting any action at all, they overreacted. There was a member of the board, I don't recall which one -- my freshman year -- I was not at this meeting of the Board of Visitors, but it was reported in the Flat Hat and I talked with a number of students who were there.

The issue was (again) allowing visitation in the dormitories, And this guy stood up and with tears rolling down his cheeks talked about moral turpitude and moral degeneration at William and Mary and how he was not going to allow it to happen. he talked about "marriaguana" I believe is how he pronounced it. They were operating out of ignorance, and they simply didn't have enough ~~info.~~ input. We were trying to give them that input, and they wouldn't have it. That was too much of a concession for them to make. You know, I suppose you've come across the "Bateman issue" at the time.

Williams: Yes.

Edwards: Okay. That was about visitation--

Williams: and moral turpitude.

Edwards: Yes, and moral turpitude; he used that phrase. Senator Herb Bateman -- he actually introduced a resolution in the state legislature to prohibit visitation in the dormitories. Now, he visited here himself. He was invited by the young Democrats to speak. This must have been -- I get my years confused -- this must have been my sophmore year (1971). Anyway, he came and talked to the Young Democrats, and people asked him a lot of questions. ~~I remember I stood up and~~

It was very clear to us that it was a campaign issue for Herb Bateman. he was really on the bandwagon and people were jumping on it faster than you could even count. People loved it on the peninsula. The alumni, the parents -- it really tapped the paranoia of that time. So Bateman was a hated figure on this campus, let me tell you, and during that same period Saul Alinsky was invited to come and speak. Saul Alinsky was a hero to students. We loved what he said. I remember I went up to pick him up at the airport with a couple of other students. On the way back to the college he asked us what was going on on the campus, and we told him about Bateman. We also told him about another issue at the time -- I'll get into it in a second. But he really picked up on those two things, and when he addressed the students that night in the ballroom of the Campus Center (it was so jammed with students there was hardly any standing room; everybody turned out that could fit in), he really condemned Bateman. One of Bateman's objections -- it was not just visitation, it was to the use of obscenities in the college newspaper. (This is the other issue I mentioned.) In February of 1971, The Flat Hat published on its front page an article with the headline, "Student Senate Bullshits; Holds C. of S." (C. of S. stood for community of students, which was a

proposal to replace the student association. It was an idea ~~phonated~~ fomented by Winn Legerton and some other people. Unfortunately it collapsed. It was a pretty good idea, but it collapsed.) Winn had made the comment casually after the meeting, when a reporter went up and asked her what she thought about the student senate inaction on the thing ~~and she said~~ "I think they're just bullshitting," or something to that effect. And the reporter used it in the headline. Well, that was irresponsible on the part of The Flat Hat, we later acknowledged. It shouldn't have been in the headlines, although it had a place in the story. Well, that inflamed people beyond belief, And Bateman really picked up on that. He distributed copies of The Flat Hat in the state legislature. There were attempts to cut off funds to The Flat Hat through the college.

Williams: Dr. Paschall must have been jumping up and down.

Edwards: Yes, he was. W. Roy Smith, delegate from Petersburg, ~~delegate~~ head of the appropriations committee in the house [of Delegates] and an alumnus, I believe.

Williams: I'm not real sure.

Edwards: I'm not sure, either, but I sort of think he was. He was furious, and he was heading up this effort to cut off funds. The merchants in Merchants' Square in Williamsburg withdrew their advertising, even Blaine of Blaine Cinemas -- that was the only theatre in town -- (there were only two theatres in town) ~~the only theatre in town~~ showing soft core pornogra-

~~on and on until something happened~~. Fortunately the people in Merchants' Square changed their minds after a couple of weeks or so. The paper didn't die, but there was a question of it -- there was really a danger of its dying there for awhile.

Williams: Maybe I should ask could the student association have ever become the publisher? This could have come up.

Edwards: The college could have ~~exploited~~ thwarted it, if it had chosen to, because the college owned all those machines and the college---

Williams: And all the fees of the Student Association, too.

