

R. HARVEY CHAPPELL, JR.

In the midst of World War II, sixteen year-old Harvey Chappell enrolled at William and Mary, one of few men in the student body. He stayed on through the postwar period, taking his law degree in 1950. He became a successful practicing attorney in Richmond, maintaining his ties with the college, particularly in alumni work and served on the Board of Directors and later as president of the Society of the Alumni. In 1968 he was appointed to the Board of Visitors and served until 1976, being elected to two terms as rector of the board (1972 to 1974 and 1974 to 1976). This interview was taped only a few weeks after his retirement as rector.

Mr. Chappell approved the transcript almost entirely as submitted to him, with the exception of a thirty - second passage concerning the Jeroyd Greene affair, a passage which Mr. Chappell requested deleted. His instructions were followed, but the future researcher is none the poorer.

INDEX SHEET

Interviewee R. Harvey Chappell, Jr.

Date of interview March 17, 1976

Place 1200 Mutual Building (E. Main St.), Richmond

Interviewer Emily Williams

Session number 1

Length of tape 72 mins.

Contents:

Approximate time:

as student during World War II

- attitudes

3 mins.

- Flat Hat incident

2 mins.

postwar William & Mary

4 mins.

as law student (1948-1950)

4 mins.

comparison to law school currently

founding of W&M Law Review

3 mins.

founding of law alumni association

2 mins.

plight of W&M law school

9 mins.

appointment to Board of Visitors, 1968

1 min.

geographical location of board appointments

5 mins.

philosophies on the board

3 mins.

issues before board, 1968-1976

parietal rules

9 mins.

Statement of Rights and Responsibilities

2 mins.

branch colleges (acceleration, independence)

11 mins.

athletic program future (Plans I and II)

7 mins.

Greene affair

1 min.

view of role of rector

2 mins.

summary of years on board

1 min.

R. Harvey Chappell, Jr.

March 17, 1976

Richmond, Virginia

Williams: Let me ask you to start with: when you came to William and Mary as a freshman at the end of World War II, you were a member of a very distinct minority: the male student body. I wondered in view of this if you could assess the mood on campus during World War II?

Chappell: Actually, you said I came at the end of World War II; I came in the summer of 1943, which was right in the midst of the war, and you're right, there were mainly women students. At that time there was a chaplain's school and also an Army Specialized Training Unit, which swelled the male population. But essentially the men students as such at William and Mary were a group of youngsters, those seventeen and under--I was sixteen when I first went to college--and then a group of people disqualified from military service because of physical disability. It was an interesting experience, but I suppose it was a great time to be there as a man.

Williams: Was there much mixing with the military units you mentioned? I know there were some boys on work/study down at Cheatham Annex.

Chappell: Well, they were two separate things. The young men at Cheatham were indeed students, and there was all sorts of fraternizing there; they were students just like anybody else. As far as the army unit was concerned there was not

a great deal of mixing for the very simple reason that they had full days and commitments, as did the students, more or less. They did participate in athletics; I remember particularly that several of them played on the basketball team and were quite good. As far as the chaplain's unit was concerned, they were such an older group that they struck me as absolutely ancient men. I've reached the conclusion they really weren't so old after all, as I look back on it now.

Williams: While you were there an event of great import (at the time, anyhow) came up and that was known as "the Flat Hat incident," when the editor of the Flat Hat wrote an editorial dealing with racial prejudice. I have wondered what was the student reaction? The board's reaction and President Pomfret's reaction are recorded, but how the students felt about it is not.

Chappell: Well, I think that the students' views are recorded. If you'd go back and look in the news morgues during that period you would find that the students became mildly outraged with the idea that the editor was going to be discharged and that the newspaper was going to be shut down. Several of us participated in presenting our views on the subject to the president and indeed to the public; there was a mass meeting of the students, as I recall it, and looking back on it I really don't know how this came about, but I think I was

the one who actually presented the resolution stating the students' views on this. It probably got blown out of all proportion because of the sensitivity of the subject, and I should be very candid so that I don't masquerade under any false colors. I suspect that my concerns were not so much the right or the wrong of what the editor had said; looking back on it, she had hit the nail pretty close on the head, I suspect, but I think that at that time (speaking for myself) that I found it offensive that she would lose her job and that the newspaper couldn't address a sensitive issue and at least discuss it. As I recall it, although I haven't read the editorial in thirty years or longer, I don't believe she used any language that would even be remotely considered offensive; it was just the subject. So that was a high old time. I think that the president and the Board of Visitors responded to our outrage with outrage.

Williams: Yes. And the outrage, you think, was over the principle of the matter rather than what it was she was talking about?

Chappell: I think the students' concerns were over the principle, I suppose, of freedom of the press more than the subject matter of her article. I think the president and the Board of Visitors were concerned about the subject matter of the article and I suppose felt that it was not appropriate for a college newspaper.

