

INTEGRATING THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

Lois Bloom, Ph.D.

Edward Lee Thorndike Professor Emeritus
of Psychology and Education

Teachers College, Columbia University

For The Lemon Project: A Journey of Reconciliation
at The College of William and Mary

CONTACT INFORMATION:

Lois Bloom
3001 Larkspur Run
Williamsburg, VA 23185

203-673-7021

lmb32@columbia.edu

I thank Jody Allen for asking me to research the two questions for the Lemon Project that led to discovering, in the pages of William and Mary's student newspaper *The Flat Hat*, the larger story I pursued in this report. I very much appreciate Terry Meyers' infectious enthusiasm and good humor, and his letting himself be distracted enough from A.S. to care so much about William and Mary's history.

I thank Bob Bloom, Kermit Dance, Carl Dolmetsch, Jack Edwards, and Terry Meyers for reading one or another draft of this manuscript (there have been many) and generously providing valuable comments and corrections, and Jayne Barnard and Trudier Harris for help with specific questions.

INTEGRATING THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

Outline

The Cost of the Civil War in the South, 4

Slavery, the Civil War, and William and Mary, 5

Government Efforts at Civil Rights Legislation, 6

The 1866 Civil Rights Act, 6

The 1875 Civil Rights Act, 6

The 1964 Civil Rights Act, 6

The 1964 Civil Rights Act and Education, 7

The 1964 Civil Rights Act and William and Mary, 7

Stirrings of Racial Conscience, 8

An Interregnum, 9

Black Students on Campus?, 10

Intervening Protests, 12

Heightened Awareness of Racial Discrimination, 13

The Assassination of The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., 14

The Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Scholarship, 15

The Hampton Institute Exchange Initiative, 18

Change is Hard and Progress is Slow, 22

The First Black Students, 22

Black Students Experience William and Mary, 23

Song of the South., 23

Confederates on Campus., 24

A Black Commencement Speaker? Not Yet., 24

The Students React, 26

The Black Students' Organization, 30

A Look Back, 31

Assessing the Progress, 32

The President's View of Progress, 32

Official Administration Policy, 33

Faculty Research and a Report, 34

Black and White Enrollment at Other Universities, 34

Progress and Problems, 36

Administration Summary of Progress, 37

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
and the College of William and Mary, 38

The HEW Directive, 39

Student Interviews, 39

The Richard Bland College, 41

A Lawsuit, 42

The HEW Charge to the College, 43

President Paschall's Response to the Charge, 44

HEW Threat to Cut Off Federal Funds, 46

The Administration Response., 46

The Student Association Response., 48

The Black Students Organization Response., 49

The Board of Visitors Response., 50

The Faculty Response., 50

Uncertainty about HEW Cutting Federal Funds, 50

Civil Rights Groups Anticipate Governor's Plan, 51

The Governor's Plan for Desegregation, 52

The Courts Decide Richard Bland, 53

The Federal District Court., 53

The Supreme Court., 54

The President's Assessment of His Decade in Office, 55

Davis Y. Paschall Resigns as President of William and Mary, 56

A New Administration, 57

A Presidential Reaction and then Actions, 58

The Beat Goes On, 58

Black Studies, 59

Affirmative Action, 63

"The Commitment", 63

Epilogue, 2014, 65

INTEGRATING THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY

Racial integration did not come easily to William and Mary, nor to the town of Williamsburg which did not admit black children to its all-white schools until 1964.¹ This report is an account of efforts made to integrate the College in the decade following the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The primary resource used in the research was the undergraduate student newspaper *The Flat Hat* which, in my view, was diligent in reporting the relevant events. Consequently, much of what follows here presents the events of that period from the student point of view. Other state and local newspaper accounts, the presidential papers of Davis Y. Paschall, and other archival records in the Earl Gregg Swem Library were consulted when available.

The report begins with a brief background summary of the history that led to the landmark civil rights legislation of 1964. Following this background is a chronological account of the slow and halting development of a racial conscience on campus in the four years after passage of the Civil Rights Act. Two events in 1968 cast light on the integration problem at the College. The first was the assassination of the Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr. which immediately raised awareness, at least in some quarters, of William and Mary as a segregated institution. The second was the beginning of an investigation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare into discrimination at William and Mary and efforts being made (or not) by the administration to comply with the Civil Rights Act. The HEW investigation eventually encompassed a law suit that reached the United States Supreme Court in 1971.

Finally, in 1972, with changes at the top of the William and Mary administration and the HEW investigation continuing, the College began to move toward embracing programs of “affirmative action.”

The Cost of the Civil War in the South

The southern states at the end of the Civil War were utterly depleted, having ‘lost everything.’ The human cost of the war in sons, brothers, husbands was, by at least one estimate, 1.5 million casualties.² The monetary cost was also staggering. The inflation rate in the Confederacy was 700% in the Civil War’s first two years and 9,000% at its end. “By the end of the war, Lee’s Army of Northern Virginia was out of food, out of supplies and out of alternatives to surrender.”³

Arguably, however, the greatest and inestimable cost of the war to the South was the loss of its entire way of life. Having been utterly dependent on slave labor in its homes, fields, and factories, white southerners at the end of the war found themselves surrounded by 4

¹ *Daily Press*, Virginia Peninsula, May 9, 2004. At <http://www.dailypress.com/dp-brown09.0.490049.story>.

² The number of casualties in this account includes deaths from disease, the wounded and missing, and 620,000 deaths in combat. The cost of war: Killed, wounded, captured, missing, *Civil War Trust*, n.d. At <http://www.civilwar.org/education/civil-war-casualties.html>.

³ John Steele Gordon, The high cost of war. *Barrons*, April 9, 2011. At <http://online.barrons.com/news/articles/SB50001424052970203990104576191061207786514?tesla=y>.

million freed slaves. The reaction to all the loss was an enormous anger directed towards the freedmen. That anger resulted in the wave of laws known as “Black Codes” and the Jim Crow practices that swept over the South.⁴ The effects of that post-war anger have lasted, by now, more than 150 years.

Slavery, the Civil War, and William and Mary

William and Mary history was stained by slavery long before the war. The College bought and sold slaves until well into the 19th century. Slaves helped to build the earliest buildings, served the students and faculty, and worked the nearby tobacco plantation that provided funding for the College.⁵

Faculty at William and Mary were staunch supporters and defenders of the institution of slavery. “William and Mary was the intellectual center of Virginia and the genteel South, and an unabashed apologist for slavery and Jim Crow.”⁶ Thomas Roderick Dew, President of the College from 1836 to 1846, was outspoken in defense of slavery, writing for example to a school principal in Amelia, VA (October 18, 1837),

“I am glad to find that you agree with me on the subject of slavery. Every day convinces me of its blessings in southern latitudes, & I think you are right in regard to Liberia - Man cannot be uplifted from barbarism to civilization without the aid of slavery. All history demonstrates this proposition.”⁷

At the end of the war, universities in the South were not spared the loss, and the College of William and Mary was not an exception. With nearly all its students as well as its president and many professors having enlisted in the Confederate Army, the College was closed in 1861. By the following year, Williamsburg had fallen to the Union army; the college campus was occupied by federal soldiers and commanders; and the landmark Wren Building had burned.⁸

William and Mary recovered from the ashes of the war, like the proverbial phoenix, and thrived in the ensuing century—but without women students (until 1918), without black students (until 1951 when the first black graduate student enrolled in summer sessions),

⁴ Leon Litwak, 1979. *Been in the storm so long, the aftermath of slavery*. New York: Random House, and Leon Litwak, 1999, *Trouble in mind, black Southerners in the age of Jim Crow*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

⁵ Terry L. Meyers, 2008. A first look at the worst: Slavery and race relations at the College of William and Mary, *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 16:4, p. 1141. At <http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1055&context=wmborj>.

⁶ Lekan Oguntoyinbo, June 4, 2013. William and Mary aims to atone for role in slavery. In *Diverse: Issues in Higher Education*. San Diego: University of California. At <http://diverseeducation.com/article/53737/#>.

⁷ Office of the President. Thomas Roderick Dew Records, 1830-1967. Special Collections Database, University Archives, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary. At <http://scdb.swem.wm.edu/index.php?p=collections/controlcard&id=6541>.

⁸ William and Mary 1850-1899, History and Traditions, Chronology, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary. At <http://www.wm.edu/about/history/chronology/1850to1899/index.php>.

without undergraduate black students allowed to live on campus (until 1967 when three black women were admitted),⁹ and without a black member of the faculty until 1972.¹⁰

Government Efforts at Civil Rights Legislation

The 1866 Civil Rights Act

“The Civil Rights Act of 1866 granted citizenship and the same rights enjoyed by white citizens to all male persons in the United States ‘without distinction of race or color, or previous condition of slavery or involuntary servitude.’” The bill became law when a two-thirds majority in both houses of Congress overturned a veto of the bill by President Andrew Johnson.¹¹

The 1875 Civil Rights Act

The Civil Rights Act of 1875 was passed by the last biracial U.S. Congress of the 19th century. The bill protected all Americans “regardless of race, in their access to public accommodations and facilities such as restaurants, theaters, trains and other public transportation, and protected the right to serve on juries.” However the Supreme Court declared the bill unconstitutional in 1883 and it was not enforced.

That decision by the Supreme Court moved the fight for civil rights to the judicial realm. In 1896, the Supreme Court held (in *Plessy v. Ferguson*) that designating separate railway cars for whites and blacks was constitutional as long as the facilities were “equal.” The “separate but equal” doctrine of racial segregation stood until 1954, when the Supreme Court ordered school desegregation in the case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*.¹²

The 1964 Civil Rights Act

One hundred years after emancipation and the end of the war, Congress acted to turn the *Brown* decision into law by passing the benchmark civil rights legislation that continues to resonate in America today.

“An ACT To enforce the constitutional right to vote, . . . to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations, to . . . protect constitutional rights in public facilities and public education, . . . to prevent discrimination in federally assisted programs. . . and for other purposes.¹³

⁹ African American Students, Swem Library, William and Mary, November 3, 2013. At http://scdb.swem.wm.edu/wiki/index.php/African_American_Students, November 3, 2013.

¹⁰ Steve Budman, Flat Hat, William and Mary, September 22, 1972, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5040/fh19720922.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹¹ The 1866 Civil Rights Act, Reconstruction: The second Civil War, American experience. PBS Online, December 19, 2003. At http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/reconstruction/activism/ps_1866.htm.

¹² The 1875 Civil Rights Act, Reconstruction: The second Civil War, American experience. PBS Online, December 19, 2003. At http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/reconstruction/activism/ps_1875.html.

¹³ 88th Congress of the United States of America. January 7, 1964. Reproduced in Prologue: Pieces of History, National Archives. At <http://blogs.archives.gov/prologue/?cat=735>.

The prohibition against discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin ended the Jim Crow laws upheld by the Supreme Court in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The Civil Rights Act in 1964 paved the way for future anti-discrimination legislation by Congress, including the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which expanded and strengthened enforcement of the fundamental civil rights of all citizens.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act and Education

Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act specifically prohibits discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in programs or activities that receive financial assistance from the Federal government:

“No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.”¹⁴

Agencies and institutions receiving funds from the U. S. Department of Education and, therefore, covered by Title VI included more than 3,200 colleges and universities in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and United States territories and possessions. The programs and activities in such institutions that must operate in a “non-discriminatory manner” include, but are not limited to, “admissions, recruitment, financial aid . . . recreation, physical education, athletics, housing and employment, if it affects those who are intended to benefit from the Federal funds.”

Title VI is enforced by the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) in the U.S. Department of Education in two ways, either through investigation and resolution of complaints filed by people alleging discrimination, or targeting institutions for compliance review in order to identify and remedy discrimination that may not be addressed through complaint investigations.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act and William and Mary

Among the archival records preserved in the Swem Library at William and Mary is a folder marked “Negro Education.” The folder holds copies of some of the correspondence between the administration and black applicants to the College in the years overlapping the last half of the presidency of Alvin Duke Chandler (1951-1960), and the early years of the presidency of Davis Y. Paschall (1960-1971).¹⁵ Most of the correspondence consists of a letter of rejection in response to a letter of inquiry or application, with a few instances of extended correspondence from persistent applicants. The replies from the administration uniformly give two reasons for denying admission: that admitting Negroes to William and

¹⁴ Education and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education. At <http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/hq43e4.html>.

¹⁵ Davis Y. Paschall was a graduate of William and Mary and received his doctorate from the University of Virginia. At http://scdb.swem.wm.edu/wiki/index.php/Davis_Young_Paschall. He was the Superintendent of Public Instruction in Virginia from 1957 to 1960, “during the years of Massive Resistance, a campaign to prevent integration in Virginia” before he returned to William and Mary as President in 1960. *Job Half Done, William and Mary (In)action During the Civil Rights Movement*. Exhibits and Programs, Swem Library, William and Mary, October 14 – September 14, 2014. At <https://www.flickr.com/photos/scrc/sets/72157643064913924/>.

Mary is against the law in Virginia and the program the applicant asked to enter is available at one or more of the predominantly Negro colleges, for example,

“Under existing State policy the College of William and Mary is unable to admit Negro students in the type of program in which you are interested. You should be able to secure at Virginia State College in Petersburg the type of course in which you are interested. . . .”¹⁶

Stirrings of Racial Conscience

In 1945, an expression of concern over racism at William and Mary appeared in a *Flat Hat* editorial under the title “Lincoln’s Job Half-Done”:

“We believe, and know that Negroes differ from other peoples only in surface characteristics; inherently all are the same. The Negroes should be recognized as equals in our minds and hearts. For us, this means, that Negroes should attend William and Mary; they should go to our classes, participate in College functions, join the same clubs, be our roommates, pin the same classmates, and marry among us. . . .

The most important work, however, must be done in educating ourselves away from the idea of White Supremacy, for this belief is as groundless as Hitler’s Nordic Supremacy nonsense. We are injuring our personalities with arrogance; we are blocking our own emotional growth. . . . Is your conscience clear?”¹⁷

The Flat Hat did not appear the next week. Reappearing two weeks later, the banner article on the front page announced the appointment of a new *Flat Hat* editor, and a new managing editor of the paper to be announced shortly.¹⁸

In 2014, the event was featured in a Swem Library exhibit:

The “editorial became nationwide news, sparking articles, editorials, and letters around the country. . . . The board of visitors removed [Marilyn] Kaemmerle as editor and nearly expelled her, but upon the insistence of William & Mary president John Pomfret, she was allowed to graduate. Not until the 1980s did the boards of visitors issue a formal apology to Kaemmerle.”¹⁹

The 1945 editorial was reprinted in *The Flat Hat* in 1970: “The editorial would have been a mild one by today’s standards but its publication in February, 1945 resulted in temporary suspension and censorship of the *Flat Hat* as well as” its author, Marilyn Kaemmerle.²⁰

¹⁶ George J. Oliver, Head, Dept. of Education. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Box 33, Folder “Negro Education,” 1982.74.

¹⁷ Editorial, Lincoln’s job half done. *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 7, 1945, p. 8. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/309/fh19450207.pdf?sequence=2>.

¹⁸ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 21, 1945, p.1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/274/fh19450221.pdf?sequence=2>.

¹⁹ Job half done, William and Mary (In)action during the Civil Rights movement. Exhibits and Programs, Swem Library, William and Mary, October 14 – September 14, 2014. At <https://swem.wm.edu/exhibits/job-half-done>, also <http://hdl.handle.net/10288/309>.

²⁰ Mary Edwards, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October, 30, 1970, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5396/fh19701030.pdf?sequence=1>.

Twenty years later, in Spring 1963, a “Statement of Interest” was circulated on campus and gathered more than 500 signatures before it was published in *The Flat Hat*:

“We, the undersigned, believe that admission to the College of William and Mary should be granted solely on the basis of academic excellence and personal character with no regard to the race, color, or creed of the applicant. . . . This statement does not intend to imply any read-in accusation of current college policy, for we do not feel ourselves knowledgeable on such matters. . . . We merely express our belief with the general understanding that the College, located in a geographical region where race relations have been a historical problem, will have to cope with this situation in the future. . . . [and receive any student] on no other grounds than his good character and good mind.”²¹

One week later the number of signatures had grown to approximately 800 and was transmitted to the President of the College, Davis Y. Paschall. “The poll reached about 1800 students” and reportedly “Those who declined to sign gave as their principal reason that they felt it would do no real good.”²² President Paschall did not respond.

An Editorial, “On Integration,” in the same *Flat Hat* issue endorsed the statement and the “willingness of the signers to accept *any student, anytime*, on the basis of his good character and mind. This, in contrast to the tragedy of Oxford, the circus at Greenwood, and the debacle in Birmingham speaks highly of William and Mary students. . . . integration . . . in years to come, will inevitably be a common fact at all institutions of higher learning.”²³

However, a letter in the same issue disagreed:

“It’s time the opposition organized itself and presented a united front against this latest brainchild of some of William and Mary’s equalizers. . . . the whole matter. . . [is] presumptuous as well as repulsive. . . . [The writer suggested that the College] cut back on out-of-state admissions, particularly where applicants from north of the Mason-Dixon Line are concerned, though it must be conceded that such a requirement would hardly guarantee against meddlers in racial matters.”²⁴

Other letters followed that both responded to this letter and endorsed the original Statement.²⁵

An Interregnum

The CRA, enacted on July 2, 1964, was not mentioned in *The Flat Hat* that year or in the next several years. In fact, with the notable exception of the “Statement of Interest” in the

²¹ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 3, 1963, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4653/fh19630503.pdf?sequence=1>.