Edwards: Certainly we were determined. I was on The Flat Hat staff at the time, and we were determined to put out that paper no matter what. Even if it meant mimeographing -- we were going to do that. Fortunately, it didn't come to that. We had to cut down the size of the paper for a few issues, as I recall, because we just didn't have the ads. But it built back up again. We lost some $8000 on that.

Williams: In that period would you say The Flat Hat was leading student opinion? or were they reflecting what the students were thinking? You ~~know~~ made the comment -- I don't know if the recorder was on or not -- that The Flat Hat was really -- some of the things about The Flat Hat were very controversial.

Edwards: Yes. I think The Flat Hat did not reflect the opinions of the majority of students. It reflected the opinions of that portion of the campus -- forty to fifty percent -- who were up to the left of center, I think, or oriented there or at least

accepting those view points. It was not at all representative, and there were many, many objections to that. Again I don't see anything wrong with it. I think that it was a healthy thing. It was an outlet. The Flat Hat office became a center for all kinds of activity. It was a strike office during the spring. Oh, there were a lot of things. ~~The Flat Hat became ---- people attacked it~~ The Flat Hat was a symptom of the times. People attacked it as a cause, as a root cause, and it was not. So all of their attacks at The Flat Hat were ineffectual. They weren't hitting at anything, they weren't addressing themselves to the problem. There were several attempts at establishing alternative papers from the conservative viewpoint. One of them, of course, was the College Observer, which gave an entirely different picture of the campus than The Flat Hat did. Practically every issue dealt with R.O.T.C., the Circle K Club, and the debate team and that was about it. The Flat Hat hardly ever covered any of this. Then there was Excalibur, that was another attempt. I don't remember how many issues of Excalibur there were. There were at least two, maybe three or four, and it was also very conservative. There was a group called Young Americans for Freedom on campus, ~~I suppose there were~~ composed of about a dozen guys, and they would occasionally stage protests in front of The Flat Hat office.

Williams: Getting back to something you had started at the beginning; ~~was~~ this sense of malaise that you wrote about in The Flat Hat in '70. You talked about this heady feeling, I guess culminating in the spring of '70. Is that right? ~~About~~ By the

fall of '70, you wrote this column that there was sort of a driftless feeling that students had. Did you find this continued on into '73, or was it just that the spring of '70 had been such a high point that nothing could top it?

Edwards: It was both. It was difficult to top the spring of 1970. People were just consumed by all kinds of conflicting emotions. It was not just a heady feeling at the time. There was a strong and true rage against what was happening, and there was very great sorrow and a feeling of ~~human~~ frustration and helplessness, the ~~fact~~ feeling that nothing you were doing was having any effect at all, coupled with the impatience that was a condition. So there was a summer of cooling off, I guess. Some students who had participated in protests in the spring went to help various candidates in the elections that fall. The candidates didn't win. After that the spirit generally collapsed. The anti-war protests continued throughout, but it didn't have the same -- it's difficult for me to make generalizations here because, you see, in the year from '69 to '70 there were so many campus issues which contributed to the rage generally felt about what was going on in this country; in subsequent years there were fewer of those issues to contribute. So whether or not I can say that feelings dimmed on these national concerns or whether it was the fact that student issues themselves were less inflammatory, I don't know.

Williams: You really couldn't separate them, I wouldn't think.

Edwards: No, I can't. It's very difficult to untangle all of this stuff. I've had a hard time with it; I've been spending a lot of time on it, and I can't untangle it all. But I do know that when students returned that fall I think it wasn't so much apathy that settled in at all. Apathy is not really the right term. It was a feeling of helplessness; it was resignation. There was one student I talked to -- I quoted him in that story. I think his statement sticks in my mind more than anything else because it expressed the hope that still lingered that things would still boil again. ~~He said~~ I asked him if he thought this silence would continue or if it was just temporary, and he said, "it's just a half time, I think. It's just a half time. It's just a brief time-out, and then we are going to come back again." But the students never came back again, not in the same way, not with that same coordinated, fierce effort. Now in 1971 -- I'll just check the date on this -- 1971 was the year of the "Counter-Conference". That was when Nixon came to address some sort of judicial conference in Williamsburg at the Lodge, I think. The students realized it and staged a counter conference with many radical leaders. Rennie Davis, Allen Ginsberg, representatives of the Student Mobilization Committee, the United Farm Workers, the Vietnam Vets Against the War, there were a couple of Black Panthers, the National Welfare Rights Organization -- those were the chief ones. Things like that kept happening.