Williams: Soon thereafter the college was practically inundated by the

veterans coming back. As you saw post-World War II William and Mary, did you see a return to normalcy, or could there ever be normalcy again?

Chappell: Well, I came back to the college and observed, it seemed to me, more dedication to getting the educational job done. Although everybody had a good time, I'm satisfied that because many of the students, particularly the veterans, were older and many of them were married, it was a more a no-nonsense approach. They were going to get the job done and get their education behind them, and I think there was a very aggressive attempt to improve their grades. It was a highly competitive group, and I think I saw during that period some of the finest students I have observed. Now my close connection with the college to see the students as such is varied during the thirty-plus years since I first went there in 1943. As a student I could see it very closely. As a member of the alumni board for a period I would see it a bit more closely, and as a member of the Board of Visitors I've seen it reasonably close, but in between there were gaps, so I really couldn't compare one group of students with the other. But I think that bunch after World War II had clearly in mind what they wanted to do and that was to finish their education and get the best possible grades so they could get the best possible jobs. Jobs were the key thing then.

Williams: Professionally oriented. In this return period I know was when the fraternity lodges were built. Were you in a

fraternity? I know that the fraternities were not at first very willing to go to the lodges.

Chappell: I was in a fraternity; I was a PiKA. I did not get too heavily involved in fraternity life, however. I was older than some of my brothers, and as a result I did not follow the same social schedule that they did. I had other things to do: most of the time when I was in college I was working as well as going to college. I worked in the dining hall for years--I think through my senior year in college. I was headwaiter that last year, largely through the assistance of Y.O. Kent, who was then the man who ran it and whose interview you really ought to take if you take any of them.

Williams: I have one with him.

Chappell: Yel Kent was a remarkable person, and he was of great assistance to me during that period. Then I worked in the law library during the period that I was in law school, so I really didn't have a lot of time to worry about fraternity matters. But I think they did come back with a push, and I think a lot of people were enthused about them; they seemed to be reasonably active as I recall it during the late '40s. I left in January of 1950; I graduated mid-year from law school.

Williams: The law school at that time wasn't as large as it is now.

Chappell: Not by any means.

Williams: How would you evaluate the preparation that you received

at the law school at William and Mary?

Chappell: Well, you have to recognize that you're almost comparing an elephant with a canary. The law school then was the department of jurisprudence, and it essentially was Dudley Warner Woodbridge, who quite likely is the finest teacher I ever had--just an outstanding man. The law school was very small. It functioned along with other departments in almost an interdisciplinary manner. There seemed to be concerns, as I recall it, not to make too many waves about the law school for fear that the General Assembly or some hobgoblin somewhere would come in and say, "We are not going to let you have a law school anymore." This was a real concern. I've never been able to figure out who the hobgoblin was. I don't believe it was the University of Virginia; I don't think they looked upon us as any competition as such. There had been a threat to abolish the school in 1939. Indeed, for a week I think it was abolished by resolution of the Board of Visitors, and I guess that was still a hangover because you must realize that '39 to '49 was only ten years, and that's a short period of time and memories were still fresh. So at that period the law school was small, but the instruction, in my opinion, was super. Woodbridge taught contracts and torts and negotiable instruments, property--your key courses--and there just was no better teacher anywhere. There were other members of the law faculty who were good, and we had some members of the law faculty who really were not so good, which is true of almost any

school. The preparation nowadays is in a larger group. Instead of having a student body of 75, they have a student body of 465 or 475. The present law faculty is an unknown factor to me: I have no idea how good they are, how bad they are. I suspect that on balance the quality of the training has been essentially good all through the years; that would be my judgment.

The law school was so small that we did not have an alumni group separate for the law school, and we did not have a law review. There was no vehicle for student writing, for students to express themselves, to learn to write. One of the big problems for all lawyers is to express themselves, to be able to make a simple declaratory statement, either in writing or orally. So I guess the two highpoints to me in law school and immediately after law school were these: in 1949 I chatted with Dean Woodbridge, and much against his better judgment we went to see President Pomfret to get some money for a law review. It had seemed to me that we ought to have a law review, even if it was just intramural, and President Pomfret gave me \$250 from the Friends of the College Fund. That was all the money he had, and consequently that was all the money I had. I used that to go to the Virginia Gazette to get them to print the first issue of the William and Mary Law Review, and I have it over here in my bookcase. The first issue, which is dated May 1949, was a grand total of thirty pages long, and the

reason it was thirty pages long is because they'd print thirty pages for \$250. That started the law review. It continued on that basis for a number of years and then became a full-scale law review and is no longer strictly intramural. Indeed, nowadays there are several student publications.