²² *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 10, 1963, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/18236/fh19630510.pdf?sequence=1>

²³ Editorial, *Ibid.*, p. 4.

²⁴ William F. Andrews, Jr., *ibid.*, p 5.

²⁵ See, for example, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 17, 1963, pp. 2, 5, 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4370/fh19630517.pdf?sequence=1>.

Spring of 1963, most of the ‘news’ in the student paper in the early 1960s (and doubtless before then) was fairly insular and about college athletics, performing arts, and social activities centered on the fraternities and sororities. The Johnson-Goldwater election of 1964 generated some debate, as did the Vietnam War beginning in 1965, and a cheating scandal reared up in the winter of ’64-’65 . But perhaps the most intense activist display was for a cafeteria boycott in 1967 after cockroaches were discovered in the food.

The governor of Virginia, Albert S. Harrison, Jr., in a meeting in December, 1964, asked President Davis Y. Paschall “to explore possibilities for admitting 200 additional women students” in September, 1965. The response from the administration, students, and faculty (at least as reported in 1965 issues of *The Flat Hat*) most often deplored (whined) the lack of classroom and dormitory space: for example, “William and Mary is in no position to increase enrollment above the number presently in attendance, unless it wants to reduce educational quality to a mediocre level.”²⁶ Admitting fewer men in order to admit more women was apparently not considered as an option.

Two public lectures addressed race issues. In Spring 1965, Dr. John Hope Franklin, Professor of History at the University of Chicago, presented “A New View of Reconstruction” in which he “refuted the wide-spread belief that the Negro played the villain’s part in Reconstruction.”²⁷ In the Fall, Prof. of History Joseph L Brent spoke on “The South: A Mythological Society” in which he “stressed that the concept of ‘whiteness’ as superior to ‘blackness’ has been a part of the southern myth since the time of Jefferson.”²⁸

By the end of the Fall 1965 semester, however, debate and demonstrations both for and against the Vietnam War had escalated considerably and was the main focus of attention.

Black Students on Campus?

At the end of 1966, a graduate student noticed the absence of black students on campus: “Having come to Virginia from an entirely different part of the country, I was quite surprised to find so few Negro students at William and Mary. . .”²⁹

The Flat Hat Editor responded,

. . . “we investigated and found no evidence of discrimination in either the recruiting o[r] admission practice of William and Mary. The registrar and the admissions office do not keep records on the racial and ethnic backgrounds of students enrolled here. . . .

²⁶ Joy Hutzell, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, January 8, 1965, p. 4. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3996/fh19650108.pdf?sequence=1>, and *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 12, 1965, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4568/fh19650212.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁷ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 9, 1965, p. 12. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4315/fh19650409.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁸ Don Ferriss, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 22, 1965, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5325/fh19651022.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁹ A. Daniel Kemp, Letter to the Editor, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 9, 1966, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5079/fh19661209.pdf?sequence=1>.

Negro students do not seem to want to study at William and Mary. Socially, they would be much more uncomfortable here than at a predominantly Negro school or some other schools. The arts and humanities orientation here requires more of a high school preparation than is offered by many predominantly Negro secondary schools in Virginia and elsewhere. . . . William and Mary is tragically missing the benefit of contributions of good Negro students. . . . ³⁰

In the next week's issue, an Instructor of English fired back:

. . . "It is incredibly weak to assume a safe passive attitude when we have a crime to undo. William and Mary should know that desegregation involves seeking good Negro students, making an active effort to recruit them. . . . William and Mary can do one of two things: either get out and recruit good Negro students (good white students and star athletes are recruited here) or just be honest about the whole business and admit that the College doesn't care about civil rights."³¹

Several weeks later, two more faculty letters were printed, one of which was signed by 77 members of the faculty: ". . . We urge our College to intensify whatever efforts it may be making to find and welcome qualified Negro residential students as soon as possible."³²

Letters in the next few months took another turn as reaction seemed to set in against the idea of 'reverse discrimination' (although not named as such). For example, a faculty member who had signed the group letter had second thoughts: ". . . we must not allow good intentions to lead us to new forms of prejudice. . . ."³³

In response, a member of the Faculty pointed out (among other things) that ". . . some selectivity in favor of the Negro not only is necessary to offset past and present inequities, but also to enhance the education, in the full sense, of those who otherwise lack educational and cultural contact with diverse groups."³⁴

A group of students signed a Letter urging "that, instead of specifically recruiting qualified Negroes, the college institute an active policy of finding and attracting qualified students, making it extremely clear . . . that William and Mary requires ability . . . and is not concerned with the package in which it comes."³⁵ In response to the student group letter another signer of the faculty group letter pointed out: "The change will not come

³⁰ Editor's Note, p. 5. *Ibid.*

³¹ Silvia Wilkinson, Letter to the Editor, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 16, 1966, pp. 5, 10. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4329/fh19661216.pdf?sequence=1>.

³² Nathan Altshuler, et al., Letter to the Editor, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, January 13, 1967, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4075/fh19670113.pdf?sequence=1>.

³³ Louis E. Catron, Letter to the Editor, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 10, 1967, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4092/fh19670210.pdf?sequence=1>.

³⁴ Leonard G. Schifrin, Letter to the Editor, *Flat Hat*, p. 5, William and Mary, March 3, 1967. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5368/fh19670303.pdf?sequence=1>.

³⁵ Margaret Hofbauer, *et al.*, Letter to the Editor, *Flat Hat*, p.5, William and Mary, February 17, 1967. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4341/fh19670217.pdf?sequence=1>.

inevitably. It must be made to happen The evidence indicates that we won't have qualified Negro students unless we recruit them. . . ."³⁶

Another faculty member submitted a Letter containing "facts" he considered pertinent to the debate:

"In the state of Virginia this year [1967] there were 21 Negro National Merit Scholars" but none would enroll at William and Mary, choosing other universities and colleges in Virginia and elsewhere. In contrast, "the state of North Carolina had 21 negro National Merit Scholars, of whom seven would enroll in the University of North Carolina. . . . it would seem reasonable for this college to attract National Merit Scholars whatever their race."³⁷

Indications were that the issue was a subject of considerable discussion and debate on campus through the 1967 Spring semester. Reviewing the faculty meeting minutes might be instructive. The question was evidently left hanging over the summer.

Intervening Protests

Momentum in support of black student enrollment appeared to stall as the students and its newspaper were taken up with other issues in the ensuing academic year. Debate and protest over the Vietnam War, having simmered for several years, suddenly erupted in Spring 1968 as it did on college campuses across the country.

The new found student activism appeared to empower protest over local campus issues: faculty salaries and, tangentially, salaries of other employees on campus; visitation rights for students of the opposite sex in the dormitories; and perhaps most passionately, the discovery of cockroaches in the food served in the cafeteria which resulted in a cafeteria boycott. One of the principle organizers of the cafeteria boycott, recalling the debate over recruiting black students in Spring, 1963, commented that the boycott "impressed me because the students were finally active—they moved; it depressed me because it was over such a minor thing."³⁸

Students clearly grew in their capacity for asserting themselves as the 1960s decade drew to a close, seeming to gain both momentum and traction from not just the Vietnam protests but expressions of racial injustice that had begun to appear. The leadership of the student body demanded revision of proscriptive regulations governing student conduct and demanded a "Statement of Student Rights" with, among other things, student representation on faculty and administrative governing bodies up to and including the Board of Visitors. Women students were also empowered by the feminist movement sweeping the country and acted by rejecting the protectionist rules and regulations

³⁶ William F. Davis, Jr., Letter to the Editor, *Flat Hat*, p.5, William and Mary, February 24, 1967. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4652/fh19670224.pdf?sequence=1>.

³⁷ David J. Gray, Letter to the Editor, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 7, 1967, p. 4. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4713/fh19670407.pdf?sequence=1>.

³⁸ Judy Johnson, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 29, 1967, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5116/fh19670929.pdf?sequence=1>.

governing their life on campus such as curfew, and demanding dorm visitations as well as personal rights including the dress code and abortion.

In a letter to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare at the end of 1970, the Women's Equity Action League "a national women's liberation organization" filed charges alleging discrimination against women at William and Mary. Among the charges cited were the disproportionate representation of women among the faculty and their relative status and salary relative to their male colleagues; the 60/40 gender quota for admissions that kept the student body predominantly male in spite of higher qualifications of many female applicants; and gender discrimination in non-academic hiring.³⁹ An editorial expressed outrage over the inadequacy of compliance reviews and the administration's failure to take charges seriously.⁴⁰

Students' sensitivity to differences among them was also presciently expressed in a lengthy article and accompanying editorials that addressed homosexuality on campus:

"Homosexuality exists at William and Mary as it does at every other College. Yet here as hopefully at few other institutions of higher learning is there an atmosphere of intolerance, ignorance, and cruelty which both inhibits and ridicules the different, the strange and the introvert . . . hence, the Flat Hat feels compelled to try to penetrate this topic with some information, explanation and discussion documenting the local and national perspectives on homosexuals. . ." ⁴¹

Heightened Awareness of Racial Discrimination

The first of a projected series of editorial articles on "the situation of Negro higher education in Virginia," cited a study by the Commission on Higher Educational Opportunities in the South (no citation provided) reporting wide disparities between southern black and predominantly white colleges in "admission standards, breadth and depth of curriculum, quality of instruction, [and] preparation of students for employment." Only 15% of the South's college-age Negro population, in contrast to 44% of college-age whites, attended college last fall [presumably, 1966].⁴²

According to a subsequent editorial, "because the civil rights laws forbid racial discrimination, colleges no longer classify themselves as either Negro or white. Neither is it possible for them to keep a roster of students by race. Therefore, no statistics on integration of the student bodies are available." However, the total number of students enrolled in the four colleges in Virginia that "call themselves predominantly Negro

³⁹ Mary K. Lamont, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 4, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4577/fh19701204.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁴⁰ Editorial, *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁴¹ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 22, 1968, pp. 4, 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4143/fh19680322.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁴² Patricia Howard, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 6, 1967, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5151/fh19671006.pdf?sequence=1>.

institutions” is 3,825 which is only slightly more than “the present enrollment of the College of William and Mary.”⁴³

The concern over racial disparities and discrimination in education coincided with protests over faculty salaries, a heightened awareness of conditions and circumstances affecting other staff employees, and personnel policies more generally. Employment practices were singled out in two areas in particular, the college laundry and the cafeteria, under the banner headline “Tradition Limits Negro Employees” (“Little Pay, Advancement or Change”).⁴⁴ An editorial in the same issue addressed the “deplorable employment situation. . . of Peninsula Negroes employed at the College.”

. . . “the negro has had a heritage of years of slavery and consequent discrimination . . . it is no wonder that he has had poorer education, looser domestic ties and a larger sense of frustration and aimlessness. . . . He does not work in the College laundry, the caf or the ground crew, because he wants to. Rather, these are positions traditionally held by Negroes.

“ . . . paying higher wages “would raise the cost of an education. . . . Perhaps, then, there should be an awareness that tuition is not a true indication of the total cost of an education at William and Mary. Someone else is sacrificing both in economic and human terms. . . .”⁴⁵

And in the next week’s issue, an article on “Personnel Policies” concluded “on no grounds should the Negro have to prove himself first to achieve the freedom and opportunity blanketly (*sic*) extended a white. . . . We must accept him with no modifiers; it has been our gain, it must be our risk.”⁴⁶

However, none of these often passionate pleas for racial justice on campus addressed the question of integrating the student body and the faculty.

And then. . .

The Assassination of The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

The murder of Dr. King on April 4, 1968 clearly struck a nerve at the College, as it did throughout the country. The faculty responded within the week:

“To those among our colleagues who scruple against programs aimed specifically to advantage Negroes, let them be dissuaded from such views by recognizing that theirs is an argument for inaction, an argument which ignores that centuries of neglect have

⁴³ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 20, 1967, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4587/fh19671020.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁴⁴ Linda Phillips, Donna Wonnell, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 8, 1967, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3687/fh19671208.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁴⁵ Editorial, *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁴⁶ Editorial, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December, 15, 1967, p.2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3531/fh19671215.pdf?sequence=1>.

consequences which we—as the inheritors of this ignoble legacy—are morally obliged now to confront, now to assuage and now to commence to erase.”⁴⁷

Four resolutions were proposed and three were passed: first, that condolences be sent to Dr. King’s widow, and second, that a scholarship fund of \$1300 be established “for a needy student ‘who gives promise of continuing the pursuit of racial justice in the spirit of Dr. King’.” The third resolution proposed that a committee of faculty, students, and administration be appointed “to undertake a study of the means by which the College of William and Mary may quickly move toward a broad expansion of opportunities for Negroes in the College staff, its faculty and its student body.”

However, a fourth resolution, objecting to the use of Phi Beta Kappa Hall for the Lions Club minstrel show on the day after Dr. King’s death, was tabled.

Two student initiatives emerged in response to Dr. King’s assassination. The first was the creation of an independent King Scholarship Fund which gained support only slowly and was absorbed the following year into the fund established by the faculty. The second was an effort to create a student exchange program with nearby Hampton Institute, an effort that evolved over several years but ultimately failed (at least within the time frame of this report).

The Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Scholarship

The Student Association responded to Dr. King’s death with an independent resolution to create “a Memorial Scholarship Fund. . . which will rely on the philanthropy of the student body. . . [for] anyone who can demonstrate genuine financial need. Though available to applicants of all races, the scholarship was implicitly created to enable deserving Negro students to matriculate at the College. . . a step toward redressing the obvious racial imbalance in the student body.”⁴⁸

“[It] seems peculiar that groups of faculty members and students must take the initiative in attracting Negro scholars. Obviously, the Office of Admissions is in a much better position to effect such a plan if, of course, it desired or was permitted to do so. That it has not is, ultimately, the fault of the Administration. Token integration, in the most limiting sense of those words, remains the rule as the policies of the College show no evidence of change. Even on a broad regional level, William and Mary perseveres in a less-than-splendid isolated, [*sic*] conspicuously refusing to work with predominantly Negro institutions like Hampton, Virginia Union, and Virginia State.”

The next week, the Student Association reported that \$375 had been contributed to their Scholarship Fund. Plans were made to appoint a committee to act in coordination with the faculty, the Office of Admissions, and other Administration offices to help administer the

⁴⁷ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 12, 1968, p.1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4000/fh19680412.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁴⁸ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 26, 1968, pp. 2, 4. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5199/fh19680426.pdf?sequence=1>.

scholarship program, but “it is indefinite how much of a voice the students will have in naming the scholarship recipient.”⁴⁹

Students were asked to contribute \$1 each to the student fund.

“It is the supreme and most bitter irony to find that professors are more liberal, more enlightened than a supposedly select group of . . . [students].” Although students outnumber faculty 15-to-1, the faculty raised \$1065 in spite of the “deplorable salaries they receive at this institution. Contribute a dollar? What students gave doesn’t even amount to a quarter each [with] less than \$400 contributed by illustrious students of the institution whose early graduates helped to create a republic which promised liberty and justice to all.”⁵⁰

By the middle of the Fall 1968 semester, the faculty had raised \$2632, with an average contribution of \$15, and the students had raised \$635. At some point, the decision was made to combine the two efforts, and the faculty took charge of administering the scholarship and deciding how the funds would be used.

“The Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Scholarship Fund established and supported by the Faculty of the College, provides annual awards, preferably to entering freshmen. Based upon merit and need, the scholarships may carry a stipend up to \$1300. The recipients shall be selected by the Faculty Committee on Admissions.”⁵¹

The goal was to solicit contributions “in the autumn of all succeeding years so as to assure this scholarship in perpetuity.” Evidently the available funds were to be distributed each year and contributions solicited to replenish the funds from year to year.⁵²

The first King scholarships, \$500 each, were awarded to five prospective students of the incoming (1969-70) freshman class, with three additional students chosen as alternates. No information about the students was reported.⁵³ However, the number of potential awards dropped to only three for the 1970-71 freshman class because of “a decreasing number of contributors to the fund.”⁵⁴

Nevertheless, in Spring 1970, the names of “six winners and five alternates” for the award were announced prior to their planned visit to the campus. According to this later article,

⁴⁹ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 3, 1968, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5339/fh19680503.pdf?sequence=1>

⁵⁰ *Flat Hat*, *Ibid.*, p. 2.

⁵¹ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, November 22, 1968, p. 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5402/fh19681115.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 12.

⁵² The lack of student participation in the decision-making process and crediting the students for their contributions to the fund did not seem to become issues. Instead, student activism in the Fall was largely directed toward the administration and the Board of Visitors for what was to become the major issue in the next few years: student regulations and redefining students’ rights.

⁵³ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 14, 1969, p.1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5163/fh19690314.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁵⁴ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 10, 1969, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4225/fh19691010.pdf?sequence=1>.

the award was to be presented to “outstanding black entering freshmen” (the description given originally for the scholarship did not specify race).⁵⁵

Shortly after, the Student Association again announced a fund-raising effort, pointing out that “[l]ess than one percent of the student body here is black now.” This time students were asked to donate 50 cents each in order to add \$1000 to the fund and “provide two additional \$500 scholarships for—hopefully—two additional black students next year.”⁵⁶

A gift (reportedly \$30,000) to the College from President Davis Y. Paschall’s own Class of 1932, given to enhance the entrance to Crim Dell, elicited the following response in a *Flat Hat* editorial.

“Certainly the problem of the severe racial imbalance here [on campus] is one of the more obvious” needs of the college. However, “[t]he Martin Luther King scholarship fund limps along on sporadic contributions from both faculty and students. Its existence is so tenuous that the admissions office fears to mention it in print lest it shrivel to nothing before the next interested black student applies.