It wasn't as though it had stopped after 1970 in the spring. It kept on, and in fact in the spring of 1971 was the May Day thing. That was called the "Days of Rage". That was when Rennie Davis and his followers went to D.C. and stopped cars in the streets and protested. So all that was still going on. I think basically the sentiments of the students ~~was~~ were unchanged. It's just that something had been taken out of the movement. It had lost momentum, but all of the elements were still there. It's difficult to explain. I don't think it was that people considered those issues less important at all. It was just general -- that was where the term malaise came up-- there was no way to really explain it, except in terms of malaise. And how do you explain malaise? Malaise can have a lot of causes, and it can mean a lot of different things. It didn't necessarily mean disinterest at all. So as for why things changed on the campus --I think it was that ~~tremendously~~ ~~the~~ spring of 1971 was an enervating experience, and people -- their energy was sapped. And then coming back after the elections, which were dismal, we felt, "what else is there to do? We tried open revolt. We tried proper channels. What else is there?" When you're impatient to begin with, and you haven't yet gotten out in the world and tasted it, and you aren't very cynical and don't have a particularly accurate perspective on things, you throw up your hands. So that's what happened there. The silence continued, ~~and~~ one thing -- this is perhaps not germane to my years on campus, but it must be

said someplace. One thing I felt keenly and I know other people did was that after the draft was ended, that took what was left out of the anti-war movement. The war was still going on, but the anti-war movement ended for all practical purposes, and there were those of us who really resented that. As soon as the men didn't have to go to war -- forget it; the war was no longer an issue. And there were a lot of women who were left high and dry in that. The leaders of the anti-war movement for the most part were men. Partly that's because the draft was such an obvious issue to seize upon. The other part was that especially when this whole student movement began in the late '60s, the men were very chauvinistic, and they would not allow women to take a role in it. ~~The leaders -- even~~

[redacted]

Women comprised a great number of the followers and had done most of the leg work and women were the ones who were writing the letters, participating in and lending their help and feeling very committed to the whole thing, so when the draft ended and the men quit-- I mean, that left a lot of bitter feelings. You wonder about the sincerity of people

who acted in that fashion. So there for the record is that point.

Williams: As conditions [and] rules began to be less strict at William and Mary did that pull away some of the support? Now that leads me into ~~the~~ this time when you were in the B.S.A. [Board of Student Affairs] because the year you were chairman, a lot of these rules went by the board. Do you feel that that pulled some of the life out-- ~~that~~ perhaps there wasn't so much to rail against?

Edwards: Yes, I think that's true. Now there are two things at work there. One is that I think the persistent efforts of the students to get those rules changed ~~--- if~~ and the fact that changes were going on on other campuses all across the country contributed to a breaking down of the authority rationalizations for those mindless rules. And the rules were changed. ¶ The other thing which is important is that President Graves came. Now that is very important, because with Paschall it was so apparent to students -- an audience with Paschall was impossible. You could not get his ear for anything. He was committed to another way, another time. He really dated from a period in Virginia history that at one time was -- Paschall's mind-set, his background, and so forth was what Virginia was for about fifty years. But at this point it was no longer; it was moving out. The whole thing had opened up, and Paschall was out of date, and he could not cope. Paschall was probably one of the greatest -- through his

inaction and his just failure to plug into the issues at the time, he was a great impetus to everything that happened on this campus.

Williams: I was going to ask was he an issue himself?