The second thing that I viewed as significant was that my first year out as a lawyer, a number of us who were alumni of the law school thought we ought to organize a law school alumni association. And so I believe in 1951-- I guess it would be twenty-five years ago this year -- we organized it, and I don't want to overlook any of them, but included in the group were Wesley Coffey, Marvin Murchison, Dixon Foster, Garland Clark, Ira Dworkin, and there may have been others, but that was the beginning of the law school alumni association. I was its first president. And that has grown, of course, in these twenty-five years until now I think according to last year's statistics we give more per capita among our law alumni than any other law school in the nation. You have to realize that at that time our law alumni, counting everybody who'd even walked through the door down there that was still alive, might be a couple of hundred. I don't recall how many were in my graduating class, but it may have been as many as sixteen. So that gives you the order of magnitude between then and now in the law school. I digressed, but that's what stands out in my mind

about the law school.

Williams: And the point in organizing this alumni group was to maintain the interest...

Chappell: Of the law school. The law school had been sort of like an orphan for so long. This present flap about accreditation is nothing new. I think the reason we are catching such a hard time now is because we have been chronically on the borderline by reason of accreditation standards. You must understand that accreditation does not suggest that there's anything wrong either with the students or with the faculty. It customarily means that you don't have any money. It means that you don't have the money to buy books. There were long periods there where we literally did not have the essential numbers of volumes to be properly accredited-- the fundamental books, like codes and the restatements of the law and things of that sort. We also did not have proper salaries, and, of course, we had no proper facilities. I've watched the law school from my time to now go all over the campus almost like a wildflower: it springs up in a different place each year. When I was there they were teaching law on the third floor of what used to be called Marshall-Wythe. (I forget the name of it now -- James Blair.) The law library was on the third floor of the then library, which is now the law school building. So you had to go up three floors to even find it. It then came down from the third floor

and ended up in the basement of Bryan Complex for awhile, down amongst the steam pipes and all. Then finally when the law school grew to approximately 175, as I recall it, and when the new library came into being we got the old library building. The present law school building is capable of housing no more than 175. So there is your problem just in a nutshell. The alumni group was developed to foster the school and to try to do things for the law school as distinguished from the college, although there was never any cleavage from the college itself. It was just that no one ever gave a damn for the law school.

Williams: Could you cite some reasons why, then, the law school has had this hard time that you've described?

Chappell: Well, I think the law school's plight goes back to the plight of the college. The college itself, if you will take a look at it, only started getting back on its legs in the '20s and the '30s. It had no money. The college would not have survived were it not for its tie-in with the teaching profession, the training of teachers. I find it amusing that people look down their noses at this now, but this is what kept us afloat and is the reason today why we have so many friends within the public school system of Virginia. They went through William and Mary, if not as undergraduates, as people who worked on their masters' and whatnot. I think the college had been in

such bad financial straits generally for so long that the law school was just a pebble on the beach--and not a very big one at that--and so it just stayed off to itself. There were a few people who were interested in it and tried to push it along, but not enough. You can't do it with six or fourteen or seventy or two hundred when other law alumni groups are numbered in the thousands. So I think that's the reason the law school was in deep trouble most of the time from a financial standpoint. Then after World War II, with the first even remotely sizeable groups coming out--to me that was the first time they'd had an opportunity to get out from under the bushel, and I think it's done it. But failing that I suspect if it had continued the way it was going on through the late '30s and early '40s it probably would not have survived because there just would not have been enough people coming out to promote it and to make it worthwhile to have the facilities. In a law school you need to have a critical mass; you have to have a certain size, and four hundred is about it. With anything less than that you have trouble supporting your basic functions, like your law reviews, and breadth of curriculum offerings, and things of that sort.

Williams: Have you found competition or cooperation--or neither, I suppose should be an alternative--from the other law schools in the state?

Chappell: Oh, I've found all sorts of cooperation from the other law schools. Friendly competition, but never any sense of wanting to see any other law school put out of business or relegated to some inferior status--quite to the contrary. All of the other three law schools in the state to the

extent that I've had any contact with them at all have without exception been supportive of the law school at William and Mary. In fact, Dean Ribble, who was the celebrated dean at the University of Virginia, was a William and Mary alumnus, and he was a very close friend of Dudley Woodbridge. That's the reason I'm satisfied this hobgoblin I mentioned earlier about someone up there trying to get us didn't exist. The hobgoblin was the absence of funds.

Williams: Perennially a problem, as you said. I know that you were active in alumni work in between 1950 and 1968, when you went on the board. I don't mean to sound like all of a sudden Harvey Chappell again appeared on the scene, but I did want to ask you why it was you think that Governor Godwin appointed you in 1968 to the Board of Visitors?

Chappell: I really don't know. When he called me to make the appointment I was then forty-one years old, and I told him that I really didn't think he should appoint me; I thought I was probably too young to take the job and that I had not achieved the stature to do the job. He nevertheless appointed me. I suspect if I had to guess at it my name probably was on the alumni list because I had been active in the Society of the Alumni, had served on the board of the alumni directorate, and had been president of the society for a couple of years. I suspect that's how it happened.