. . . “We think that the investment of this money in the lives of young black people [through the King Scholarship Fund] would have been a far better symbolic ‘look to the future’ which could have gone far to compensate for the College’s ‘heritage’ of racism, which is, indeed, a challenge.”⁵⁷

In pointed contrast to the gift from the class of 1932, the 1971 Senior Class “set a remarkable standard for future class gifts” by donating \$800, their parting gift to the College, to the King Scholarship Fund, thereby demonstrating “concern for one of the College’s most pressing and most neglected problems.”⁵⁸ The 1972 Senior Class, in turn, donated half the money they collected, \$300, for their class gift to the King Scholarship Fund.⁵⁹

In Spring, 1973, fifteen high school seniors were awarded Martin Luther King Scholarships for the 1973-74 year. Contributions and pledges to the King Fund totaled \$2,695.50 as of April 23, with contributions from 75 students, 1 campus organization, 3 alumni, and 106 members of the administration, faculty and staff.⁶⁰

⁵⁵ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 13, 1970, p. 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5281/fh19700313.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁵⁶ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 3, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4820/fh19700331.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 1.

⁵⁷ Editorial, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 18, 1970, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4324/fh19700918.pdf?sequence=1>

⁵⁸ Editorial, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 5, 1971, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4002/fh19710205.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁵⁹ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 12, 1972, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3870/fh19720512.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁶⁰ *William and Mary News*, William and Mary, April 21, 1973, p. 4. At <https://digitalarchive.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/18997/WMN19730421.pdf?sequence=1>.

I found no mention of Martin Luther King Scholarships under Financial Aid on the current William and Mary website.

The Hampton Institute Exchange Initiative

In Fall 1968, a junior from Minnesota majoring in history enrolled in a course on History of Africans at Hampton Institute, motivated by a “meaningful dialogue with black students.” In an interview with a *Flat Hat* reporter, he commented,

“Hampton is in many ways similar to William and Mary. Both schools are de facto segregated colleges. Both are historically rich. And yet while they are within a half an hour’s distance of each other, there is very little formal or informal communication between them.” Also, “there seems to be no real inclination on the part of the College’s administration to have any such communication. Personally, I got very little encouragement from the deans from whom I had to secure permission. . . . In fact one dean went so far as to say that ‘if you don’t like the lack of racial confrontation at this college, why don’t you transfer.’”⁶¹

He suggested a formal exchange program between the two colleges. “Considering that Hampton has exchange programs with numerous ‘prestige’ universities such as Cornell, it seems incredible to me that nothing similar has been set up here.”

His proposal was taken up in Spring 1970 by Tom Rees, a member of the Student Association as part of a student “Attack on Racial Imbalance.” “It’s manifestly obvious that this place doesn’t represent the real world in terms of racial makeup” [with] “its nearly all-white (about 99%) student body.” He reported that in the previous semester he and another student “formed a special subcommittee of the SA’s Academic Affairs Committee to pursue the twin goals of greater racial unity and better racial balance on campus.”⁶²

“By the middle of the fall [1969], committee members had formulated a two-point program which they felt would improve the racial picture at William and Mary. They called for (1) an exchange program between William and Mary and its predominantly black neighbor, Hampton Institute, and (2) increased black admissions. . . . In the area of admissions, the committee . . . recommended that Admissions office recruiters concentrate more on black high schools and that a special brochure aimed at prospective black students be included with other College literature mailings.

“Admissions officials responded that they had indeed delivered recruiting lectures to black schools, but that funds [were] not available” for printing a special brochure.

Rees had written the president of the Hampton student government and proposed “a one-semester exchange of an equal number of students from each school. The Hampton student government and the William and Mary Student Association each passed along pertinent information to their respective administrations. . . . [and] both administrations expressed a tentative interest in the exchange.”

⁶¹ Bob Works, In Nadia Tongour, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 18, 1968 p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5237/fh19680517.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁶² Russell Smith, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 6, 1970, pp. 1, 4. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4899/fh19700306.pdf?sequence=1>.

However, “an unexpected snag developed. . . Apparently, the Hampton administration expects official word from William and Mary before taking further action . . . and [the William and Mary Dean of the Faculty] also awaits the same official word from Hampton before he will act. . . . Rees expected to be able to generate an official communication from William and Mary to Hampton” so that the issue could be sent forward from the Dean’s office to President Paschall “for final disposition.”

In late February, 1970, Rees and other SA members also appealed to visitors from the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare who were on campus to investigate compliance by the College with the 1964 Civil Rights Act. “In private talks with committee members, HEW officials gave assurances that they would provide ‘any help we can’ in liberalizing William and Mary admissions and instituting an exchange program. . . . Given their careful groundwork and the additional HEW leverage, the Rees committee’s labors may yet bear fruit.”

However, as the Spring 1970 semester was coming to a close, the Hampton Exchange proposal was still “languishing through the bureaucratic mire of William and Mary. . . . In his search for the ‘proper channels’ Rees spoke to the office of nearly every major official of the college. . . in many of them he found sympathy for the cause, but he found none eager to act on the exchange program.”⁶³

Reasons cited for the failure of the Hampton initiative included “institutional racism; the fear of lowering William and Mary’s standards; and delay because of [the ongoing study by the Department of] Health, Education and Welfare. . . . Some administrators have hinted that a degree from William and Mary might tend to be ‘cheapened’ by a formal bond with Hampton Institute. . . . In all, there appears to be only one thing barring an exchange program with Hampton Institute—the reluctance of William and Mary’s administration. President Paschall is the man who can start the program moving toward realization.”

“Administration officials told Rees earlier this spring that the College could not enter into an exchange program with Hampton Institute until the State Council of Higher Education and Gov. Linwood Holton had submitted, and HEW had approved, plans for the desegregation of Virginia’s colleges.” However, according to visiting HEW representatives, “the HEW report on the College would probably include recommendations on the proposed exchange and that College President Davis Y. Paschall did not have to wait for the report to set up an exchange.”⁶⁴

After a year-long effort, President Paschall asked the Vice President for Academic Affairs, W. Melville Jones, to take up the proposal. Jones contacted the Dean of the Faculty at Hampton and “asked him to sound out reaction to the idea there.” He also “indicated he would bring up the proposal at the May 15 Board of Visitors meeting.” Tom Rees reported that he had “discussed the idea with a number of students and one administrator at

⁶³ Editorial, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 17, 1970, p. 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3822/fh19700413.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 7.

⁶⁴ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 17, 1970, p.2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3822/fh19700413.pdf?sequence=1>, p.3.

Hampton, and found the reaction highly favorable. . . . He had also taken up the matter with investigators from the Office for Civil Rights in the regional office of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare . . . and received assurances of their support for the measure.”⁶⁵

Hopes were high, as the Fall 1970 semester began, that the exchange between the College and Hampton would “probably become a reality next semester.”⁶⁶ High level officials from both schools, including President Paschall and two vice presidents met with the president and the Dean of Faculty at Hampton to “discuss matters of ‘general co-operation.’” After several planning sessions, Vice President Jones expressed

“hope to be able to set the program up by second semester.” He noted that “[t]he exchange presents no serious financial problems . . . and may broaden other ‘cultural areas’ such as choir and band concerts. On the faculty level, at least one Hampton instructor will definitely teach in the College’s English department next semester, perhaps as a prelude to a faculty exchange program.”

However, in “replying to Rees’ suggestion about student participation [in planning the exchange], Jones asserted ‘I think you might mess it up if you get into it right now. We are moving in good faith.’ He stressed the need for academic selection criteria and careful screening of applicants. ‘We don’t want to send people down there who are going to stir up a revolution.’”

Regarding “possible action by the Board of Visitors at their November meeting, Jones voiced general optimism, noting that plans for the exchange would probably not need specific Board approval. ‘The President will inform the Board of steps taken and report progress, but we don’t anticipate any problems.’”

“Rees concurred, ‘it looks good,’ he explained, ‘and will probably help . . . the image of the College considerably, especially when the HEW thing is bringing so much bad publicity,’ referring to the “clash, recently made public, between Paschall and U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare officials over the College’s compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act.”

An accompanying Editorial, “share[d] in the view that, on the whole, ‘it looks good,’ or at least better than ever. For a truly viable program, however, students must have voice and responsibility; they should be heard now. . . . “fears that student intervention might ‘mess things up’ betrays a basic, potentially dangerous, lack of trust in the student body.”⁶⁷

It seems transparent that the willingness on the part of President Paschall and his administration to at least explore a student exchange with Hampton Institute was motivated, in no small part, by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare presence

⁶⁵ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 1, 1970, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4949/fh19700501.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁶⁶ Mary Frances Lowe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 2, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/18245/FH19701002.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, Editorial, p. 2.

on campus and the possibility of a confrontation between the government agency and the administration.

Meanwhile, the University of Virginia and Hampton Institute initiated a comparable exchange with \$200,000 in support provided by a grant from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.⁶⁸ Hampton had applied for the grant, choosing to collaborate with the University of Virginia, ostensibly because it was the largest state university. The Dean of Faculty at Hampton said he did not expect the Virginia exchange to influence plans with William and Mary.⁶⁹

As the semester came to a close, a list of courses offered at Hampton for William and Mary students in the Spring 1971 semester was announced. Tom Rees provided information about the courses and about what students in the exchange program might expect on the different campuses.⁷⁰

Optimism was short-lived, however, when it became clear that student response to the program was light; only five students at Hampton and 24 William and Mary students had signed up for exchange courses. Rees concluded “This semester’s exchange may not come up to the expectations which I had, but it is a beginning. The William and Mary students who do participate will be in an excellent position to increase the interest of the Hampton student body for a program during the fall semester.”⁷¹

The program failed to take off. Only Tom Rees and one other senior attended classes at Hampton while no students came to William and Mary from Hampton. The two William and Mary seniors discussed their experience with directness and considerable feeling.

“The experience has made me begin to understand how it is for a black person on this [W&M] campus. . . . “life at Hampton” is a “heavy experience” . . . “you see the long term frustration of black people.” Expressing “appreciation for the friendliness of the students at Hampton,” he concluded that “more can be done by individuals here [at W&M] to make black students feel more at home.”⁷²

At the close of the semester, Rees felt that

“[t]he exchange was one hell of an experience. . . I was able to get rid of some guilt and develop some human relationships with black people. The decision to go to Hampton should not be a flippant one . . . it would be a real challenge for a white student,

⁶⁸ Mary Frances Lowe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, November 3, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4368/fh19701103.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 1.

⁶⁹ Mary Fran Lowe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, November 6, 1970, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4530/fh19701106.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 3.

⁷⁰ Paul Guytos, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 4, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4577/fh19701204.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁷¹ Mark Reynolds, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 16, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5144/fh19701216.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁷² Steve Bates, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 6, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4847/fh19710406.pdf?sequence=1>.

particularly one coming out of William and Mary.” Although Rees would be graduating, he urged a “one-to-one” student exchange with Hampton the next year.⁷³

In Fall 1971, the exchange did continue on a “one-to-one basis” with one senior from each school.⁷⁴ Meanwhile, Thomas A. Graves had replaced Davis Y. Paschall who retired as President of the College (for “health reasons”) earlier in the year.⁷⁵ In one of his first acts as President, he visited Hampton Institute to explore ways of extending the exchange.^{76, 77}

Change is Hard and Progress is Slow

The First Black Students

The first black students admitted to William and Mary, in 1951, were graduate students: Hulon Willis studied education in summer sessions and graduated with a master’s degree in 1956; Edward Augustus Travis studied law, graduating in 1954 with a Bachelor of Civil Law. Miriam Johnson Carter, the first woman, was admitted to the law school in 1955, but did not graduate. The first undergraduate student, Oscar Houser Blayton, was admitted in 1963 as a day student but left after his sophomore year.⁷⁸

The first black undergraduate students to live on campus arrived in Fall 1967, three women who roomed together in the basement of Jefferson Hall.⁷⁹ The next academic year opened with integration of the women’s dormitories. However, according to the Dean of Women,⁸⁰ integrating the dormitories

“was not deliberate. Students were placed together arbitrarily, in order of date of application to the College. . . . those who plan student housing have no idea who is black and who is white. They do not separate Negroes from Caucasians just as they do not separate Lutherans from Catholics. . . .

“One elderly Ludwell resident heard that Negro girls were rooming in some of the college-owned sections of Ludwell. She was ‘appalled.’ ‘I am ruined. I shall not be able to sleep to

⁷³ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 14, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5427/fh19710514.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁷⁴ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 17, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3801/fh19710917.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁷⁵ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 22, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3698/fh19711022.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁷⁶ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 17, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3801/fh19710917.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁷⁷ According to the Swem site, “African American Students,” at http://scdb.swem.wm.edu/wiki/index.php/African_American_Students, the “Hampton Institute Exchange Program dissolve[d] due to lack of funding and student interest” in January, 1971. However, that seems to be in error because it evidently did continue, at least through Fall 1971.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ Nadia Tongour, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 20, 1967, p. 16. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4587/fh19671020.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁸⁰ Cheryl Scott, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 25, 1968, p. 5. <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3978/fh19681025.pdf?sequence=1>.

night.’ [However,] . . . there has been no evidence on campus that integrated housing has caused insomnia or any excessive concern.”

Black Students Experience William and Mary

It is difficult, even presumptuous, from the vantage point of this report, to try conveying what it was like for the first black undergraduates who integrated William and Mary in the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, two honored traditions on campus, and the events around selecting the 1971 commencement speaker, give a sense of the environment that greeted them.

Song of the South. A long tradition at William and Mary football games had students standing, clapping, and singing along as the school band played “Dixie.” Evidently no one questioned the practice until the week before the October 18, 1969 Homecoming Game, when students objected to “Dixie” having been played by the band during the William and Mary-University of Virginia football game the previous week.

“On at least two occasions our fine, nearly all white marching band played DIXIE, and hundreds of students, all white I might add, stood and clapped to the music. We need to be reminded that DIXIE, although an innocent sounding song of the south, symbolized one of the worst periods in American history. It is also a slap in the face to every black and many whites within ear’s reach of it. . . . I appeal to you, Mr. Varner [the band’s leader], the band, and all students who stood, think a little about what you are doing before you endorse racism.”⁸¹

At the same time, the political climate on campus was rife with protests against the Vietnam War. Three days before Homecoming, a “Moratorium” event took place as part of a nationwide protest. A “Peace March” from the Wren Building to the Colonial Capital was accompanied by the police as well as representatives from major television networks and wire services.⁸²

But the “Dixie” protest was not lost. Students threatened to demonstrate if the song was played at Homecoming (Warren Buck, for example, threatened to burn a Confederate flag in protest). As a result, the College Band Director Charles R. Varner announced that the band would not play “Dixie” and, furthermore, the tune had been dropped from the band’s musical selections. Varner said ‘We’re not about to play any song that may provoke an incident in front of ten to twelve thousand people’”⁸³ (sidestepping the issues).

Opposition to the band’s decision as well as some support were expressed in Letters to the Editor and interviews with students.⁸⁴ Evidently, however, “Dixie” was not played again in university sponsored events.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Richard K. Hester, Letter, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 17, 1969, p. 8. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4225/fh19691010.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 33.

⁸² Dan Ch—ley, *ibid.*, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4225/fh19691010.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 26.

⁸³ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 24, 1969, p.2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3697/fh19691024.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 6, 11.

Confederates on Campus. Every spring, as part of an 80-year (in 1971) traditional “Southern Ball and Weekend,” members of the Kappa Alpha fraternity dressed in Confederate uniforms and paraded from the Capital to the intersection where Jamestown and Richmond roads meet North and South Boundary streets. There the fraternity president handed a sword to a member of the College administration to signify the fraternity’s temporary secession from the College for a weekend in Virginia Beach. In 1971, the College Vice-President Carter Lownace, who was to accept the sword, pronounced the parade and ceremonies “symbolic of the chivalry and traditions of the Old South. There is nothing racial in it at all.”⁸⁶

The Black Student Organization disagreed, considering the event “an insult to the blacks on campus” and “an attempt to perpetuate the enslavement of the black people.” . . . “the ceremony and parade symbolize, among other things, ‘the perpetuation of traditional Southern prejudices’ [that] ‘hinders efforts for understanding and co-operation.’”

Letters to the Editor pointed out, for example,

“We do not object to the staging of the parade per se. But we strenuously object to the symbols so plainly displayed during the procession.”⁸⁷

“The Confederate flag, the Confederate uniforms and singing ‘Dixie’ are obnoxious, offensive and threatening to black people. . . . The idea that is expressed by the symbols . . . is one of racism, racial oppression and black subjugation. These symbols are insulting and demeaning to black people.”⁸⁸

The parade took place “without any direct confrontation between the fraternity and the Black Students Organization [but] . . . the ceremonies took place a half of a block down Duke of Gloucester Street . . . ‘to avoid any trouble with the blacks.’”⁸⁹ The tradition evidently continued at least for another decade.⁹⁰

A Black Commencement Speaker? Not Yet. Early in the 1970-71 academic year, the senior class sponsored a referendum to determine class preferences for their commencement speaker. The final list of potential speakers they proposed was, first, Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York “by a substantial margin” with Mayor Charles Evers of

⁸⁵ For a fuller account and citations, see L. Bloom, 2013. *Confederates on the Campus*, 1. “Dixie.” The Lemon Project.

⁸⁶ Mary Whitesell, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 7, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3758/fh19710507.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 1.

⁸⁷ Black Students Organization, Letter, *ibid.*, p.2.