Edwards: Yes, he was. He was a symbol. It wasn't what he said; it was what he didn't say and the fact that you had no access. He was the symbol of authority. Lambert was the visible one, but Paschall, of course, being the president of the college -- the logical symbol ~~and~~ he just confirmed everything students suspected. Just like Nixon. So there was that. Now I was on a student search committee for the president. There was a student committee, and I'm sure it was just a token thing, ~~And~~ but people were very polite to us, and they seemed to listen to what we were saying. Winn Legerton and I think Bob ~~Williamson~~ Ranson, who was vice-president of the S.A. under her, were on the actual search committee, but there was a student search committee below that, and Bob and Winn headed up that student search committee of about eight people or so. . . we were permitted to interview the top ten candidates. We were requested to give evaluations. We took our duties very seriously, and we wrote up elaborate evaluations on everyone. There was another candidate from New York; I can't remember his name now, but he seemed to be very, very liberal. And here he had come from New York! He was a worldly person. Williamsburg can be a very claustrophobic community. Ivory tower -- I think the term was invented here. And here he

came, and it was so refreshing. The students liked him immensely. His wife, however, openly expressed the fact that Williamsburg would be quite a change from what she was used to in New York-- a very active cultural life, a lot of variety, and the hustle and bustle of New York, and so I think that may have been a strike against him. But he was an obvious favorite for his opinions and so forth. However, after we meant Graves we actually sat down and decided that while this New York person more accurately reflected our points of view, Graves would be more effective in dealing with the legislature, the Board of Visitors, etc. we were very impressed with Graves. Graves is an extremely good listener. Can you imagine the contrast between Graves and Paschall on that point? He seemed sincere. He made intelligent comments. He was not afraid to say, "I don't know the answer to that". And he would sincerely inquire. He was very impressive, and so was his wife.

Williams: What sort of things did you ask them -- like hypothetical situations-- like what would you do if there was a sit-in in James Blair-- would that be the sort of thing?

Edwards: Yes. I wish I could remember the specific questions. We asked him, I'm sure, his opinion of policies, about student participation. Student participation was the big thing. "Will you listen to us," is what we were asking, and he said, "yes, I will listen to you." he made pledges and he made suggestions for meeting with student leaders and not just student leaders. We liked that point very much. He was

interested in meeting casually over lunch with any student who wanted to talk to him. He would make time, he said. He also seemed to be a person who thought logically and rationally. He could come up with good, intelligent reasons for the way he thought, even if we didn't come up with the same opinions we could appreciate his reasoning. That was a great selling point. When we got down to making our final recommendations after seeing most of the candidates, we actually put: First choice - Thomas A. Graves, Second choice - blank, Third choice - we had the guy from New York. We felt so strongly we didn't even want anybody being construed as being a close second to him. I don't know how heavily that weighed in the ultimate decision, it may not have weighed at all, but that was how we felt, and of course, it was a very wise thing to have had a student search committee, because those students who were on it were motivated types who were involved in many different sectors of the campus and took back the good word, so to speak, about Graves. And he had quite a honeymoon when he came here. People gave him the benefit of the doubt all over the place.

Williams: The Flat Hat seemed to, too.

Edwards: Yes. People were just so encouraged. We couldn't believe that something good had happened. And he bore us out for the most part. In ~~And for~~ that year (my junior year, '71-'72) that was when I was head of the B.S.A., and that was Graves's

first year as President and he gave us a lot of his time. He would meet with students regularly, always ready to listen. However, there were some clashes with the B.S.A. The B.S.A. was revising its by-laws and wanted to have authority over student regulations-- wanted to have decision-making power instead of just recommending power, and Graves put us off. He said that eventually he could see that happening, but in view of the Board of Visitors and the legislature and this and that it couldn't be done right then. We tried; we really tried. We presented our case. I think we presented a very strong, well-reasoned case. ~~It wasn't~~ We weren't just asking for it out of hand. ~~It~~ There was a lot of thought that went into it; a lot of discussion. We didn't get it, and the B.S.A. still hasn't got it, but we tried anyhow. It got people thinking. The other big issue we got into the finances of the college; the B.S.A. really asserted itself that year. Bob English was vice-president for financial affairs. ~~He was very much like~~ He had come out of the same school as Paschall. He didn't want to give the students anything if he could avoid it because it was not their place to ask for it. That was his general frame of mind. The B.S.A. had the hardest time getting any kind of answer out of him on any questions. Eventually we had to complain to Graves about it, and Graves got on him, and we did get some answers, but it took constant pressure. It took months. We started on this around October. I don't