Williams: How important is it to have board members who are nearby-- meaning nearby to Williamsburg?

Chappell: I think that as a practical matter it is very important. I know this is an emotional issue, though. People immediately start talking about how many out-of-state alumni we have from the college in general and that they love the college as much as the people who live close at hand-- and there's no denying that. And then there's a question of some parts of Virginia being farther from Williamsburg than some neighboring states, but in general the job of a member of the Board of Visitors can be--ought to be-- a reasonably demanding job, where he is available if he is needed. (When I use the "he" through here that's male chauvinism. I'm talking about "shes" too.) But I think that the closer to Williamsburg the better, as far as the majority of the board is concerned. That is not to say there should not be members from all over, -- from various parts of the country and various parts of the state. But at least there ought to be a working group that's close enough to respond if they have to. Now that's my personal judgment, but I do know that reasonable people differ on that.

Williams: Could you give an example where this was a help to have people nearby?

Chappell: Well, everything is a personal judgment from personal participation, so whatever I have to say here is just

my own reaction from personal involvement. I do not believe that I personally could have responded as often as I have in these eight years if I had not been just fifty miles from Williamsburg. Just that simple. These eight years it's turned out that Richmond has been a suburb of Williamsburg. I made trips down three and four times a week, almost on a daily basis--drive down in the morning, come back at night. You just couldn't do that if you lived a couple of hundred miles away. No way you could do it. At times during running the affairs of the college the president or some of the college officers will have occasion to call on some members of the board, maybe the rector more than others, or maybe the vice-rector when the rector's not available. But it is, I think, important to the president that there be at least a limited number close at hand to function if need be, not just in emergency, but to get something done in short order. And by that I don't mean to have any corporate action without the other members participating, just individual advice and things of that sort.

Williams: Similarly, is it a necessity -- I don't think anybody can deny it's important, but is it a necessity to have members on the board who are in Richmond?

Chappell: Oh, no. There's nothing necessary about having Richmond members. I think to the extent of everything else being equal that if you could have some in Richmond it is a plus for a number of reasons: the General Assembly now meets

every year rather than every other year, and with William and Mary being a state institution and depending for our lifeblood as to money on the place on the hill you can see out my window,* it's awfully convenient to have people in Richmond who know where the capitol is and who can go there if they have to to speak for the college. It doesn't happen with great frequency, but it happens often enough that it's a plus. On the other hand, if the caliber of the board representation in Richmond is not the equivalent of that elsewhere then there ought not to be a Richmond member just for the sake of having a Richmond member.

Williams: In these eight years that you were on the board could you characterize the boards? Now, I'll say what I have in mind here: it's been commented to me that there's been a broadening of viewpoints on the board. Have you seen that while you've been on it?

Chappell: What do you mean by "broadening of viewpoint?"

Williams: Some of the earlier members of the board -- and I mean this in the earlier '60s -- I've asked them, "Could you characterize the board?" And they've said, "It was a conservative board." I've asked some of the later people, and they say there was a mixture of opinions on the board, and they think that this has been something that's come in recent years. I wondered if

* The state capitol

you felt that?

Chappell: Well, I think you have to judge people by their times.

When I first went on the board in 1968 I was far and away the youngest member of the board, I guess by fifteen or twenty years, so it really was not so much a matter of conservatism versus liberalism as it was a different viewpoint by reason of age alone. I happen to think that by and large the older members of the board -- that is to say those who were older than I -- were remarkably resilient during the period that I was on the board.

You must remember that from 1968 to 1976 -- this has been about as wild a period to serve on any board that you could think of in this century. We had the student unrest; affirmative action, both with reference to minorities, women, you name it; athletic policy problems; faculty outrages of one sort or another. All of these things have come out of this period of unrest, some of which was generated by the war in Vietnam, but not all of it. Consequently the boards as they have been constituted in these eight years have had to face some very, very difficult problems that were so completely out of step with their own views and lifestyles and concepts of right and wrong that looking back on it I find it remarkable that they did what they could do. For example, I think that the parietal issue at the college was probably one of the most difficult ones, one that was most heavily laced with emotions, than

anything that the boards during these eight years have had to face. You must remember that on the parietal issue alone the idea of unlimited visitation among the sexes in their various rooms and that sort of thing almost borders on the shocking when you just talk about it out loud. And yet over a period of time, slowly but surely, it (the idea) was adjusted. Now, I'm not saying it was adjusted for the better or for the worse. The students obviously liked the idea of the relaxation, although I have noted in recent years a tendency, I believe, on the part of many of the students to want to get back to some measure of privacy so that ladies could be able to have their hair in curlers and be able to study without having guys run up and down their halls and maybe vice versa. But at the time the idea of being able to stay with your girl or boyfriend twenty-four hours was a heady wine, and that seemed to be the thing to do. To get that idea across to any group of people such as constituted our board during that period was difficult, and yet they by and large accepted what I'm sure to some of them seemed to be the inevitable. And so I guess to get back to your question, maybe there has been to an outsider a discernable trend from an apparent conservatism to a more liberal outlook, but from my standpoint I think there was a remarkably -- I don't want to use the word liberal -- resilient attitude on the part of all the people I

have served with on the William and Mary boards.