⁸⁸ Henry Tucker Jr., Letter, *ibid.*,

⁸⁹ For a fuller account and citations, see L. Bloom, 2014. *Confederates on the Campus*, 2. Secession. The Lemon Project.

⁹⁰ Terry L. Meyers, 2008. p. 1163, fn. 128. At <http://scholarship.law.wm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1055&context=wmborj>.

Fayette, Miss., Senator William Fulbright, and Kingman Brewster, president of Yale University as the “other senior class choices.”^{91, 92}

In early Spring, 1971, after John Lindsay declined the invitation, members of the administration suggested that inviting Charles Evers, the students’ second choice, “might not be appropriate,”⁹³ and President of the university, Davis Y. Paschall, announced his intention to invite a graduation speaker of his choice, by-passing Mr. Evers.⁹⁴ Students expressed surprise and outrage, “The President has no right to disregard the expressed will of the senior class in choosing a speaker.”⁹⁵

Four others were invited to speak, all of whom declined, and the President reported that “he was continuing the search for a graduation speaker. . . who would appeal ‘to all segments of the college community.’”⁹⁶ After a local member of the state legislature was announced as the 1971 speaker,⁹⁷ an editorial pointed out, “It appears that the administration’s action in rejecting Evers and replacing him with someone much less suitable, even by their own criteria, will be viewed as a racist one—whether it was intended as such or not.”⁹⁸

The senior class officers then invited Mr. Evers to come to Williamsburg and address students at a special assembly on the day of Commencement.⁹⁹ He accepted the invitation but expressed his wish that his presence on campus not interrupt the Commencement exercises. In response to a letter from one of the students, Mr. Evers had this to say,

“ . . . I am truly sorry that you and the other members of the Senior Class at William and Mary have been balked at your attempts to secure the commencement speaker you wished to have. . . . However, if you and all the others of the Class of ’71 who feel as you do can take this experience as an object lesson of what racism has done in our country, and can attempt in your future lives to help get rid of discrimination in all its forms, this temporary setback can be turned into permanent victory. . . .”¹⁰⁰

⁹¹ Charlie Gambler, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 9, 1970, p. 4. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4268/fh19701009.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁹² For a fuller account and citations, see L. Bloom, 2014. 1971 Commencement Speaker. The Lemon Project.

⁹³ Mary K. Lamont, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 5, 1971, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4871/fh19710305.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁹⁴ Mary K. Lamont, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 12, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4373/fh19710312.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁹⁵ Editorial, *ibid.* p. 2.

⁹⁶ Mary K. Lamont, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 6, 1971, p.1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4847/fh19710406.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁹⁷ Mark Reynolds, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 30, 1971, p.1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5171/fh19710430.pdf?sequence=1>.

⁹⁸ Editorial, *Ibid.* p.2.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.* p.1.

¹⁰⁰ Charles Evers, Letter, *Ibid.* p. 2.

The black undergraduate students who arrived on campus were confronted everyday, not just on occasions like these, with the symbols of the 'lost South' and vestiges of the anger and resentment that continued to fuel white southern prejudice long after the end of the Civil War.

The Students React

The first women admitted in Fall 1967 were cautiously positive, in a *Flat Hat* interview:

“All three agreed that they were curious to see ‘how the other half lived’ [with one of them adding] ‘I’ve been surprised at how little difference there is. I had expected a much more difficult transition from a completely segregated high school to a predominantly white college.’” Asked about what they didn’t like, one of the women commented “I wish that people would feel freer about discussing race relations with us. They seem to shy away from the subject. Even some professors seem afraid of the word ‘race’.”¹⁰¹

However, three of the five black women who enrolled as freshmen in Fall 1968 failed out at the end of the first semester. According to Edith Cooke, one of the two who remained:

“We had adjustments but more than the average white student had to make. . . everything seemed doubled or tripled for the black student. . . . The black girls who failed out came from black schools in the South. While they were prepared for college in general, they were not prepared for William and Mary.” In contrast, two men from schools in Ohio had “less difficulty than black students from Virginia.”

“Besides the luck involved in getting a particular professor, another reason given for the high percentage of failures was the pressure of adjusting socially while maintaining studies at the same time. . . at least one girl felt ‘burdened by a prejudice which was always present even if not always overt’.”¹⁰²

According to the girls’ advisor, a professor in the Economics department, “[w]hile all the girls were in at least the top two percent of their classes, ‘their background just wasn’t enough’.”

Fraternities were reportedly “courteous” to a “Black Rushee” who became the “first Negro to pledge a social fraternity” in Spring 1969.”¹⁰³ When asked if he had experienced the difficulties reported by Edith Cooke, he said his “adjustment problems were no worse than any other freshman. . . her difficulties probably stemmed from the fact that she came from an all black high school, and that he had experienced similar difficulties upon going from an all black junior high to an integrated senior high school.”

Two freshmen basketball players who were “unable to achieve rush grades” agreed that the fraternities were “cordial.” However, according to one, “around campus ‘white girls

¹⁰¹ Nadia Tongour, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 20, 1967, p.16. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4587/fh19671020.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁰² Connie Wilson, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 14, 1969, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4361/fh19690214.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁰³ Carl Nelson, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 21, 1969, p. 4. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4506/fh19690221.pdf?sequence=1>.

seemed scared to talk to a Negro,' but that it was not discrimination. He felt that they were 'scared of ostracism' from their friends."

The 1969-70 incoming freshmen sounded upbeat and positive,

"the kindness and friendly attitude. . . by faculty and upperclassmen toward us was great." . . ."being black hasn't seemed to make a difference . . . as far as courtesy, helpfulness and considerateness goes."

An upperclassman had another view:

"On the whole the student body and faculty are sincere in their concern on our behalf, but the two-faced hypocrites who 'grin and bear it' sometimes overshadow the 'nice' guys." One sophomore added, "if the faculty and rest of the student body were given a bottle of extra-quick super-duper tanning lotion and we took away a few Peter, Paul and Mary albums and replaced them with Sly, the College of William and Mary would be almost perfect."¹⁰⁴

However, an essay and three letters from black women, in the last *Flat Hat* issue of the Spring 1970 semester, were considerably less positive. The essay, "The Black Experience" by Janet Brown, one of the first three women admitted in 1967, was excoriating,

"I've found out a lot about 'whitey' in the past three years; a lot of things that I previously only suspected to be true. I say only suspected because I did not believe it possible for a race of supposedly 'civilized' people to be so phony and bigoted. I did not believe that behind those 'ultra bright' smiles lurked so much deceit. But one does come to college to learn and I have learned indeed!! . . .

"There are also a FEW with whom I have made what [I] hope to be lasting friendships. These few, however, cannot right the wrongs of the majority. Therefore it is impossible for me to change any of the views I hold about the white man until he changes his views about Black people. I mean honestly and not in the ways he has pretended to thus far."¹⁰⁵

A letter, "Black is the Color of my True Self," from a woman in the 1973 graduating class, admonished "please don't try to get hip by 'tanning.' It isn't becoming,"

"For some people Black can never mean something pure and beautiful. . . [but] For me, Black is beautiful beyond measure. . . . Each culture has defined its own symbols, and so the Black culture has defined Black. The negative connotations have been taken away and replaced by connotations which are more relevant, closer to the fact and which reject the white racist idea that white is right. . . ." ¹⁰⁶

A woman in the 1972 class was angrier,

¹⁰⁴ Renee Fleming, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 26, 1969, p. 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5030/fh19690926.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁰⁵ Janet Brown, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 8, 1970, p. 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4949/fh19700501.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 15.

¹⁰⁶ Viola Osborne, *ibid.*

“I am a human being. I have no apologies for my race or color. I walk upright, I communicate with other human beings, . . . I respond in ways most humans do: I laugh, cry, speak, sing . . . As a black woman here at the College of William and Mary, I have tolerated great abuse and I am damn sick of it. . . .”¹⁰⁷

The third letter, from Edith Cooke, now at the end of her sophomore year, was angrier still. Professor of Sociology Vernon Edmonds fired back in a letter written shortly after but not published until the Fall 1970 semester began,

“I am convinced that the verbal violence in these letters is a precursor of the physical violence that will come if the Office of Admissions, the Faculty Committee on Admissions, HEW and certain ‘demanding’ student groups succeed in their effort to produce a maximum infusion of Negroes into William and Mary in a minimum length of time. . . . If I had my way I would cease the various social engineering efforts centered around recruitment and preferential admissions.”¹⁰⁸

In response, a professor in the Physics denounced Prof. Edmonds’ letter as “inaccurate in its representation of the Faculty Committee on Admissions.

“If Mr. Edmonds had taken the time to read the April 1970 interim report of the Admissions Committee (distributed to all faculty) he would perhaps have omitted the more erroneous portions of his letter. No academic standards have been lowered for admission of black students. Intensified recruitment of qualified students of all races has increased in recent years and has included presentations at high schools which were predominantly Negro. To characterize this as ‘beating the bushes in order to get a maximum infusion of Negroes into William and Mary’ is inaccurate and offensive.

“Many potential minority applicants have apprehensions about feeling unwelcome at previously segregated white campuses. [This] letter does nothing to dispel such apprehensions.”¹⁰⁹

More than two years later, Prof. Edmonds again appeared in the pages of *The Flat Hat* under the headline “Edmonds Faces Racist Charges,” after he failed the four black students in his Social Problems course in Fall 1972.

The four students had “appealed their grades of No Credit, claiming that Edmonds imposed his personal ‘White Supremacist’ convictions upon the class and penalized students who disagreed with his opinions. After hearing their appeal in a conference that was attended by the chairman and other members of the sociology department, Edmonds refused to change any grades and stated that his ‘anger’ concerning so-called ‘preferential’ admissions treatment for black students had been ‘intensified’.”¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁷ Karen Ely, *ibid.*

¹⁰⁸ Vernon Edmonds, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3623/fh19700911.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁰⁹ Robert E. Welsh, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4324/fh19700918.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹¹⁰ Steve Bates, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4509/fh19730223.pdf?sequence=1>.

In a defensive memorandum in the same *Flat Hat* issue, Edmonds replied to the charges:

“This semester four blacks were enrolled in my two sections of social problems. . . . All were at the bottom of the class on [a written] summation of the course and . . . a 100 item objective test of achievement in the course. All received NC’s (*sic*) as final grades for the course. All are now raising charges of ‘racism’, etc. These facts, plus previous reports by the Committee on Admissions, plus other bits and pieces of information indicate to me that a preferential admission policy and practice favoring blacks is in existence at William and Mary. . . .

“It seems to me that only two categories genuinely benefit from such a policy: (1) the social engineers on campus who, presumably feel very ‘good’ about getting more blacks on campus with little or no concern for scholastic competence, and (2) the bottom-of-the-curve whites who are displaced by blacks.”¹¹¹

An editorial appeared in the same issue,

“Just as the college is . . . beginning what strike us as, at best, minimal efforts at desegregation, we are horrified to read the claim . . . that four black students who flunked one of his classes were admitted only because of what he terms ‘preferential admissions policy and practice favoring blacks’ . . . basing his claim largely on the lower scores blacks usually receive on culturally biased standardized tests . . . [and ignoring what] the Assistant Dean of Admissions cited as the outstanding high school records and recommendations of the four students concerned. . . [and denial] by the chairman of the Committee on Admissions Policy that there is any discriminatory policy as Edmonds charges. Nor can we find any support for Edmonds’ claim by looking around a campus in which it is entirely possible to go through an entire day of classes without seeing a single black person aside from an underpaid custodian. . . .

“The reports of Edmonds’ students about his presentations are yet more shocking. . . He apparently has repeatedly cited studies purporting to demonstrate the intellectual and moral inferiority of black persons, and required students to answer questions on tests that reflected a racial bias. It seems a grating injustice that an individual must accept a subjective inferiority in order to answer a question on a test.”¹¹²

The controversy continued in subsequent issues of *The Flat Hat* with many letters and opinion pieces from students and faculty, some growing increasingly acrimonious.¹¹³ Prof. Edmonds was called “scholar,” “failure,” “martyr” (among other things).¹¹⁴

As the Spring 1973 semester ended, the Faculty of Arts and Sciences “adopted, without dissent, a motion praising the recruitment of minorities by the Office of Admissions.” They acted “in reaction to the controversy surrounding Vernon Edmonds” and out of

¹¹¹ Vernon H. Edmonds, *ibid.*, p.6.

¹¹² Editorial, *ibid.*, p. 6.

¹¹³ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 3, 1973, pp. 1, 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4415/fh19730302.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹¹⁴ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 9, 1973, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4234/fh19730309.pdf?sequence=1>.

concern that such publicity might “deter blacks from coming to the College.”¹¹⁵ The issue of preferential treatment in recruiting minority students, faculty, and staff continued to be debated in the next and subsequent semesters.¹¹⁶

It is ironic that as events continued to unfold, those opposing the so-called preferential treatment for admitting black students, recruiting black administrators and faculty, and even forming a Black Students Organization would invoke fear of violating the Civil Rights Act and thereby putting the College in danger of losing government funds.

The Black Students’ Organization.

In Fall 1969, a black graduate student, Warren Buck, was invited to contribute an editorial essay, “Black on White”:

“White America as a whole is a sick beast. . . [m]ost of its members whether they are liberal or conservative have the same goal in mind, racism. . . . the Black man has been studying the White man for centuries. He is angry at all the waste material he has had to swallow, and he is not going to take it any more. . . . The way to overcome this racist society is for concerned Blacks and Whites to stand up and destroy the idiots who behave like K.K.K. members at social gatherings. We believe in people who are not afraid to speak up and do what they believe in. . . .”¹¹⁷

The following spring, the Black Students Organization, a “pressure group” “calling for “black awareness,” was formed to “wake the College up to its obligations,” with Warren Buck as its first president: “We want to make administrators know that blacks are not happy on campus.” However, a “possible stumbling block” in seeking recognition from the Student Association was “a clause in the group’s constitution limiting membership to blacks exclusively [although] [a]ll students can participate in the group’s meetings and activities.”¹¹⁸

Members of the administration decided that the BSO’s membership requirement would violate the 1964 Civil Rights Act “and thus place the College in jeopardy of losing its federal assistance.” After “checking with HEW,” Buck agreed to strike “the controversial ‘blacks only’ clause,” but asserted the “constitution is changed; our ideology hasn’t.” The new wording specified “a board of trustees composed of the original members who would have the power to determine policy and the new trustees.” Kermit Dance explained,

¹¹⁵ <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5088/fh19730413.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 1.

¹¹⁶ See Bloom, 2014, Notes on Professor Vernon H. Edmonds, for a fuller report of the Edmonds controversy and the faculty response.

¹¹⁷ Warren Buck, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 17, 1969, p. 8. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4225/fh19691010.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 33.

¹¹⁸ Pam Franks, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 13, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5281/fh19700313.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 1.

“This is simply for the reason that there are so few of us on campus. The underlying theme is black awareness. As individuals, no one sees us as a force. With a group we gain identity. We want to represent the black voice on campus.”¹¹⁹

The BSO was initially divided in its leadership and direction, according to Kermit Dance.¹²⁰ Warren Buck advocated a more radical “Black Power” approach and taking over the Campus Center, similar to demonstrations happening on other college campuses at the time. Others, including Dance who succeeded Buck as President, were more proactive and focused on recruiting more black students to campus.

In the Fall, the BSO asked for and were given their own “House,” described by Dance as “a place where blacks can interact . . . [with] a study room and lounge with books by black authors and records by black artists.”¹²¹

A Look Back

A student leader, Kermit Dance (1969-1973) was elected President of the Black Students Organization, Vice-President of the Student Association in his junior year, and then SA Senior Class Representative. He was among the students who pushed hard for recruiting black students to William and Mary and adding courses to the curriculum that included contributions by and about black people.

After his election as Vice-President of the Student Association, by a substantial majority, he “saw in his election a mandate for the administration to eliminate all forms of institutional racism, so that ‘the College can better reflect the attitudes and opinions of the student body.’” The SA president said, “I think Dance’s election means a step forward not only for the student government, but for the College community as well.”¹²²

More than 40 years later, he shared something of how he feels now as a graduate of William and Mary. He reports that he, and others of his cohort in the vanguard of integrating the College, received support as students from only one or two faculty members and little from the administration. Instead, it was the custodial and cafeteria workers on campus, and the parishioners and clergy in the First Baptist church across the street, who encouraged and counseled them. More than forty-five years later, they do not now have positive feelings about the College of William and Mary as their ‘Alma Mater’ and have severed their ties.¹²³ It is a loss for them and, surely, a loss for William and Mary as well.

¹¹⁹ Beth Wellington, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 17, 1970, p. 4. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3822/fh19700413.pdf?sequence=1>, p.5.

¹²⁰ Personal Communication, by telephone, August 2, 2014.

¹²¹ Pat Mayer, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 9, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4268/fh19701009.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹²² Ron Gup, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 29, 1971, p.1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4699/fh19711029.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹²³ Personal Communication, by telephone, August 2, 2014.

Assessing the Progress”

The President's View of Progress

An alumni donor, William D. Eppes, wrote in 1963 to President Paschall requesting “an honest, forthright statement . . . as to [William and Mary] policy on the integration issue.” His request was prompted by a report he received that two foreign visitors (subsequently identified as African) “were denied overnight hospitality in Williamsburg.