I believe that students were beginning to get a handle on their emotions, were maybe growing up a bit. It was very clear that things are accomplished through the established channels, and that rational dialogue was the necessary prerequisite to that. The students of William and Mary were more than willing to try the reasoned approach.

think we got any answers, any readout of, for example, the athletic fees (where the money was going) until March. I remember I was writing letters all the time, and ~~I still have~~ some place at home I have a whole folder just jammed with copies of letters to Graves and to English pleading for some kind of response. It was English who was holding it up. At least on the surface he was the one who was holding it up; I think he was. Well, when we got that athletic fee breakdown-- just where our money was going, everyone had anticipated ~~where they~~ women were getting a small cut, but the actual figures were shocking. Women were getting nothing by comparison to what men were getting. ~~I'd always been~~ It evolved into an affirmative action complaint eventually, though I think it had its roots in that year.

Williams: You've given the example of the fees, your feeling was that the B.S.A. was the logical place for students to make policy for students-- is that right?

Edwards: Yes. We had a good representation on the B.S.A. There were class presidents and also in that year (1971) the student association voted to abolish all class presidents but the senior class president. After that it was much more democratic, class. So there was that. There was the Student Association President, the President of the Honor Council, each one [men's and women's]. Then there were the administrators.

Williams: Yes. How did that situation work out? Did it become an issue you could say "yes votes were the students and "no votes were the administrators or the other way around?

Edwards: No. It really didn't work that way. We had a very agreeable

board on the whole. Dean Barnes was not very agreeable. He didn't even come to many of the meetings. He was Dean of men.--No, Dean of students, I'm sorry, Dean of students at that time. And there was Dean Donaldson, and Dean Sadler(Donaldson: Dean of women, Sadler: Dean of men). I believe those were the only administrators. Then there were several professors. There was a law school professor, Richard Williamson; Bill Liddell from the Business Administration School, Cam Walker from History, a very nice person from chemistry whose name escapes me just now. There was the President of the Graduate Student Association as well. It was good to see them involved. There may have been other people that I'm forgetting-- the President of the Women's Dormitory Association-- I just can't remember. I'm not sure if they were there.

David Kranbuehl

Williams: I think not, but in any event--

Edwards: It was a pretty good group of people to make decisions, and we even proposed ~~and we even proposed making decisions. We gave the~~ when we made that the President be given veto power, but we also gave ourselves the option of overruling a presidential veto by a certain vote.

Williams: Was this new with Dr. Graves?

Edwards: Yes. This went before Graves, and Graves rejected it. But we thought ~~that~~ was an excellent form to the community of students would have been even more elaborate in that way. It would have been an enlargement, a great enlargement of

the same thing. It would have been similar to a senate, but with many representatives. We wanted to have college workers represented on that, too. That was an issue which was there on the campus among a minority of people, but I think it was probably one of the most important things the students could have ever done. It's a pity we didn't pick up on it more than we did. There was one student in particular-- Mike Savage was his name-- who became very involved in the idea of unionizing college employees. There were so many grievances ~~and~~ college employees are paid miserably-- the janitors, the maids, who are the only ones paid out of the actual tuition, and then there are others: clerical workers, many communications workers who are miserably paid -- the benefits are not very good-- many, many grievances, even other things. The women who worked in James Blair were not permitted to eat their lunches anywhere but in the women's bathroom. They didn't have a lounge or anything of that sort. Things like that, just dehumanizing things that needed to be rectified. Well, this one student became very concerned. This to me was one of the examples of very sincere motivation. It was an other-orientation. It was very well founded. I respect this person tremendously for what he did in this way. He talked with a number of people. He wrote a brilliant article in The Flat Hat on the subject and an editorial. He wrote another one as well. And he got a representative of National Association of

Government Employees down here from New Jersey. That person ~~meant~~ met with English a couple of times. Nothing ever came of it. Of course, collective bargaining is illegal for state employees, and Delegate Doug Wilder in Richmond kept introducing measures every year to ~~prevent~~ permit collective bargaining. He'd get shot down every year, but it was a really good effort. I wish-- there were so many things we should have taken up and we failed to, but I think we were spread pretty thin. Another one was the consumer movement.

Williams: When you say"we"-- you're talking about the B.S.A.?