Williams: I know it struck me that you were very much involved in some of these issues that you've just been talking about. For one thing, you were chairman of the student affairs committee for a time. I suppose that was one good reason. As you mentioned -- well, at least until Roger Hull came on the board, I guess you were the youngest member on the board.

Chappell: That's right. I was the first chairman of the student affairs committee, and I remember that when we first started meeting with students there would be little knots of people in the room: there would be the students over to themselves, and the board members over to themselves. It took a little doing to loosen things up, but that's human nature. I think that one thing that has happened in these eight years is that the Board of Visitors has become a much more approachable group. At one stage we really were "visitors." We came in the dark of night and we'd meet somewhere, though people really didn't know where, and we would do some things, but they didn't know what we'd done, and we'd leave. Then there'd be a strange picture of us in the yearbook -- a bunch of old people who had had their picture taken for the yearbook, but that was our only contact. Over a period of eight years there has been a development of more approachability within the board, which I think

has been helpful. I'm sure it's not as much as the students would like, but it's just like day and night from the beginning of the eight-year term to now.

The students themselves I think have been essentially very responsible. There certainly were times I would have liked to have knocked some heads together, and they certainly said things to me and to the other members of the board that I never would have dreamed of saying to members of the board when I was a student, which I suppose is all to the good. But all that to the contrary notwithstanding, I think that they've been basically a very attractive, responsible group of people.

There's one other factor on the parietal rules that for some reason has gone absolutely unnoticed, and I've never been able to figure it out. You must also realize that during this period, from 1968 to now, the age of majority -- indeed, with twenty-one being the cutoff point, most of them would be approaching their senior years before they achieved majority -- but with the change of the age back to eighteen, practically every student who came to William and Mary already was eighteen, what with twelve grades. So they were already adults, and we no longer could even suggest a continuation of a finishing school approach. I don't know why people have never focused on that, but that eliminated, in my mind at least, a lot of the logic for the

rules, although I must say again, not to fly under false colors, I think the lowering of the age was a mistake. I think it accomplished nothing, that it came through in a period of fever and frenzy arising from the war, and that an eighteen year-old today is just like an eighteen year-old thirty years ago, with the same problems and the same needs, the only difficulty being that the colleges nowadays, since students are of age, really find themselves in an awful position of providing services for adults that go beyond the strictly academic side of the picture, as distinguished from social rules.

Williams: You've alluded to the fact that there were some years in there that were very tense times. Did the board see this student movement as it existed at William and Mary -- qualifying that by saying that of course this was nothing like Columbia or Berkeley or any of those places -- did they see this as a potential crisis and realize it for that?

Chappell: Yes, I think so. I think that it was looked upon as a crisis -- our own version of a crisis, a small crisis, but a crisis nevertheless. And I think it was. I think tempers were short. Emotions were charged. Parents particularly and alumni were just beside themselves. The students on the one hand were saying they wanted complete freedom of action, and the parents of these same students, although they probably would not say this to their own children, were saying to us, "You get in there and you hold the line.

We're not going to have this." And the alumni were saying, "We're not going to tolerate this mixing of the sexes. We're going to cut off our contributions." And members of the General Assembly wrote letters and got on the telephone. It was an interesting period. I personally would get telephone calls at my office or at home at night. A lot of people were disturbed, and I think a lot of them thought we were not doing our job properly by relaxing the rules at all. I hope they have seen we had to do what we thought we had to do, within the confines of what we just talked about, but I don't know whether they have or not.

Williams: I'd have to ask them. Was it your view -- I sensed this, but I wanted to ask you if I sensed it correctly -- was it your view that the board should make -- I hate to use the word "concessions;" that's stronger than I want to say -- but should try to compromise in order to head off a greater confrontation?

Chappell: I suppose that was part of my motivation. Stated in another way, I suppose that if the students had never raised the point, I'm pretty certain I would have never urged that they have twenty-four hour visitation. Granted that when they raised the point I certainly thought -- and I view this on everything in life -- that there ought to be some reasonable midground for compromise. I saw some legitimacy in their requests.

I did not and do not now think a great deal of the twenty-four hour visitation, and it has nothing to do with sex or morals or anything of that sort. I've long since quit trying to play God with anybody's morals. But I think it's an absurdity to have living quarters set up so that you cannot be comfortable in them and cannot study, which is why you're there basically. I'm satisfied there've been a lot of inconveniences to go along with all of this heady wine of freedom since the parietal rules were changed. So I guess, yes, I did want to head off a larger problem, but I did think some of their requests were legitimate.