“I was stunned and shocked to be confronted with this knowledge. . . . For too long our so-called ‘men of good will’ in the South have remained passive and silent on the issue. The only possible solution to this problem is honestly facing up to the law of the land and dictates of our intellect.”¹²⁴

Noting that Mr. Eppes had reduced the amount of his annual donation to the College Fund, President Paschall answered by reporting several “specific facts” concerning reactions to the recent presence of “Negroes” on campus, instead of providing the statement of “William and Mary policy on the integration issue” that had been requested.¹²⁵

“Last summer, we had three Negroes enrolled at the College . . . Two of these roomed in our regular dormitories and all three ate in our regular dining facilities. There was no act of discrimination evidenced during the entire Summer School Session. . . . we had two other Negroes participate in a Summer School Institute . . . Again, no incidents were evidenced. . . . we have had two Negroes enrolled in our Evening College program, and without incidents. . . . we had the Harvard Glee Club appear in Phi Beta Kappa Hall . . . [and several] were Negroes. . . . a faculty member, did a superb job in providing meals and accommodations on our campus and in town . . . without any action, direct or indirect, of discrimination that I have been able to detect or learn. . . . we have played a basketball team in the Blow Gymnasium which had a Negro member. . . . the first experience of this type, and no incidents arose. . . . [When the College hosted] the Colonial Relays . . . There were seven or eight Negro members of these teams. . . . They were accommodated in our housing and dining facilities without any embarrassment, or even the slightest indication of an act of discrimination.” And so forth.

In what may or may not have been a consequence of this exchange, Mr. Eppes subsequently chose to send his important collection of artifacts and memorabilia of the performing arts to Virginia, but gave it to the University of Virginia, with which he does not appear to have had any affiliation, bypassing William and Mary.¹²⁶

¹²⁴ William D. Eppes to Davis Y. Paschall, April 5, 1963. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Folder 42, Box 17,” 1982.74.

¹²⁵ President Davis Y. Paschall to William D. Eppes , April 17, 1963. *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ Virginia Heritage, Guides to Manuscript & Archival Collections in Virginia, Guide to The William David Eppes Collection Of Arts Memorabilia 1908-1998, Special Collections, University of Virginia Library. At http://ead.lib.virginia.edu/vivaxtf/view?docId=uva-sc/viu01803.xml#bioghist_1.1 .

Official Administration Policy

The Office of Admissions, at the end of the Spring 1969 semester, announced “a conscious effort to reach the state’s black students with information about the College.” However, according to the chairman of the faculty committee on admissions,

“We are not going to have a high number of black students in the near future unless we have a remedial program.” [and] “even a much intensified program to recruit ‘qualified’ black students would probably not bring Negroes in very large numbers because the social and educational backgrounds of most black high school seniors . . . (particularly . . . those from rural, nearly all black high schools) do not equip them to survive at William and Mary.

“We have admitted every black applicant that we felt had a chance (to graduate), . . . It’s not fair to the student to admit him’ if he has no chance at all . . . the problem is not just trying to get more applications from black students, but giving positive help and encouragement’ [although he] expressed doubt as to whether the faculty would agree to a massive remedial program. . . . even if the money were available, feeling it might involve ‘lowering the academic standards here.’ . . . Certainly no one seems to be pushing it very hard . . . and the admissions office ‘does not plan any extra emphasis on black students’ as opposed to white students.”¹²⁷

Two demonstrations at other southern universities were reported in 1969.¹²⁸ At Duke University, 70 black students produced the first strong display of student power on a predominantly white Southern campus by seizing an administration building for a 10-hour sit-in while “about 1000 white students gathered around the building . . . to demonstrate support” for their demands. And the University of Virginia was the site of a sit-in by about 700 students demanding “black equality” on campus, particularly with regard to admissions and representation on the Board of Visitors, along with demands for a higher pay scale for non-academic employees in janitorial and cafeteria jobs.

Picking up on these demonstrations, a *Flat Hat* Editorial declared

“Black students who can go to college do not consider the University [of Virginia] or the College [of William and Mary] as options in choosing colleges. They see them as ‘white man’s schools’: they have white students, white teachers, white administrators, and white curriculum. . . [but] these are Virginia institutions, and Virginia is not all white. . . . We thank and back up the gentlemen of the University of Virginia for demonstrating this to the leaders of the Commonwealth. They have placed a black admissions officer in their institution . . . It would likewise be a good place for us to start.”¹²⁹

¹²⁷ Bob Irvin, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 2, 1969, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3523/fh19690502.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹²⁸ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 21, 1969, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4506/fh19690221.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹²⁹ Editorial, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 21, 1969, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5120/fh19690321.pdf?sequence=1>.

Faculty Research and a Report

At the end of the Spring 1970 semester, after “eight months of research,” the faculty Admissions Committee (in a remarkably constrained report), “recommended that in order to attract more minority-poverty students the College should hire a black admission officer and initiate a summer preparatory program.”¹³⁰ Pointing to the success of the Martin Luther King Memorial Scholarship students, the committee suggested that “if more minority-poverty students were given this special personal attention they too would have less trouble in college.” The faculty report only recommended the summer program for preparing “poverty-minority students” for college without specifying details, and seemed to expect that federal and private funding as well as financial assistance from the College would be forthcoming.

The preparatory program was referred to “the faculty at large” to fill in the details “so that the program will fill the needs of a student to be educated here.” According to the committee chairman the “present student body should be exposed to black students and black students should be encouraged to take advantage of the opportunities at William and Mary. He also emphasized that the program should include other minority or poverty groups, especially those from the coal-mining areas of Southwest Virginia.”

The response from the administration was no less remarkable in its constraint:

“The only official response is a statement by President Paschall: ‘I shall be very glad to bring the report of your committee to the attention of [other members of the administration], and we will give careful attention to the recommendations. . . . the Executive Vice-President felt it was too early to make a definite statement. The report must be approved by the Board of Visitors before the recommendations can be implemented but [he] was confident that they would discuss it this year. ‘The report will have to be considered as part of a larger picture which includes the proposed Hampton exchange.’”

A dissent from the majority faculty report from a member of the committee in the School of Business Administration once again invoked the cover of the Civil Rights Act.

“I am not in philosophical sympathy with the objective specified in the report, i.e., a special discriminatory effort to recruit students based solely on their race. . . . not only would the addition of a black admissions officer be a financial burden, but it would also be a form of reverse ‘discrimination’ . . . [and] the College may well violate the Civil Rights Act by employing an individual based solely on race, and therefore, might subject itself to the possibility of legal action.”

Black and White Enrollment at Other Universities

There were those on campus who did not consider that William and Mary was out of step with other universities with regard to racial integration. A *Flat Hat* letter to the editor from a member of the History Faculty reported enrollment statistics from other public

¹³⁰ John Harbert, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 1, 1970, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4949/fh19700501.pdf?sequence=1>.

educational institutions “plus some prestigious private institutions . . . supplied by HEW and published in the Chronicle of Higher Education for April 21, 1969.”¹³¹ In his list, “the percentage of Negro enrollment” ranged, in alphabetical order, “from 73 of 11,020 at California State College, Fullerton¹³² to 33 of 6,312 at the University of Wyoming.”

A follow-up letter to the editor from a faculty member in Physics challenged these numbers as “extremely misleading” and two years out of date.

“As [he] is undoubtedly aware (although presumably displeased), all branches of the City University of New York, through its open admissions policy, has so increased the number of Negro enrollments that there now exists in the student make-up a more realistic reflection of the population of the City.”¹³³

The Director of Admissions at Northwestern University subsequently wrote “as a matter of clarification” that the figure reported for Northwestern, 156 black students, was the number enrolled in the fall of 1968. “This fall [1970] there are 407 black undergraduate students at Northwestern. . . . Our projections indicate that we will have at least 560 black students in the fall of 1971.

“You may also be interested in performances. In the fall of 1966, 56 black students entered the University: 43 graduated this past year. Several others will graduate in the very near future from that class. The overall attrition rate for the black student community has not exceeded 10%. “I hope you find this information helpful in your efforts to make William and Mary a more representative community.”¹³⁴

Fall 1970 saw what *The Flat Hat* called “the first step” in the appointment of Lillian Poe, a PhD candidate in the History Department, as Assistant to the Dean of Admissions for high school recruiting, for ten hours a week.

“As the first black administrator on an overwhelmingly white campus, her role will be a difficult one . . . she must navigate a treacherous course between the Scylla of conservative white backlash and the Charybdis of a loss of black credibility. . . . [As an] administrator with a well-developed sense of black consciousness. . . her presence will do much to correct our racial imbalance.”¹³⁵

At the same time, the recruiting brochure and slide show for high school presentations were “revamped to give a well-integrated picture of the College. . . . Previously the only blacks in the slide show were children in the tutoring projects.” According to Tom Rees,

¹³¹ Ludwell H. Johnson, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 9, 1970, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4268/fh19701009.pdf?sequence=1>

¹³² or California State College, Hayward (the numbers are not precisely aligned in the printing).

¹³³ Morton Eckhause, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 20, 1970, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4520/fh19701020.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹³⁴ William Ihlanfeldt, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, November, 6, 1970, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4368/fh19701103.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 6.

¹³⁵ Editorial, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 25, 1970, p. 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4952/fh19700925.pdf?sequence=1>.

these efforts “reflect a discreet change in attitude on the part of the administration toward black students.”¹³⁶

Progress and Problems

Both the progress and the problems encountered in the integration efforts were discussed in three interviews at the start of the Fall 1970 semester.¹³⁷

The newly hired Lillian Poe said,

“Certainly I realize that my job as one black person in the administration is tokenism but it is a start.” She suggested that other members of the administration, faculty, and graduate students had to help recruit the “many well-qualified blacks [who] still do not seriously consider William and Mary. . . . The historically segregated image of the College, lack of significant special programs for blacks in comparison with other colleges, absence of black faculty and administrators and relatively deficient black studies courses all contribute to the low number of applications from black high school seniors. . . . William and Mary is foreboding to the average black high school student.”

According to Tom Rees, who had worked so diligently to promote an exchange of students with Hampton Institute,

“We’re moving but nowhere near fast enough to compensate for our history of racism.” Dismissing the possibility of an easy solution to the problem, he noted “that the College is ‘one hell of a challenge’ to any black student” . . . [and he] “placed primary stress upon improving social life for black students who feel alienated in such an overwhelmingly white school. ‘We’ve got to make the atmosphere of the campus much more receptive’.”

Asked about the “desirability of ‘lowering standards’ to admit more blacks, Rees said that after devoting much time to that issue over the summer and polling 50 other American colleges and universities, he felt such a special program was unnecessary. ‘There are plenty of recruitable qualified black students under the College’s regular admission procedures.’”

Although “he has never been able to get an appointment with Paschall,” he did not consider the administration “necessarily hostile to his efforts” and reported that the Vice President for Academic Affairs has been “generally ‘cooperative, helpful, and receptive’” to his ideas.

The Black Student Organization President, Kermit Dance,

“doesn’t want admission standards changed to admit more black students simply because ‘blacks don’t appreciate that kind of reform. It’s only a new way of telling us we’re inferior’.” The “importance of hiring black faculty members is crucial . . . not only to attract more blacks and give them a positive on-campus image to identify with but also to broaden the educational backgrounds of many white students.”

¹³⁶ Pat Mayer, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 9, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4268/fh19701009.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹³⁷ Mary Frances Lowe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 18, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4324/fh19700918.pdf?sequence=1>.

He reported that his two primary concerns as BSO President were “pre-application contacts with black high school students and increasing the College’s awareness of black culture. ‘I don’t want to be thought of as a person first, but as a black,’ he declared. Black students run a serious risk of becoming ‘brainwashed’ into acceptance of white standards at William and Mary.”

“In Dance’s opinion there has been ‘very little’ progress in integration during the past two years. ‘Sometimes I doubt the sincerity of people in the administration . . . especially when they pull out statistics . . . to prove that violence will result if certain levels of minority enrollment are reached. . . . no black students were arrested or suspended last year in drug raids or student demonstrations.’”

Administration Summary of Progress

As the 1970-71 academic year drew to a close, an unusually long, informative interview with members of the administration summarized the efforts made by the College to attract black students:

In 1966, “in response to various pressures,” the administration began an “active program” to recruit black students, with “the unstated but agreed upon philosophy . . . ‘to do what we can without lowering the standards of the college.’” Because the “race blank” had been deleted from the application forms, the Admissions Committee relied on other demographic clues such as high schools, home neighborhoods, and where parents had gone to college to determine applicants’ race.¹³⁸

“The only formally stated criteria that the Faculty Committee on Admissions must adhere to without exception is stated by the Board of Visitors”: a “70/30 in-state/out state ratio,” a “60/40 male/female ratio,” and placement in “the upper half grade category of their high school class.”

While “[t]hese guidelines in no way limit the number of blacks eligible for admission . . . other criteria are also considered,” including “College Board scores, athletic or other special interest abilities, types of subjects taken in high school, extra-curricular activities and what three of those interviewed . . . called the probability of success of the candidate at William and Mary.”

When the official guidelines and the “informal, but equally decisive, criteria were used to scan the applications for admission to the college in former years, the results were that for many years no black applicants were accepted at William and Mary.”

In 1966, the committee was “able to find only about ten” black applicants. “Three black students were admitted that first year; seven came the following year; over ten in 1969; and over twenty in 1970.” Almost all who matriculated as freshmen evidently continued, and 38 black students were on campus in Spring 1971.

One member of the administration interviewed suggested two other non-scholastic factors that limited the number of black students enrolled at William and Mary.

¹³⁸ Shannon Long, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 14, 1971, p. 14. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5427/fh19710514.pdf?sequence=1>.

“In the past the College itself has made no effort to recruit black students, to welcome those who did apply or even those who were matriculated. At the same time the black youth of Virginia have generally believed that they were unwanted and unwelcome at the college in Williamsburg.”

Several changes by the administration and in the Admissions Office were reported to have already met with “some happy results—the number of known black applicants for the 1971-1972 term has increased significantly.” A “black representative” [Lillian Poe] was hired on a part-time basis in the Admissions office to “represent the College at every predominantly black high school in the area in order to make it known that William and Mary is eagerly seeking black students.”

The first full time black administrator at the College, Juanita Wallace, was hired in the Admissions office to begin in the fall of 1971. Publicity materials used for high school recruiting were “reorganized” to show more black students on campus. “All black students in Virginia who made reasonably acceptable scores on the National Achievement Test for Negro Students or on the National Test for Minorities” were sent a letter with an application for admission, the recruiting brochure, and publications from the Black Student Organization.

No mention was made in the report of adding money from the College to supplement the funds for the King Scholarship, or actively recruiting contributions to the funds from the alumni.

In an interview after her arrival on campus, Juanita Wallace said,

“I think that the College felt a need for a more integrated community. Being the only black administrator with no black faculty members, there is necessarily the aspect of tokenism.” However, she considered her position “more than a token one. . . [but, rather] the beginning of diversification of cultures within the college community.”

Asked about admission standards, she said “William and Mary requirements are high. I am aware that black students do not always score high on tests of that sort. As such there are other experiences that might be more indicative of the student’s potential than college boards. . . . [in considering] what he can do rather than what he has done.”

She “also mentioned the need for more black culture courses. . . [for attracting black students and to] help in providing understanding of the black experience.”¹³⁹

Her goal for black enrollment at the College was “ten percent over the next few years” which would mean the addition of about 300 black students.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
and the College of William and Mary

Arguably, students were the instigators of steps by the administration toward integrating William and Mary. However, the major motivating force behind whatever actions the

¹³⁹ Mark Reynolds, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 15, 1971, p.1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3844/fh19711015.pdf?sequence=1>.

administration had taken by 1971 was the investigation, begun three years earlier, by the U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Four years after Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act specifically prohibited discrimination based on race, color, or national origin in programs or activities receiving financial assistance from the Federal government, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare descended on William and Mary. They sought to determine whether the College was in compliance with the 1964 Civil Rights Act for eligibility to receive over \$500,000 in federal funds.¹⁴⁰

The HEW Directive

More than a year later, William and Mary and the other state-supported colleges and universities in Virginia were instructed by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare to end its “racially dual system of higher education,” in a letter dated December 2, 1969 to Governor Mills E. Godwin Jr. from Leon E. Panetta of HEW’s Office for Civil Rights.¹⁴¹ The directive

“asked for a first-draft desegregation plan within 90 days, followed by a final plan 90 days after that. . . . To fulfill the purposes and intent of the Civil Rights Act, it is not sufficient that an institution maintain a nondiscriminatory admissions policy if the student population continues to reflect the formerly *de jure* racial identification of that institution’.”

Panetta’s letter also said that he did not want to

“stipulate the form which a desegregation plan should take,’ but suggested ‘that a systemwide plan of cooperation between institutions involving consolidation of degree offerings, faculty exchange, student exchange and general institutional sharing of resources would seem to offer a constructive approach.’”

The directive could be enforced by cutting off federal aid funds and/or by suing the state in federal court for non-compliance with the Civil Rights Act.

For the academic year, 1968-1969, about 44,000 students were enrolled in the state’s predominantly white four-year institutions, 209 of them black (less than 1 percent). At Virginia State in Petersburg and in Norfolk State, two predominantly black schools, 50 whites were enrolled out of an enrollment of 6,179 (also less than 1 percent).

Student Interviews

At the time of the first HEW visit in 1968, investigators met with students and, in particular, with representatives from the respective sorority and fraternity councils. Their interaction appeared to be fairly benign:

“they wanted to know whether we (the College) actively recruited Negroes, for one thing. They were interested in admissions policies,” according to the president of the

¹⁴⁰ Mark Cole, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 25, 1968, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3978/fh19681025.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁴¹ Bill Sizemore, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 12, 1969, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4291/fh19691212.pdf?sequence=1>.