Edwards: No. I don't mean the B.S.A. there, I'm sorry. I mean just students in general.

Williams: Was the B.S.A., then, able -- I've been trying to pinpoint how the B.S.A. could be different from the Student Association, other than their representation. Was the B.S.A. able to deal more effectively with student concerns?

Edwards: I believe so, I really do. The BSA provided a forum for the various ~~factions~~ sectors of the college community. There was dialogue.

Williams: Things like visitation, curfew-- I guess curfew was a dead issue by the time you were chairman, probably.

Edwards: No.

Williams: Was it not? No, that was the year they were talking about card key systems.

Edwards: Yes, we were very much involved in that. We got rid of curfews on the B.S.A. The B.S.A. did have more clout. I'm not exactly sure why, except that if there had been no B.S.A.

the Student Association would have had that. But I think the format of the Board of Student Affairs lent itself to constructive work. People took it very seriously. ~~The that I think it was worthwhile.~~ People approached student government in their own fashions, but it's always a worthwhile thing simply because it's a good learning tree. And our various studies ~~the Board of Student Affairs~~ conducted; the relationship with the Student Association, and the administrators, and the Board of Visitors all were very good educational experiences. In addition to being a good forum for airing student ~~concerns and~~ other concerns and for making decisions,

the Board of Student Affairs accomplished another purpose, and that was to at least give the illusion that students could contribute something to the rules governing their lives and the conditions around them. Students sincerely want to improve the community. This brings up another thing that I would really like to mention, and that is in that same year there was a movement created by a small group of people on the campus -- small, but diverse group, really, called Community. This is different from the community of students, but it may have been an offshoot of that idea. The idea was to get involved in the community as a whole. Now Mike Savage was involved in this and he was the one who got interested in the college workers. It was trying to gain some perspective on college life and putting it all together. We had a "disorientation," as opposed to orientation at the beginning of that year. People came back early to work on this. We went up into The Flat Hat office, wrote up flyers and mimeographed them, took them by hand to the dormitories, talked with students, held informal meetings. We got on the schedule of every group -- there are so many assemblies for freshmen when they come here, you know. The freshmen women have to go and hear about Panhel and women's athletics and W.D.A., and other things. We would get on the agenda there, always talking about Community -- always trying to zero in on areas that the students had never gotten enough information on

before. Things like how to cope with registration in that arena system (that was just miserable) in Blow Gymnasium-- unbelieveable. At the time you had to have parental permission for visitation, I think-- is that it? You had to have signed permission from parents for visitation in other dormitories-- something like that. (I don't know why I can't remember.) We printed a lot of things about that. Generally we really put out a ~~lot~~ wealth of material. I was looking over some of it the other day. The Bateman resolution was kicking around at that point, and we printed a lot of stuff on that. People found it helpful ~~and~~ the community spirit, I think, is so important. There were some ~~treats~~ truths emerging from the total ~~burning~~ learning experience of these years. One of them was that the thing that counts ~~awfully,~~ ultimately is community, and your contributions to it. It isn't just taking from it, it's making it better for people who come after you-- helping others along. It is questioning everything that comes along instead of just accepting it. Maybe you ~~may~~ wind up accepting it, but at least you've questioned it. Those ~~treats~~ truths were beginning to emerge. I think if only we could have kept ~~at~~ up the momentum, if these other factors (whatever they were) had not entered in to kind of take the steam out of the movement, as later happened, I think that it would have taken us into some really interesting areas. We would have been better people. The college would have been doing a tremendous service by fostering the kind of environ-

ment in which a student could have become involved with, -- say the whole issue of consuming. Consumer rights is possibly the most important area-- it affects everything. It affects the government and national policy, as well. You have to be very broad-minded with it. It's not just grocery store stuff. It's Vepco and utilities; it's energy shortages; it's birth control; it's issues of hunger and food; all of that. If we had just taken taken that and run with it we really would have had something. If we could have converted the Student Association into a consumer-activist organization-- it could have still been a student association, but to really get into this-- this is a small community. We could have done a lot. It got derailed somewhere along the line.

Williams: By inner forces, I gather?