Williams: While we're on the subject of students: about this time was when the Statement of Rights and Responsibilities was first approved by the board. I know the students felt there should be changes made in the statement. The board, though, seemed rather reluctant to change the statement. Is that a correct impression?

Chappell: Yes, I think that the students felt that they did not have an opportunity to make any contribution to it. On the other hand, I think that the board felt -- and a lot of people in this country felt at that time -- that there had been such an inordinate stress on rights. Everybody had rights, but no one had any responsibilities, and that it was high time that rights versus or along with responsibilities be articulated in some way. I don't think

anyone on the board felt that this Statement of Rights and Responsibilities was written in stone, that this was the end of it, and I think we all--I'm certainly speaking for myself--felt that it would be amended from time to time, and it was. I will not say that I fell all over myself in trying to amend it. I suspect that if the students had not requested that it be amended I probably would have been the last person to suggest that it be amended, largely because I didn't then and don't today feel that in the overall scheme of things it amounted to anything. It was a grand statement, and it gives somebody with a flourish for writing an opportunity to express himself, but in the overall picture it really didn't amount to anything. It doesn't amount to anything if the educational process is--as I think it should be--an easy, liveable, accommodation arrangement among the administration, the faculty, the students, the alumni, the board, the General Assembly, and the public--all of whom are constituencies of the college. There's no way that you can put enough words on paper to cover every situation. I doubt it's looked at very often, if you want to know the truth about it.

Williams: In order to cover as long a period as I'm trying to cover

here this morning I have to jump around, so I'll jump now to another subject, and that's the branch colleges. Did you in the eight years you were on the board see any change in the general view of -- first of all I'll ask-- expansion of Christopher Newport and Richard Bland, and (the second part of the question) separation of Christopher Newport and Richard Bland?

Chappell: Let me start by saying that the branch colleges during the eight years I've been on the board were always looked upon as valuable parts of the William and Mary group, and we desperately tried to give them as much time as we could, to the point of having meetings of our board at varying colleges from time to time, Christopher Newport obviously grew at a different rate from Richard Bland. It was in a larger metropolitan area, and with the legislation at the present General Assembly there is little doubt but that Christopher Newport has reached the stage -- and I think legitimately so -- to be on its own. This comes about by reason of the fact that for many years sort of an unstated, but I think at least several times actually written, principle of the State Council of Higher Education has been that once an institution is a four-year, degree-granting institution it really ought to have its own Board of Visitors. So I think that Christopher Newport has followed the normal course of events, with the upgrading from two years to four years, and in another year -- I

believe 1977 -- it will have its fully acting Board of Visitors. There will be, as I recall the legislation, a one-year gap in which the present Board of Visitors will run Christopher Newport and a new board will get in step, so to speak. I think that's a good series of stages for development. It's far more orderly, I'm sure, than what occurred in the case of the Norfolk division or R.P.I., but these are good examples of how this has happened before.

In the case of Richard Bland it was a disappointment to me, and I'm sure to all of us, that it has not been accelerated to a four-year, degree-granting institution. I can say -- again speaking for myself personally -- that the desire to accelerate Richard Bland to a four-year status not only had nothing to do with race -- it never crossed my mind. Richard Bland was never in any different category than Christopher Newport, than the Norfolk division, which is now Old Dominion, or R.P.I., which is now V.C.U. We were doing the same thing that we'd done in the past. But unhappily it got caught up in the wash of the civil rights movement, so it is still a two-year, degree-granting college, and that's created problems. We're in a very unique category: we're not a member of the community college system; we are the only two-year liberal arts school in the commonwealth. A committee is presently looking into this under the sponsorship of the

State Council of Higher Education, and what they'll decide I have no idea, but I'm sure they'll do their very best to come up with a solution. There's been no movement to my knowledge for any separation on the part of Richard Bland. Indeed, I think they have manifested a continuing desire to keep with the college at Williamsburg because they believe we can help, and I think we can help.

Having said all of that, it has never been a completely easy job to run three public institutions, all three of which are equally deserving--because you don't measure who is the most deserving by the number of students or the course offerings. It's been very difficult to run the three of them with one Board of Visitors. And I'm not saying that three Boards of Visitors are to be greatly desired; I think it would be a mistake for Richard Bland now to have a separate Board of Visitors. I'm just stating a fact: that it is obviously more difficult to run three schools than it is to just run the affairs of one institution. But I've been gratified by the things that have happened at both places. I think dollar for dollar you'd go a long way before you'd find any better physical plant or better educational offerings than you'll find at Christopher Newport and Richard Bland. They're beautiful campuses and their students conduct themselves well; they're interested and they've done well. I think the track record

for Richard Bland's students, for example, who come to William and Mary is remarkable; many of them end up being elected to Phi Beta Kappa, if I read the William and Mary News accurately. So there's not a marked difference in the level of instruction or intelligence of the students (I think) in the basics. But it's been an interesting experience to have the three of them at once. And you will also recall in this eight-year period we have had two presidents at Richard Bland and two presidents at Christopher Newport and two presidents at William and Mary and three deans of the law school and two academic vice-presidents -- indeed, all of the deans of all of the schools in all the upper echelon positions have changed in these eight years, not to mention maybe three or four football coaches.