Pan-Hellenic Council for the sororities. They asked about discrimination in rushing and pledging practices and whether any fraternity charters included “white Christian clauses.” The president of the Interfraternity Council reported that “Five years ago the national IFC made all the member fraternities delete the ‘white Christian’ clauses. Due to inefficiency, some area chapters have not yet complied.”¹⁴²

The HEW investigators also interviewed the three “Negro students who lived on campus last year.” However, it was the president of the Panhellenic Council (presumably white) who was quoted with respect to the three women’s responses to the investigators’ questions. For example, she reported that with respect to

“life on campus . . . the girls feel that it is a comfortable relationship in general. There have been a few isolated instances, but in general, there is not a problem. The Negro women are rooming together this year, but ‘that was their own decision. . . [t]hey didn’t rush last year either, but they said no one had discouraged them. They just decided not to.”

The president of the IFC, speaking for the fraternities, said “there had never been discrimination [in rushing]. . . because there had never been a possible discriminatory situation before.” . . . “I know of a couple of fraternities who are thinking of rushing Negroes. We’ll take things as they come . . . if anyone doesn’t get a bid it will be because of personal conflicts, not color.”

There was no report of meetings between the HEW representatives and members of the faculty and administration.

Early in Spring, 1970, investigators from the HEW Office for Civil Rights again visited the campus and met with “everyone from President Davis Y. Paschall and Executive Vice President Carter O. Lowance to the various deans and athletic officials.”

“what they found in their encounters with the administration is yet to be seen. . . but at least from the students, they found a definite impetus toward making William and Mary a multiracial institution.”¹⁴³

A Student Association representative, David Bernd, approached the HEW officials with his idea of “a black recruitment booklet to be sent to Virginia high school guidance departments, similar to a recruiting device put out by the University of Virginia. . . . Financial problems appear to be the major cause for delay on the booklet. ‘We’ve had no real opposition from the administration, but no real help either.’

“A similar reaction seems to be meeting . . . the possibility of a student exchange program with predominantly black Hampton Institute. Although one administration official has termed such a program ‘highly unfeasible’ due to accreditation problems, exploration of the idea is continuing. Projects similar to both of these have been endorsed in principle by HEW in past efforts at desegregation of Virginia colleges.”

¹⁴² Mark Cole, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 25, 1968, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3978/fh19681025.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁴³ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, February 27, 1970, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4494/fh19700227.pdf?sequence=1>

In the next several years, students were increasingly persistent in drawing the attention of the HEW investigators to their efforts on behalf of the student exchange with Hampton and the College's recruiting practices.

By far, however, the major issue for HEW became the decision by the William and Mary Board of Visitors to escalate Richard Bland College, a two-year school operated by William and Mary, from a two-year to a four-year program. The Bland escalation plan culminated in a law suit that ultimately reached the U.S. Supreme Court.

The Richard Bland College

While already in the HEW headlights, the Board of Visitors made a move that was at least surprising if not arrogant:

“Meeting in a special session Monday Feb. 15, [1970] the Board of Visitors of the College approved four-year, degree-granting status for RBC, currently a two-year institution under the College, to be implemented by June, 1973.”¹⁴⁴

A predominantly white 2-year school, Richard Bland College was and still is located in Petersburg, VA only about four miles from the predominantly black, 4-year Virginia State University (formerly, Virginia State College). The effort to desegregate Virginia's secondary schools had already included proposals, in the state legislature and elsewhere, to merge the two schools. A 4-year, predominantly white Bland College in the same town would seriously compete for faculty and students with the 4-year Virginia State, and students would be less likely to transfer to Virginia State to complete their education. The immediate criticism of the Bland expansion called the plan “a means to prevent the merger of RBC and VSC as a part of a statewide desegregation plan” and “a subterfuge to maintain segregation in public higher education” in Virginia.

A *Flat Hat* editorial denounced the RHB expansion as “Institutional Racism”:

“The machinations of the Board of Visitors, Del. Roy Smith (D-Petersburg), and local white Petersburg groups, all acting in their own political interests, can and will lead to a further separation of the black and white communities in Petersburg.”¹⁴⁵

Escalation of Richard Bland was strongly opposed by Virginia State College. The president of the VSC chapter of the Association of University Professors told the *Flat Hat*, in an interview, that the proposed expansion violated the criteria for escalating a junior college to degree-granting status suggested by the State Council of Higher Education in 1969: Among other things, an institution expanding from a two-year to four-year degree program “should not be in competition with any other four-year colleges within commuting distance.”

Bland students, on the other hand, were enthusiastic about the plan and met with William and Mary students and members of the administration “to put forward their position.” While some W&M students were sympathetic, others were “critical of the racial implications of the escalation proposal.” However, President Paschall, Vice President

¹⁴⁴ Ellis Johnson, *Ibid*, p. 1.

¹⁴⁵ Editorial, *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Lowance, and the Vice-Rector of the Board of Visitors defended the plan “on the grounds that expanding enrollments in the next decade will require more four-year institutions.”¹⁴⁶

The controversy continued when Governor Linwood Holton’s State Council on Education released its “outline for a plan concerning desegregation of Virginia state colleges and universities under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.” While the governor’s outline made no mention of the Bland escalation plan, nevertheless, “[a]dministrators at both predominantly black and predominantly white institutions have been quick to recognize the revolutionary effect that any plan acceptable to HEW may have upon state colleges” such as Richard Bland and Virginia State in Petersburg.¹⁴⁷

Governor Holton subsequently received an evaluation of his outline for a desegregation plan from the Office for Civil Rights. The evaluation pointed out that “the central omission of the outline plan as it presently stands is that it contains no reference to the desegregation of the Commonwealth’s institutions of higher education and gives no timetable for achieving such desegregation. . . .

“An important area to be covered in the final plan is the relationship between Virginia State College and Richard Bland College, both of which are located in Petersburg. . . . The establishment of a state-supported four-year college, overwhelmingly white and a few miles distance from Virginia State College, predominantly black, appears to reinforce rather than unitize the old dual system. . . . Failure to show how both institutions may be expected to operate on a desegregated basis would lead us to conclude at the present time that the expansion of Richard Bland to a four-year institution is inconsistent with the Commonwealth’s obligations under Title VI.”¹⁴⁸

William and Mary, Richard Bland, and Virginia State were the only institutions in the state named in the Office for Civil Rights evaluation.

A Lawsuit

At about the same time, “[s]ix faculty members and four students at Virginia State College and three Petersburg parents acting for their daughters [filed a suit seeking] to block the expansion of Richard Bland College. In addition, the plaintiffs requested that the court require the Commonwealth of Virginia to desegregate its state-supported colleges and universities and to require the eventual merger of Richard Bland and Virginia State.”¹⁴⁹

Meanwhile, the General Assembly in Richmond had evidently already approved a \$150,000 appropriation to cover the expenses of the initial phases of the Bland expansion. According to Vice President Lowance, “The College’s position is to await further action.”

¹⁴⁶ Bill Sizemore, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, March 13, 1970, p.3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5281/fh19700313.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁴⁷ Mary Frances Lowe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 24, 1970, p.6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4499/fh19700424.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁴⁸ J. Stanley Pottinger to Linwood Holton, August 31, 1970, p. 3. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Folder 6, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

¹⁴⁹ Ellis Johnson, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 25, 1970. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4952/fh19700925.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 1

In a letter to President Paschall, April 7, 1970, the Regional Civil Rights Director had requested a meeting to discuss the current status of the College with respect to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964:

“A matter deserving inquiry . . . is the Board [of Visitor]’s recent action to expand the [Richard Bland] College to a four-year institution. I am sure you understand the inferences drawn from the Board’s decision regarding the duplication of educational goals in two neighboring colleges, one 99 percent white and the other, Virginia State College, predominantly black. Before this office can take a position in the matter, I would appreciate learning of the circumstances leading to the Board’s action and its plans for the expansion of Richard Bland College.¹⁵⁰

Copy of any reply to this letter was not found among the President’s papers and according to the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, “Dr. Paschall never replied. . . William and Mary takes the position, according to a Paschall aide, that it is doing no more nor less than what the General Assembly ordered. ‘The legislature has spoken and that’s that,’ he says” citing the legislature vote to finance the Bland escalation.¹⁵¹

The HEW Charge to the College

Three months later, Dr. Severinson again wrote to Dr. Paschall “to bring to your attention some of the deficiencies disclosed by our review which I feel require corrective measures by the college if its eligibility to receive Federal financial assistance is to remain unchallenged.”¹⁵² She reminded him of a statement made the previous year by Leon Panetta, Director of the Office for Civil Rights, in a letter to the governor “which must be kept in mind as we examine the compliance status of the College.

“‘Educational institutions which have previously been legally segregated,’ Mr. Panetta wrote, ‘have an affirmative duty to adopt measures to overcome the effect of past segregation. To fulfill the purposes and intent of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, it is not sufficient that an institution maintain a nondiscriminatory admissions policy if the student population continues to reflect the formerly *de jure* racial identification of that institution.’

“After reviewing carefully the reports of my staff, I must conclude that the College of William and Mary has not adopted effective measures to overcome the effect of past segregation and that, despite a nondiscriminatory admission policy, the student population continues to reflect the College’s formerly *de jure* racial identification . . . [which] can be easily supported by the enrollment figures for the past year which show

¹⁵⁰ Eloise Severinson to Davis Y. Paschall, April 7, 1970. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Folder 8, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

¹⁵¹ Charles Cox, *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, September 27, 1970, pp. A-1, 5. *Richmond Times-Dispatch* Digital Historical Archive. At http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives/Archives?d_viewref=doc&p_docnum=-1&f_docref=v2:135B950C9F3CF0C6@HA-VARTD-1428FEAE1D24F177@2440857-1426B78F614A5B10@O&p_docref=v2:135B950C9F3CF0C6@HA-VARTD-1428FEAE1D24F177@2440857-1426B78F614A5B10@O

¹⁵² Eloise Severinson to Davis Y. Paschall, July 1, 1970. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Folder 8, Box 26, “Correspondence, Eloise Severinson,” 1982.74.

that Negro students constitute no more than one percent of the College's enrollment, and that no Negro is a member of the College faculty.

"The status of the College "is very nearly. . . [what it was] following the first compliance review in 1968." Of the original nine suggestions she made at that time, "serious consideration of which by the College would have demonstrated a positive intent to alter the traditional racial identity of the institution," only three had been pursued: increased recruiting efforts in black high schools, eliminating an off-campus housing list that did not require landlords to be nondiscriminatory, and placement of practice teachers in black as well as white schools.

However, the other suggestions made at that time have been ignored. William and Mary failed to insert a nondiscrimination statement in its catalogue, sponsor campus visits by blacks, solicit alumni support for recruiting black students other than athletes, obtain equal opportunity statements from employers, sponsor institutional agreements with predominantly black Hampton Institute and Norfolk State, and give priority to hiring black faculty members.

She then set forth a number of steps the College could take to relieve "our present uncertainty about the College's status of compliance." In addition to recommending that "a Negro should be added to the admissions staff," she also recommended that the College

"consider certain revisions to its admission criteria so that the potential for the academic success of black students is determined by means other than Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, which now appear to be the principal determining factor for admission. . . . [and] consider establishing programs for students whose potential for academic success is apparent but whose preparation in certain areas requires remedial attention."

"While the black students [interviewed by HEW investigators] reported no outright hostility or overt discrimination at the College, the administration should pay heed to . . . their most pressing concerns . . . the small number of black students, the absence of black faculty, limited social outlets, difficulty in finding off-campus housing, and indifference to their needs on the part of the faculty and administration."

She concluded by seeking "from you a series of proposals for a plan of affirmative action covering each of these items, and those set forth in previous letters which will commit the College to the elimination of the effects of past segregation. . . within 30 days."

President Paschall's Response to the Charge

In his six-page response,¹⁵³ the President made clear that he considers the College of William and Mary is already in "full compliance with the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964." He began his reply with a pedantic and somewhat petulant argument over *de jure* versus *de facto* segregation in which he pointed out that William and Mary

¹⁵³ Davis Y. Paschall to Eloise Severinson, July 27, 1970. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Box 26, "Correspondence, Eloise Severinson," 1982.74.

“is the second oldest institution of higher learning in America, *and the first such institution in America to be integrated racially*.¹⁵⁴ . . . and, *before the Supreme Court decision in Brown V. Board of Education in 1954*, did, *indeed*, have Negroes in attendance and conferred degrees on the same!” (emphases in the original). He concluded, “I doubt that many of the institutions you regard in the *de facto* category can claim both of the above two points. . . .

“You have said in effect that . . . William and Mary “violates Title VI because it *does not have enough* minority students. . . . this is the first time that William and Mary has been told *that a quota system prevails under Title VI* (emphasis in the original). . . .

“You suggest . . . that the College should consider ‘certain revisions of its admissions criteria . . . [and] establishing programs for students . . . whose preparation in certain areas requires remedial attention. . . . Even had I the power, I would be most reluctant to direct a lowering of admissions standards and the offering of non-credit remedial instruction. I question whether such is required in order for William and Mary to remain eligible for Federal financial assistance.’ . . .

“Surely you would not envision William and Mary offering remedial non-credit instruction to minority group students and permitting them to take less than a full academic load but denying such opportunities to the similarly deserving non-minority applicants who would have been admitted to William and Mary but for a failure to meet the admission standards and required level of preparation.

“The second area of major concern to which you allude in your letter is the absence of black faculty members . . . [and] the lack of extraordinary efforts to solicit applications from black teachers and recommend that we ‘set the recruitment of substantial numbers of black teachers’ as one of our immediate goals. . . . I question the assumption that a quota system measures compliance under Title VI . . . Again, I refer to the official explanation to Form 441 in which, in very clear language, it is explained that compliance with Title VI prohibits ‘the use of membership in a group as a basis for selection of individuals for any purpose if in selecting members of the group there is discrimination on grounds of race, color or national origin.’

“The third area of major concern . . . is that inter-institutional agreements with neighboring Negro colleges are not being strongly pursued . . . I do not understand how the presence or absence of cooperative arrangements bears on a resolution of the question whether William and Mary discriminates under Title VI. . . . [However,] William and Mary is exploring the feasibility of student exchange programs with Hampton Institute . . . I welcomed and encouraged this development.”

¹⁵⁴ This assertion by President Paschall was repeated over the years, often quoted with some derision in *The Flat Hat*. According to the list of “African American Students” on the William and Mary website, at http://scdb.swem.wm.edu/wiki/index.php/African_American_Students, November 3, 2013, the earliest students were three black graduate students, one admitted in 1951 and two in 1954; two of the three received degrees. Dr. Paschall reported the same information in response to an inquiry from the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, March 27, 1961, (J.W. Lambert to Davis Y. Paschall, March 29, 1961, and Davis Y. Paschall to J.W. Lambert, April 17, 1961. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Box 26, “Correspondence, Eloise Severinson,” 1982.74.

After responding to several other points raised by Dr. Severinson, he concluded,

“I reiterate the determination of the College to operate an educational program of high quality without regard to race, color or national origin or creed (you didn’t mention this) . . . I am confident that we have and are doing just this and that as a consequence, we are in full compliance with the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.”

HEW Threat to Cut Off Federal Funds

Dr. Severinson responded,

“Your letter is a clear and detailed statement that the College . . . intends to take no further action to comply with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

“Therefore, I have no recourse but to refer your letter of July 27 and all other correspondence and reports to our office in Washington, D.C. with a recommendation that enforcement proceedings be initiated.”¹⁵⁵

The Administration Response. The day after receiving Dr. Severinson’s letter, President Paschall wrote to two members of the Board of Visitors, Ernest W. Goodrich, Rector, and Harvey Chappell, Jr., both lawyers.¹⁵⁶ He reported that he had contacted William G. Broaddus, Assistant Attorney General of Virginia, and “I took all correspondence to him.” He also reported that just before receiving Dr. Severinson’s letter, Carter Lowance, Vice President of the College, had been contacted by Mr. Staige Blackford in the Governor’s Office with a request for a copy of the correspondence for the Governor.

“In the telephone conversation, Mr. Blackford indicated that the Governor knew Mr. Pottinger¹⁵⁷ and also HEW Secretary Richardson and would be glad to help us if we felt he could do so. . . . After conferring with Mr. Broaddus yesterday afternoon and with his blessing, we took a set of the correspondence over to the Governor’s Office and . . . told Mr. Blackford that we felt the Governor could be helpful by contacting the person in the Washington office to whom Dr. Severinson was referring the correspondence and indicating . . . that this matter had come to the attention of the Governor and that he was quite confident that there was other information in the way of action steps which should be considered . . . and that it would make the Governor’s preparation of his desegregation plan for State institutions of higher learning, due by December 1 . . .

¹⁵⁵ Eloise Severinson to Davis Y. Paschall, October 1, 1970. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Folder 8, Box 26, “Correspondence, Eloise Severinson” 1982.74.

¹⁵⁶ Ernest W. Goodrich, Obituary, *Daily Press*, May 13, 2005. At <http://www.legacy.com/obituaries/dailypress/obituary.aspx?n=ernest-w-goodrich&pid=3536490>. and R. Harvey Chappell, Jr., *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, December 4, 2012. At http://www.timesdispatch.com/news/local/richmond-lawyer-and-former-william-and-mary-rector-r-harvey/article_cd9b9c67-965f-51d7-ac4d-1c16d02f5c90.html.