Edwards: I don't know. We didn't really take it on as it should have been taken on. Maybe it wasn't gratifying enough to take on something like that, which is hard work, and you don't see immediate results, and it's not something that obviously affects you, as the dormitory regulations do. Because, after all, students in college very rarely have sampled the real world. They come right out of the cloister of their home, and with no break in between they enter into this new shell, and here at William and Mary it is such a closed-in community. Really it's difficult to conceive. A person like Mike Savage--

~~in 17~~

her

To me what is so remarkable about what he did or tried to do was that he really stepped out of the ordinary circle of concern of the college students. It still concerned the campus and campus life, but in a different way. That takes creativity. Just like Ralph Nader-- he stepped out, too. It takes a lot to get anybody to step out of their normal routine. That was ultimately the problem of the student movement. Once you get a mass movement rolling it's not as difficult to get people to step out because it becomes something that they have all stepped into, you see. their area of concerns changes. But then you can't sustain it; after one crop of students has left, you have to somehow keep the thing going. You have to keep bringing in fresh concerns. Somehow it went sour, it went stale. If you could have kept the same group of students in college, you know, even to this day, then you would still have the same thing rolling, I think. It would have taken new and different forms, but they left and dispersed and new students came. It's not their fault that they haven't picked up on things. You have to respond to things in your environment, and when it isn't there, it isn't there. Of course William and Mary is very conservative-- always has been, and it's difficult for things to get moving here in this tiny community. You know, there was a time during the year of '69 to '70 or else the

following year (both those years were full of turmoil), I picked up a copy of The New Republic. They ran a column on education. I don't know why I happened to read it this particular time, but anyway, it was about the University of Marburg in Germany and it was talking about this university in a sleepy, medieval town and how it was the seat of communist influence in Germany-- how ~~it~~ that used to be the University of Munich, but it had switched. And it said, "seeing the seat of communist influence move from the enormous University of Munich to a tiny little village of ~~this sort~~, steeped in tradition, ~~was~~ is about as strange as moving Berkeley to William and Mary." So there is no doubt about it, it has that reputation.

Williams: I don't want to stop, but I have to. Let me just ask you to clarify something. Was it Dr. Graves' decision that the B.S.A. chairman be elected, and by having a student selected the chairman did this give the students more clout on the B.S.A.? I should have ~~stuck~~ slipped that in on the B.S.A.

Edwards: Having the chairman elected by the student body?

Williams: No, no. Dean Lambert had been the chairman of the B.S.A., ex-officio.

Edwards: Oh, oh, I see what you mean.

Williams: ~~ex-officio~~ you were the first student. Was Dr. Graves the one who made the decision that it would be elected? And what effect did having a student make on it, do you think?

Edwards: Oh. You know, I don't know exactly who was behind that. It may have been Lambert who was mostly behind it. He recog-

nized it was a conflict of interest to ~~have to share~~ Chair something that should be under him. I don't know. It happened right as Graves came, of course. He had a hand in it because we delayed the first meeting of the B.S.A. for at least a month after it normally met in order for him to consider everything, so I'm sure he was behind it. I don't recall the origin of that decision. I remember the students got together (We all knew who was on the B.S.A., of course; We already knew that), and we got together to try and organize the student to be elected. We didn't want another administrator. We were afraid Carson Barnes would be elected. So that's how that came about. I think that it did have an effect on students. It was a symbolic thing, and I think on the whole it was a very important thing to have happen. ~~Again it was a matter~~ there were a number of positive things that happened that year. There was Graves; there was the fact of the B.S.A. had a student chairman. Myself excluded -- the fact there was a student there ~~That~~ was important. And then there were the various things that the B.S.A. accomplished with the aid of Graves. Getting rid of curfews, achieving visitation in the dorms, getting a breakdown of the athletic fee. There was self-determination in the dormitories; they permitted visitation. All of those things came about ~~that~~ year.

I would like to add that much of this was made possible by Graves, but he also had an excellent staff beneath him. Sam Sadler, for example, had gained the confidence of the students and was much admired. But most important was Mr. Lambert, vice-president for student affairs. He was a very perceptive and sensitive administrator, as I learned in weekly conversations when I was with the BSA. Graves could not have done it without him.