Williams: From what you're saying I gather that Richard Bland and Christopher Newport had your support. This is true generally of your fellow board members?

Chappell: Oh, I'm confident of that; there's no question at all. I think our only concern was whether or not we were giving -- enough time; we were giving all the time we could. Not being independently wealthy people -- at least speaking for myself; I only make a living by selling my time; I don't have a salary, so every hour I would give to William and Mary -- whether it's at Richard Bland or Christopher

Newport or Williamsburg, is an hour that I couldn't sell to somebody else for \$75 or \$100 an hour. So we gave all the time we could, but I'm sure we always kept thinking, We'd like to do more."

Williams: Was the question ever answered to your satisfaction why the state attorney general's office didn't handle the Richard Bland court case?

Chappell: Yes, I think it was answered to my satisfaction. The facts are garbled in my mind at the moment, but as I recall it the attorney general's office found itself in a conflict of interest situation because the defendants in the case included the governor, our Board of Visitors, and I think some other officials. The net effect of it was that the attorney general took the position that he had a conflict and his first duty was to the governor, as I recall it. That left us without a lawyer, so we employed a fine lawyer to represent us, and I never did any second-guessing about the quality of the legal representation. You will recall that the three-judge court split two to one. There was a very vigorous dissent by Judge Hoffman, but a loss is a loss.

Williams: Would you have supported it if there had been a move to make Richard Bland a community college, take it away from William and Mary?

Chappell: No, I don't think that would have solved anything. It

wasn't a matter of taking it away; I would have given it up gladly if I had thought it was in the best interest of Richard Bland. I just don't think that would have been in the best interest of Richard Bland.

Williams: I'll jump on to another subject, then, one that I remember well in the fall of '74, and that was the future of the athletic program at William and Mary. I know for a couple of weeks there in Williamsburg it seemed to us a very tense situation. What kind of pressure was put on you as the rector of the Board of Visitors with Plan I and Plan II being bandied about?

Chappell: Well, I received heavy volumes of mail, telephone calls, telegrams; people stopped me on the street. As is the case with most things that are newsworthy it, too, got out of all proportion to its true importance. There was never any predisposition on the part of anyone that I know of to abolish athletics or to move us into the Big Ten or anything of an extreme nature. It was that in performing our stewardship we knew that the cost of running the college's athletic program was escalating horrendously, and we did not feel that we could take dollars that were needed for the academic program and spend them on track or swimming or football or basketball or whatever. So we genuinely wanted to have the whole community, everyone within the William and Mary family, take a look at it and give us the benefit of

their thought. Well, I guess we really weren't very smart about how we went about it because the net effect of that was to invite not just the thoughtful analyses but also some highly emotional outbursts, which I think looking back on it would be absolutely normal. I think, for example, if my only interest in the college was following of the football team I would have been frightened that this would be the end of the line, and I probably would have gotten on a soapbox about it. That's what a lot of people did. And the students did exactly the opposite in many instances, though I've never been absolutely satisfied that that represented the view of the cross-section of the student body. But it made no difference: the views were expressed, and I thought the students articulated their views very well. I remember we had a meeting with the students at that same session in which we finally decided the athletic policy, and I was impressed by the way they handled themselves. I think they were disappointed and certainly mildly irritated that all of their views were not adopted, but it was not because they were not paid attention to. It was because, in our judgement, that just wasn't the way to do it. If you look at what we did it wasn't exactly a Solomon decision, but it was a decision; it was a decision that put the emphasis where we thought it ought to be, and that is if you as an alumnus want a substantial athletic program you ought to pay for

it. And I think thus far the alumni who want that are paying for it; it's been an outstanding performance in fundraising. Now whether it'll continue I don't know. I've freely conceded that I'd like the athletic program to be a representatively good one at the college, and I give to the William and Mary Athletic Educational Foundation (or whatever its name is). I make no bones about it; I'm glad to do it. But I think that those of us who want that sort of thing -- and by "that sort of thing" I mean being able to compete with our equals, not anybody else -- then we ought to pay for it. I think that's essentially what the program was. Plus, one big factor, and that is for the first time we had to cope with something we should have faced up to years before, and that's budgeting a fair share of the money for women's athletics. This was a gross oversight and something that was not a very good part of our record. But we faced up to that and made a change in it, and the women for their athletic endeavors will continually be getting more and more until we get some reasonable parity within the intramural and indeed intercollegiate arrangements. I have some difficulty, however, visualizing there being a women's football team down there. I guess it's possible, but I just don't really warm up to the idea. I also cannot see a nice, bright, October Saturday afternoon in Cary Field with everybody sitting around watching the ping-pong team or the gymnastics troupe perform. I just don't think people

will turn out for that. So we get back to football sooner or later. Of course this season above all demonstrates how popular basketball is, not just to us, but around the state. So I think there is a place for intercollegiate athletics. It has to be done within a rule of reason, and I think this policy leads that way. But a lot of people got upset. We certainly didn't please anybody, I'm sure.