¹⁵⁷ J. Stanley Pottinger, Director, Office for civil rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, replaced Leon F. Panetta who resigned in February, 1970 in protest against “what he termed a lack of strong support for civil rights efforts . . . after pressure from Congress became too great for the White House to resist.” *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, February 18, 1970, p. 1.

“much more difficult if hasty action were taken right now in regard to the College of William and Mary . . .”¹⁵⁸

A subsequent letter to Mr. Pottinger from the Assistant Attorney General of Virginia, October 15, 1970, “on behalf of the College of William and Mary” reported that

“The College is deeply concerned about this problem and is striving to meet the criterion developed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for determining its eligibility to receive federal financial assistance. . . . It will be to the detriment of the College and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare if enforcement proceedings must be resorted to when they are unnecessary. Accordingly, the College desires and hopes that it will be able to work with your office in resolving this problem.”¹⁵⁹

Following the exchange between Dr. Severinson and President Paschall, and the subsequent newspaper publicity,¹⁶⁰ the rallying cry for the College became the need to stand strong against the demand by HEW—as the administration presented it—for lowering William and Mary’s admission standards in order to achieve racial integration.

What Dr. Severinson actually recommended, as reported above, was that the College “consider certain revisions to its admission criteria so that the potential for the academic success of black students is determined by means other than Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, which now appear to be the principal determining factor for admission.”

Nevertheless, the outrage against HEW, in today’s parlance, went viral. State and national legislators weighed in, for example, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr., “I can’t conceive of anything worse than the federal government coming into a great university and demanding that it lower its standards.”¹⁶¹

The cry was picked up in the local and state newspapers, deploring, for example,

“the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare’s recent attempt to force the College of William and Mary to lower its academic standards so that more Negroes can enroll. . . . For years liberals have been demanding the elimination of double standards for the races. Now here they are demanding a double standard be re-instated, to serve Negroes.”¹⁶²

¹⁵⁸ President Davis Y. Paschall to Mr. Ernest Goodrich and Mr. R. Harvey Chappell, Jr., October 6, 1970, marked “PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL.” In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Folder 51, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

¹⁵⁹ William G. Broaddus to J. Stanley Pottinger, October 15, 1970, Copy. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

¹⁶⁰ In particular, Charles Cox, *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, September 27, 1970, pp. A-1, 5. Richmond Times-Dispatch Digital Historical Archive. At http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives/Archives?d_viewref=doc&p_docnum=-1&f_docref=v2:135B950C9F3CF0C6@HA-VARTD-1428FEAE1D24F177@2440857-1426B78F614A5B10@o&p_docref=v2:135B950C9F3CF0C6@HA-VARTD-1428FEAE1D24F177@2440857-1426B78F614A5B10@o

¹⁶¹ Harry F. Byrd, Jr., *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, October 12, 1970, Clipping, *ibid*.

¹⁶² *Lynchburg News*, October 3, 1970, VPA News Clip Bureau, *ibid*.

An editorial with the title “Blackmail” proclaimed

“In an arrogant display of contempt for academic excellence . . . a federal agency is trying to blackmail the College of William and Mary into using an iniquitous racial quota system in admitting students and hiring faculty members . . . If William and Mary agreed to accept a prescribed number of academically deficient students, what then? Would it instruct its faculty members to lower their standards to make things easier for the slow learners?”¹⁶³

A very large number of letters from alumni, parents, students, faculty members, and other public and private citizens to President Paschall, or to government officials in his behalf, applauded his efforts and exhorted him to stand firm against HEW’s efforts to lower the standards of William and Mary.¹⁶⁴

In response to a letter from Congressman William L. Scott, J. Stanley Pottinger wrote to reassure him

“that it is not the policy of this department to require colleges and universities to lower their admissions standards . . . Many educators have found that traditional admissions criteria, such as grade point averages and scores on standardized tests, may not accurately reflect the potential to succeed in colleges for all students.”¹⁶⁵

The Student Association Response. The HEW threat to cut off federal funds “had been unexpected in most quarters, and the news sparked fresh agitation last week by students and faculty alike.” On the day the story of the impending fund cut-off was published in the newspapers, President Paschall and Vice President Lowance met in a previously scheduled conference with student leaders.

According to Rees, they “very frankly stated the students’ viewpoint . . . [that] we were upset over the disgrace and dishonor which had been brought to the College by the press articles. They just reinforced the stereotype that we were trying to correct. . . . Paschall refused to comment on most of the issues they raised . . . ‘the fact that the College is involved in litigation was the reason he gave for not commenting on the Bland situation’.”¹⁶⁶

The Student Association Senate “endorsed an ‘open letter to the President’ . . . calling on Paschall to ‘take bold, innovative, decisive steps in order to compensate for its lily-white heritage’ and to ‘negotiate with (HEW) now for a quick and just resolution of the current situations. . . . [They] pointed out that the College is so far the only institution in Virginia to be singled out by HEW for a fund cut-off . . . ‘the honor and the future of the College are threatened’ by the action.”¹⁶⁷

¹⁶³ Editorial. *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, October 1, 1970, p. A-10, Clipping, *ibid*.

¹⁶⁴ In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Folder 7, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

¹⁶⁵ J. Stanley Pottinger to Congressman William L. Scott, *Daily Press*, October 29, 1970. *Ibid*.

¹⁶⁶ Bill Sizemore, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 20, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4520/fh19701020.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁶⁷ Tom Rees, Winn Legerton, Kermit Dance, *Ibid.*, p. 2.

At the Student Association meeting on October 20, a resolution calling for President Paschall to resign was defeated. The group then substituted “a resolution establishing an *ad hoc* committee to investigate the possibilities of litigation against the College . . . and such responsible individuals, particularly Davis Y. Paschall” should federal funds be cut off by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare due to noncompliance with Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.¹⁶⁸

At a follow-up meeting, the Student Association Senate voted to create a task force to add “‘their efforts’ to the existing push for further integration [and] ‘outline a program of positive action.’ . . . The Senate also voted to invite Davis Y. Paschall to speak in his official capacity as President of the College at their Nov. 5 meeting. The invitation will be reissued each week until Paschall decides to speak because of the need for ‘direct communication with the President.’”¹⁶⁹

The Black Students Organization Response. “Blacks Reject Cultural White-Wash,” an article by Kermit Dance, was published in *The Flat Hat* as “official policy” of the campus Black Students Organization.

“William and Mary is a state-supported institution. . . . According to the latest census, the state is 40% black. For too long black Virginians have been supporting a racist educational system—an institution which is ineffectively serving the educational needs of only 1% if their sons and daughters.

“The present system . . . is rather successful in strengthening the identity of its white students. For blacks, however, this is not the case. Constantly we are indoctrinated with white ideas, white culture, white customs, white history, white art, white desires and white social habits. This indoctrination is oppressive to our blackness. It is an attempt (partially successful) to gain control over our minds, to ‘white-wash’ our minds, and to transform beautiful black people into dark pigmented white people.

“Those of us in the movement are working for the total integration of the system. We envision the day when special efforts to recruit black students will not be necessary. However, black students attending a white school does not define racial integration. . . . In addition to the integration of black and white bodies, there must be a complete integration of black and white ideas, black and white cultures. The system must adapt itself to fulfill the educational needs of blacks in much the same way that it presently does for whites. . . .

“The college definitely has a racial problem, but we assert that this is not a black problem. Whites currently control the system; whites created the problem and whites will have to take a significant role in achieving its solution.”¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ Pat Mayer, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 23, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5121/fh19701023.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁶⁹ Pat Mayer, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 30, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5396/fh19701030.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁷⁰ Kermit Dance, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 20, 1970, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4520/fh19701020.pdf?sequence=1>.

The Board of Visitors Response. Student leaders met with two members of the Board of Visitors on campus, one of whom had this to say in regard to the proposed Bland extension:

“The Board and the Administration ‘have no option’ A ‘law of the State of Virginia says we are obliged’ to escalate Bland. ‘Since we’re in the Federal Court, I think we’ll have to learn the situation in the Federal Court.’”

In regard to black students at the College. . .

“there is no difference of opinion between students and Administration concerning the lowering of standards in order to admit more black students. ‘. . . not speaking for the Board of Visitors because this has never been considered there, [I] feel that there should not be lowering of standards at William and Mary. . . we’re dealing with the matter of taking substantial initiative in recruiting blacks. I’m very much in favor of that. . . . I think it’s very encouraging that progress has been made’ . . . it will be ‘by no means an easy job to get black students to William and Mary particularly because there aren’t many here.’”¹⁷¹

The Faculty Response. The Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences, meeting on October 13, 1970, passed the following resolution:

“The Faculty of Arts and Sciences of the College of William and Mary re-affirms its dedication to the principle of equal educational opportunity, and expresses its concern that the current controversy between the College and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, especially concerning Richard Bland College, may be interpreted as reflecting unwillingness on the part of the College to adhere to this principle.

We hereby direct the representatives of the Faculty Affairs Committee to convey this concern to the Board of Visitors.”

The resolution sent to President Paschall “was not intended to be a public statement” and was not made public.¹⁷²

Uncertainty about HEW Cutting Federal Funds

The State Assistant Attorney General, William G. Broaddus, reported to Robert McIlwaine (Counsel for the Board of Visitors, William and Mary) that the Supervising Attorney in the Office for Civil Rights had called him “at the request of Mr. Holmes, to whom I spoke Monday about William and Mary and its compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

“I advised [him] that the College felt that it had certain information concerning its compliance which would not be revealed in the files transmitted by Dr. Severinson . . . [and] that the Department would want to have this information . . . prior to making a decision concerning the possibility of instituting enforcement proceedings against the

¹⁷¹ Paul Guyton, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 20, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4520/fh19701020.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁷² Harold L. Fowler, Dean, to President Davis Y. Paschall, October 14, 1970. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

College. [He] did not seem interested in pursuing this and stated that HEW would not act precipitously in this matter. He indicated strongly that any decision-making process with regard to the institution of enforcement proceedings is a long way down the road and will not be made for some time.”¹⁷³

The uncertainty was reinforced by HEW Secretary Elliott Richardson, when he reported in a Press Conference that “the Commissioner of Education is releasing all funds appropriated for grants and payments to States and local educational agencies.” When asked, “why are you unwilling to invoke [termination] against the public college systems that have been defying you for two, three, four years?” he replied,

“we are not really at a stage where the termination of federal programs to systems of higher education would make any sense at all. . . . We have told them that they would be required to submit a plan to us. As far as I know, none has yet, in fact, submitted a plan, and nor has any gone beyond the deadline for submitting a plan, we do not, in the circumstances, have a base for invoking any sort of fund termination.”¹⁷⁴

However, a “main point in HEW’s criticism is the College’s escalation of Richard Bland College.” In a report issued Oct. 29, 1970,

“the Virginia State Advisory Committee of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission called the College’s escalation of Richard Bland a move to perpetuate a system of racially segregated higher education. . . . As a solution, the group recommended the merger of Richard Bland and Virginia State.” . . .

The group maintained that “college officials and state legislature succumbed to ‘intense . . . pressure from the white community when Bland was expanded.’” The committee also criticized Del. Roy Smith of Petersburg, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee . . . who, they said, “was instrumental in exempting Bland from legislation which would have transferred the two-year colleges to the community college system [and] . . . in obtaining funds from the General Assembly for the proposed [Bland] expansion.”¹⁷⁵

The William and Mary administration again took the position that they were bound by the appropriation from the General Assembly to continue with the Bland expansion, even though programs at Bland to be paid for by the funds were not yet begun.

Civil Rights Groups Anticipate Governor’s Plan

Before Governor Holton released his statewide desegregation plan in December, a state-wide conference on “Civil Rights and the Status of Higher Education in Virginia” met at Virginia Union University in Richmond.

¹⁷³ William G. Broaddus to Robert McIlwaine, October 21, 1970. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

¹⁷⁴ Elliot L. Richardson, Press Conference, October 22, 1970, Transcription. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Folder 51, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

¹⁷⁵ Ellis Johnson, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, November 6, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4368/fh19701103.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 5.

“Two hundred civil rights officials, high school and college administrators, instructors and students converged on the predominantly black campus to ‘exchange ideas and develop strategies for dealing with the problems of higher education and race.’” Eight William and Mary students and faculty members attended the conference, which featured a panel discussion of “civil rights in higher education” by six state college presidents and administrators from three other institutions, but no representatives from the William and Mary administration.¹⁷⁶

The conference, sponsored by the State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and the “State Steering Committee of the Coalition of Concerned,” called for “a firm schedule for the establishment of a unitary system of higher education” and “elimination of ‘dual systems’ of education where discrimination is inherent and facilities needlessly duplicated.”

A *Flat Hat* Editorial expressed disappointment that the William and Mary administration was not present at the conference,

“Perhaps President Paschall did have unbreakable prior commitments, but some members of the higher administration of the College must have been free to attend the Richmond conference. The fact that students and faculty did attend, and even spoke in workshop sessions, indicates healthy concern, but any significant change in William and Mary’s racial posture and composition must come from the administration, not students and faculty.”¹⁷⁷

A member of the History Faculty underscored the fact that “No one from William and Mary was there,” in a letter to the Editor in the same issue:

“There” was the Saturday morning panel discussion among college presidents and administrators at the conference. . . . “In answer to a question from the floor—yes, people did notice the absence—the conference chairman affirmed that the sponsors . . . had invited the presidents of all state colleges to participate. Whatever the reason for the administration’s failure to send an official representative to the panel, the result was unfortunate. Many at the conference undoubtedly received the impression that William and Mary is little concerned with questions of institutional racism, equal opportunity, and recruitment of black faculty and students.”¹⁷⁸

The Governor’s Plan for Desegregation

On December 1, 1970, Governor Linwood Holton submitted his plan for desegregating Virginia’s colleges and universities to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in which he proposed to introduce legislation, in the 1971-72 Academic Year, “to include

¹⁷⁶ Chris Taaffe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, November 24, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/18248/FH19701124.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁷⁷ Editorial, *ibid.*, p. 4.

¹⁷⁸ Cam Walker, *Ibid.* p. 4.

Richard Bland in the Community College system, keeping its programs at the two-year level.”¹⁷⁹

At the same time, the law suit by supporters of Virginia State College seeking to bar the escalation of Bland moved forward in the federal courts.

The Courts Decide Richard Bland

The plaintiffs in the case, six professors and four students at Virginia State and three Petersburg parents acting for their children, argued that the escalation of William and Mary’s Richard Bland College from two to a four years would frustrate the desegregation efforts of its neighbor, predominantly black Virginia State College, and thereby violate the State of Virginia’s legal obligation to eliminate its racially segregated system of higher education.

The defendants included the College of William and Mary, the State Council of Higher Education, Gov. Linwood Holton, and Richard Bland College.

The Federal District Court. In the two-to-one decision handed down May 12, 1971 the Court held

“that the provisions . . . for Bland’s escalation violate the 14th Amendment because they serve to perpetuate a state supported racially identifiable dual system of higher education. Consequently, the Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary and the President of Richard Bland College will be enjoined from escalating Bland.”¹⁸⁰

In his opinion, Judge John Decker Butzner observed that “a racially identifiable dual system of higher education exists in Virginia today. Black students comprise approximately 12% of the enrollment in the states’ 15 four-year colleges and graduate schools, yet 81% of them are concentrated in the two colleges which formerly were segregated by law” (Virginia State and Norfolk State).

“Bland was established in 1960 as a two-year branch of the College of William and Mary. . . . In the current academic year, 14 of Bland’s 841 students are black. It has never had a black faculty member. Not until last year, did its catalogue mention that it was open to all students regardless of race, and only recently has it attempted to recruit applicants from predominantly black high schools and to employ black faculty.”¹⁸¹

Further,

“[W]e find that escalation of Bland would hamper Virginia State’s efforts to desegregate its student body. . . . if Bland were escalated, white students would be more likely to seek their degrees at predominantly white Bland than at predominantly black Virginia

¹⁷⁹ Linwood Holton to J. Stanley Pottinger, December 1, 1970, Virginia’s State Plan. Virginia’s Response to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Relative to Title VI, Civil Rights Act of 1964, pp. 15, 16. In Swem Archives, William and Mary, Paschall, Davis Y. Papers, Box 26, “HEW,” 1982.74.

¹⁸⁰ *Norris v. State Council of Higher Education*, 327 F. Supp. 1368 (E.D. Va. 1971).

¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 1370.

State; and the part Bland now plays in sending some white students to Virginia State for their last two years would substantially decrease.”¹⁸²

Finally,

“The defendants’ argument is reminiscent of the dictum in *Briggs v. Elliot*: ‘The Constitution . . . does not require integration. It merely forbids discrimination.’ But this dictum, long followed by the courts of this circuit, is now ‘dead.’ . . . In its place is a positive mandate charging the states ‘with the affirmative duty to take whatever steps might be necessary to convert to a unitary system in which racial discrimination would be eliminated root and branch.’”¹⁸³

In a *Flat Hat* interview, State Senator Roy Smith denied that the plan was racially motivated and continued to defend the Bland escalation.¹⁸⁴ An editorial in the same issue applauded the federal court decision:

“Not only would a four year Bland impede full integration of Virginia State, it certainly would not have been able to accommodate a ‘state wide’ student constituency or provide students with a high quality of education. The woeful inadequacy of the state legislature’s initial appropriation of \$150,000 for the third year expansion makes one wonder what its backers had in mind, if not the perpetuation of segregated facilities and less than optimum educational opportunities for future students of both VSC and Bland.”¹⁸⁵

The Supreme Court. William and Mary appealed the decision to the Supreme Court.¹⁸⁶ In its Jurisdictional Statement, the Board of Visitors argued that

“the state has complied with the 14th Amendment by terminating its former policy of segregating students and faculty. Good faith admission and employment policies administered without regard to race, coupled with freedom of choice . . . are all the Constitution requires of a state.”¹⁸⁷

To support their argument, they cited a federal district court opinion in Alabama:

. . . “As long as the State and a particular institution are dealing with admissions, faculty and staff in good faith the basic requirement of the affirmative duty to dismantle the dual school system on the college level, to the extent that the system may be based upon racial considerations, is satisfied.”¹⁸⁸

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, 1371.