Williams: You weathered another storm, and at the time you would not comment on pressures on the state level having to do with the Greene affair. Will you now?

Chappell: No, no, that's a closed chapter in the college's life and in mine.

Williams: Let me ask you, then, in summary: you served as rector from 1972 to 1976. Did you go in with an idea or did you develop an idea of what the role of rector should be?

Chappell: First of all I certainly did not go in with the idea of anything about rector because it never crossed my mind I would be the rector, and I never had had sufficient contact with earlier boards to even know what the rector did. I think the role of the rector in large part depends on the personalities of the president and the rector. I think the rector in the nature of things has a closer contact with the president and the college -- and ought to. He ought to be available; he ought to be available at any time of the day and night or I don't think he's serving his role -- this is my view. Another rector may look at

it in a different view and may be right, but in my view the rector ought to be there to be supportive of the president and the college at any time. And by supportive I do not mean just patting your foot and being a yes-man; the rector should be there if the situation arises to give the president his frank appraisal of the validity of a course of action, whether it's good or bad. If the relationship between the president and the rector is a happy one then this only works to the benefit of the college because I firmly believe that two heads usually are better than one. This does not mean by any means that the rector gets himself involved in the purely administrative affairs of the college. He has not, since I've been rector, and he should not. On the other hand, the rector has an opportunity to bring to the president and to the college in the absence of the board the distillate of what the board brings: the view of the "outside," so to speak, and I think this is important in the governance of the college.

I suppose in a summary sort of way if I had to picture the role of the rector, he has to walk a very narrow line between making his advice available to the president when the president wants it on the one hand and not intruding in the legitimate administrative processes of the college on the other. I suppose I've been criticized for stepping over the line, and so be it. It's not an easy one to follow,

but I think it's a very important one. I think that a rector who does no more than show up at the meetings and serve as a chairman under Roberts' Rules of Order really is not being much of a rector.

Now I suppose you would like me in closing to tell what has happened in these eight years that I think is most important: I think probably the most gratifying experience at the college that I've had had to do with the selection process of the president of the college at Williamsburg. That was made up, as you may recall, of a committee representing students, faculty, alumni, and Board of Visitors. I digress and say we did that with great ceremony, but I notice some of our sister institutions have not followed that apparently equalitarian process of comprising the selection committee. I think that the committee, particularly the faculty and student representatives, worked as responsibly and better than any group I have ever served with at the college. There was absolute unanimity of opinion as to what we wanted to accomplish, and that was get the best man we could to be president. The views were freely given and exchanged. There was no bitterness; I cannot recall a voice being raised at any stage. The undertaking was such a team effort that I think the results show themselves in that we got Tom and Zoe Graves to come to Williamsburg. I think that was probably the best thing that I can recall in my eight years on the board. There were a

lot of other gratifying experiences, but they were of a different nature. There were a lot of disappointments, and I'm certainly not going to outline those, but on balance it was an interesting eight years. There were a lot of difficult problems.

I thought that the members of the Board of Visitors that I served with in those eight years gave fully and freely of their time and their talent. They were interested. They were dedicated. The attendance records of 98 percent of them were outstanding, and of course the frequency of board meetings and board participation at Williamsburg has increased enormously in these eight years. At one time, as I understand it, the board would get together two or three times a year for a day, and everything was pretty cut and dried. When I first came on they were meeting four times a year for a day and a half, most of the meetings being held at the Williamsburg Lodge. At the present time we have a minimum of five full-scale meetings a year, and these usually involve arriving in Williamsburg on Thursday and leaving late Saturday or sometimes even Sunday, depending upon what the functions are. That's a long stretch to take away from your home and your business or your profession. Then in between, the executive committee meets every month, particularly during the summer months, to keep the affairs on an even keel. Then there are special meetings of the committees of the board, which are of recent origin

and function continuously. So I think that the college has been very fortunate to get the people to serve who have served, and I'm not certain that the folks who have given their time and their talent serving on the board have really gotten the credit for it they deserve. I think that's one of the disappointments to me: I think that a lot of people assume that it was just an honorary position and it was nice to be on the board. But it has not been that way, at least in the eight years I've been on it.