¹⁸³ *Ibid.*, 1372-1373.

¹⁸⁴ Ellis Johnson, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 14, 1971, p. 9. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5427/fh19710514.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁸⁵ Editorial, *Ibid.*, p. 2.

¹⁸⁶ Board of Visitors of William and Mary v. Norris, 404 U.S. 907 (1971).

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, App. 6.

¹⁸⁸ Alabama State Teachers’ Association v. Alabama Public School and College Authority, 289 F. Supp. 784 (1968), *aff’d*, mem., 393 US 400 (1969). *Ibid.*, App. 6-7.

However, the district court in Norris had ruled that the Supreme Court's summary affirmance of the Alabama case did not constitute approval of every statement made by the lower court in the case.

The primary argument in the appeal by William and Mary Board of Visitors echoed the argument at the lower court, that

“[T]he desegregation of Virginia's institutions of higher education proceeds, and will continue at an accelerated rate as more and more students seek enrollment, as nondiscriminatory admissions policies are positively pursued and as institutions actively attempt to recruit students, staff and faculty from those racial groups which are in the minority at a particular institution. In this setting, appellants submit that the Constitution of the United States confers upon no one a federally protected right to prevent the establishment, much less the escalation, of an institution whose benefits are available to, *and are actually being enjoyed by*, students of both races, white and Negro alike.”¹⁸⁹

In other words, racial integration is bound to happen.

The fate of Bland as a two-year college was sealed on October 26, 1971. The United States Supreme Court, without benefit of a hearing, affirmed the ruling of the lower court that barred the escalation of Richard Bland College.^{190, 191}

The President's Assessment of His Decade in Office

President Paschall's evident disregard for what was happening on campus outside of his executive suite was clearly expressed in an essay he wrote for a college publication distributed to alumni, parents of students, and other individuals: “Highlights of Progress, 1960-1970.” In the introduction to his account of the decade that began with his initial appointment as president in 1960, he began, “It is specifically recognized that

“the high level of harmony and unity among the constituencies that comprise the William and Mary family contributed significantly to making this what many have termed the Golden Decade in the history of the College” (emphasis added).

He described the ‘advancements’ in this ten-year period: capital improvements, a two-fold increase in faculty salaries, administration reorganization, “emergence of the College into modest university status as recognized by the State Council of Higher Education,” new and improved facilities, increase in both applicants and degrees conferred, the building of Swem Library, and an increase in endowment by nearly 5 million dollars.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁹ Jurisdictional Statement and Appendix for Appellants at 35, Board of Visitors of the College of William and Mary in Virginia v. Norris, 404 U.S. 907 (1971).

¹⁹⁰ Board of Visitors of William and Mary v. Norris, 404 U.S. 907 (1971).

¹⁹¹ Mary Frances Lowe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 29, 1971. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4699/fh19711029.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 4. See, also, Editorial, p. 10.

¹⁹² Davis Y. Paschall, 1970. Introduction, *Highlights of progress 1960-1970, A report on the decade and a look ahead to 1970-1980*. Swem Library, William and Mary, LD 6051 .w492 R4 1970, 27963-1002.

The *Flat Hat* editorial staff responded somewhat sardonically, first offering congratulations on “quite a pretty book,” and then applauding President Paschall’s accomplishments in the era.

“But there are curious lapses in Paschall’s perception of the College as expressed in this ten year progress report that we simply cannot condone.

“All mention of black students and the College’s (at least purported) efforts at integration is, perhaps significantly, omitted in the report. The only blacks included within the 75-page resume of ‘relevant’ campus activities and personages are the faithful bell ringer, who smilingly performs his daily duty in the Wren building, and a long-time College grounds employee who has ‘laid bricks for many sidewalks’ during the last ten years.

“Pretty pictures, impressive figures and schematic diagrams can’t cover up basic flaws in Paschall’s ten-year analysis. Of course there is the problem of reaching a certain audience. Given William and Mary’s history, Paschall may have concluded that his readers would prefer not to hear about changes in black enrollment, student protest or student participatory rights. Worse yet, the report may indicate that Paschall’s own educational philosophy will pit him against their implementation during the next decade, if he remains at the College.”¹⁹³

Calls for President Paschall to resign had surfaced from time to time in articles, editorials, and letters to the editor of *The Flat Hat*, not only with respect to controversy over racial integration but in other contexts as well, particularly in response to his seeming deaf ear to student pleas for revision of student regulations and adoption of a statement of student rights. His administration had been accused of racism in the face of his apparent intransigence over integration, and also in regard to his refusal to invite Charles Evers, the students’ choice, to give the 1971 commencement address.¹⁹⁴

Nevertheless, the president persisted in presenting an almost serene (surreal?) persona in the face of criticism. He surely had his supporters and defenders among the faculty, alumni, students, and especially among his appointed staff in the administration surrounding him. However, rumors began to surface that President Paschall might be considering retirement—a reason a few members of the Students Association had given for voting against his censure. As it turned out, his resignation was more imminent than the students might have thought.

Davis Y. Paschall Resigns as President of William and Mary

In midst of the turmoil surrounding racial integration at William and Mary; the ongoing Department of Health, Education and Welfare inquiry; and the attempt to expand Richard Bland College—all leading to the law suit still pending in the federal courts, President Davis Y. Paschall resigned on November, 7, 1970 as President of the College of William and

¹⁹³ Editorial, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, November 6, 1970, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4368/fh19701103.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 6.

¹⁹⁴ Lois Bloom, 2014. “1971 Commencement Speaker at William and Mary.” The Lemon Project.

Mary, effective August 31, 1971. In an interview he said, “It was a very traumatic decision for me to make, because no one could have been more involved with William and Mary. . . . [and he] “emphatically re-affirmed that ‘reasons of health’ were the sole motivating factor behind his decision.”¹⁹⁵

“Questioned about the current controversy between the College and the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Paschall said, ‘it has been unfortunate that circumstances have not allowed us to reveal all of the facts,’ referring to the ongoing litigation in the courts and HEW investigation. ‘As a result, there have been some unfortunate interpretations. One of these is that the College is in a position of defiance with HEW. This was and is untrue.’ . . . ‘We have taken so many steps that in my opinion would have been taken normally, that it would be unfortunate if those steps were interpreted as directives from HEW to the College.’”

Student Association President Winn Legerton said that she was aware of President Paschall’s continuing ill-health, in the face of “increasing strains” upon him as President, and thought “his decision to resign was a wise one.”

A New Administration

Thomas A. Graves, Jr. was appointed the 24th President of William and Mary on May 22 and assumed the office September 1, 1971. Other high level administrative appointments followed. Without delving into the details, I suspect that President Graves’ background was very different from the those of previous presidents of William and Mary. He grew up in Connecticut, went to prep school at Phillips Exeter in New Hampshire, graduated from Yale University, and received a doctorate in business administration from Harvard University.¹⁹⁶ He was a ‘Yankee.’

He departed from the traditional formalities of assuming the office of president at the Opening Convocation, dispensing with the usual academic procession, marshals, and a special section for senior students. Student leaders were seated on the platform with administrators rather than in the audience.¹⁹⁷

In his inauguration address, he urged the College community to

“focus our attention on rights and responsibilities rather than on powers and privileges or prerogatives, on policies and procedures rather than on rules and regulations, on freedoms rather than license. . . . I hope you will find me accessible, visible and approachable, consistent in behavior and flexible in ideas. I hope that I may serve as a bridge, a communicator, and at times a catalyst—to you, through you and for you.”

Asked about minority enrollment in his first interview as president, he said,

¹⁹⁵ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, November, 10, 1970, pp. 1, 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3562/fh19701110.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁹⁶ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 4, 1971, p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3499/fh19710904.pdf?sequence=1>.

¹⁹⁷ Mark Reynolds, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 14, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3553/fh19710914.pdf?sequence=1>.

“William and Mary does need to concentrate more on minority enrollment and hiring next year, . . . [w]e have to go out of our way to encourage minority groups, to use resourcefulness, imagination, creativity and hard work to attract black faculty members as well as students. . . . It’s darn hard to attract blacks. . . competition is rough. . . . It will take tolerance, patience and time, but I am confident we can do better in this area without lowering our standards at all.”¹⁹⁸

A Presidential Reaction and then Actions

The Supreme Court decision on the Bland appeal was announced shortly after President Graves took office, and his comment echoed the original argument for expanding Bland in the first place:

“Reacting to the news of the high court decision . . . [he] noted, ‘I was disappointed by the court decision regarding Richard Bland because I believe there is room and need for two four-year educational institutions of high quality in the Petersburg area.’”¹⁹⁹

Actions in his first year as president, however, were more forward-looking. The College hired its first full-time black administrator, Juanita Wallace, as Assistant Dean in the Admissions Office.²⁰⁰ A new campus publication, the weekly *William and Mary News*, was introduced for the purpose of “inform[ing] the College community of official matters and activities of general interest,” with a black Editor, Eleanor Anderson.²⁰¹ President Graves, along with the newly appointed Academic Vice-President and the Associate Dean of the Faculty, visited members of the administration at Hampton Institute to discuss the future of the Hampton-William and Mary student exchange.²⁰²

And President Graves invited the distinguished black author, Ralph Ellison, to be the 1972 Commencement speaker and to receive an honorary degree,²⁰³ in obvious and pointed contrast to President Paschall’s refusal to consider the students’ choice for the 1971 speaker, Charles Evers.²⁰⁴

The Beat Goes On

The Georgia legislator, Julian Bond, was invited to speak at the College by the Black Students Organization in Spring, 1971 in the final event of their ‘Black Awareness Series,’

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.* p. 1.

¹⁹⁹ Mary Frances Lowe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 29, 1971, p. 4. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4699/fh19711029.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁰⁰ Mark Reynolds. *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 15, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3844/fh19711015.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁰¹ *William and Mary News*, William and Mary, September 12, 1972, p.1. At <https://digitalarchive.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/18967/WMN19720912.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁰² *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 22, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3698/fh19711022.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁰³ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 14, 1972, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3518/fh19720414.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁰⁴ Lois Bloom, 2014. “1971 Commencement Speaker at William and Mary.” The Lemon Project.

with proceeds donated to the Martin Luther King Jr. Scholarship Fund.²⁰⁵ In a moving letter to the editor, BSO president Kermit Dance implored white students to come hear him.

“I cannot overemphasize the fact that in order for this project to be successful, we must have full support from the white College community. There are 38 black students enrolled here, and each time we undertake such an endeavor we are taking a great risk. We are placing our finances, our hard work and our good faith on the line, and too often we have taken the gamble and lost.

“. . . [In this] the biggest project of our year-and-a-half history. . . poor support would destroy our effort to increase the scholarship fund; it would mean financial disaster for the Organization; and it would also result in a complete loss of black faith in the white community. . . . By not exposing yourselves to black ideas, history and culture, you are only perpetuating the white assimilation and indoctrination which is too often referred to as ‘liberal education.’ You are condoning the racist intellectual and cultural atmosphere which has been characteristic of William and Mary for the last two and a half centuries.

“You are depriving yourself of opportunities to cleanse your mind of the white-supremacy trash which has hindered the free thinking of both blacks and whites for too many generations.

“We are asking for your full support Friday night. If you can’t attend, we will gladly accept your donation, and we are positive that the entire College community (both blacks and whites) will benefit.”²⁰⁶

About 600 attended the event. Bond quoted Frederick Douglas: “There is not now and never has been a Negro problem, but a massive white problem,” and added

“there are more white people who are less disposed [today] to be prejudiced, but there are fewer who are disposed to do anything about their . . . prejudice. If they will only undertake to live their lives according to the eternal principles of truth, justice, and humanity . . . then their nation will stand and flourish forever.”²⁰⁷

Black Studies.

The call for racial integration at the College throughout the late 1960s and into the 1970s, repeatedly stressed the need for courses relevant to African American history, literature, culture, and experience in general. An effort to address the need for courses in black studies caused the color of the faculty to begin to change, slowly.²⁰⁸

²⁰⁵ Chris Taaffe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 2, 1971, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5067/fh19710402.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁰⁶ Kermit Dance, *Ibid.*, p.2.

²⁰⁷ Bill Witting, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 13, 1971, p.1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5094/fh19710413.pdf?sequence=1>.

²⁰⁸ How slowly can be seen in *The 1984 College of William and Mary Report of Self Study*: “The College has made considerable effort to attract minorities and women to the faculty. Unfortunately, a relatively small

Lillian Poe met with President Paschall in the wake of his confrontation with HEW over the perceived non-compliance by the College and the threatened cut-off of federal funds. She was particularly concerned over his July 27 letter to HEW which she described as “offensive to me.” She reported that in their meeting, “the President implied a shift in the administration’s position” since his letter:

“The President voiced no disagreement when I pointed out the necessity of seeking out black students and faculty who are first black and, secondly, qualified. . . . ‘more than one or two’ faculty members would be necessary in any meaningful desegregation effort, . . . ‘it is incumbent upon the College to begin desegregation effort[s in] each and every department right away. Since the faculty has been imbalanced for so long . . . the idea of ‘hiring black faculty because it is black’ is both rational and valid, ‘especially if the administration is serious’ about recent efforts to step up minority enrollment recruiting efforts.”²⁰⁹

The Chair of the English Department at Hampton Institute, Nancy McGhee, a PhD graduate of the University of Chicago, was hired to teach a senior seminar in 20th century American Ethnic Poetry in the Spring 1971 semester.^{210, 211} Many saw her appointment as the first step in faculty integration. However, according to the *Flat Hat*, the chairman of the William and Mary English department, Carl Dolmetsch, said

“The fact that she is black and is from Hampton has nothing to do with her being hired. . . . We’re delighted that she is black, but it just happened that she is the most qualified person for the job.”²¹²

Prof. Dolmetsch also reports that Nancy McGhee had taught the first course in Black Literature at the College of William & Mary the year before, in 1969-1970.²¹³

The “first [full time] black faculty member in the College’s history” was Prof. Louis J. Noisin, appointed in 1972 as Assistant Professor of Anthropology and Government, after having taught at The Hampton Institute for three years.

“Discussing the previous absence of black instructors, Noisin said, ‘I understand the traditions of William and Mary had been tied to the Old South. Changes are very slow . . . but William and Mary is trying to rejuvenate. . . . I came along at the right time.’”²¹⁴

number of faculty positions become vacant in any given year, and the results of the recruitment efforts have been minimal to this date.” Williamsburg, VA: William and Mary, p. 75.

²⁰⁹ Mary Frances Lowe, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 6, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/18246/FH19701006.pdf?sequence=1>.

²¹⁰ African Americans at the College of William and Mary, Special Collections Research Center Wiki, Swem Library, William and Mary, August 7, 2014, Swem Library, William and Mary. At http://scdb.swem.wm.edu/wiki/index.php/African_Americans_at_the_College_of_William_and_Mary_November_3, 2013.

²¹¹ Pat Mayer, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 9, 1970, p. 1. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/4268/fh19701009.pdf?sequence=1>.

²¹² Carl Dolmetsch, *Ibid*.

²¹³ Personal Communication, by telephone, August, 2014.

A “Black Experience Colloquium” was offered in Spring 1972, co-taught by two white professors and drawing both black and white students. One student at each session was asked to keep a journal and all students had to do a project: “songs, reports, dramatic presentations, or something.” The colloquium was structured around discussions of the journals, the student projects, and readings which included

Manchild in the Promised Land by Claude Brown, *Soul on Ice* by Eldridge Cleaver, *Confessions of Nat Turner* by William Styron, and *Souls of Black Folk* by W.E.B. Dubois, among others. Everyone also attended four plays in Hampton on the Black Experience and the film, “The Birth of a Nation” by D.W. Griffin.²¹⁵

The response to the course, from the students and the professors, was generally positive. “The Black Experience provokes discussion as well as encouraging it. The major educational experience inherent in the course is relating to the other members in the course.” And one student added, “It’s hard for white professors to teach the Black Experience. But the teachers were very good. They let us do most of the talking.”

In Spring 1973, the English Department announced two new courses to be offered in the 1973-1974 year “in Black American literature, the first such courses to be offered at the College on a regular, continuing basis.”

The first course, to be taught in the Fall was “Black Literature in America, a lecture course [covering] selected works by leading Black American writers, with emphasis upon their ethnic concerns and their contributions to the general development of American literature.” The course offered in Spring 1974 would be “devoted to a study of ‘Black Fiction’ at an advanced level. . . a combination lecture and seminar course [covering] works by twelve important Black American novelists from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.”²¹⁶

Both courses were taught by Trudier Harris, a specialist in Black American literature and folklore with a PhD from Ohio State University. She accepted an appointment as an Assistant Professor of English, effective September 1973, and stayed at William and Mary through a successful tenure review and appointment to Associate Professor. She left in 1979 to take a position at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill where she eventually became the J. Carlyle Sitterson Professor of English and the author of many books on the black experience in America and literary studies of African American writers.²¹⁷ She is now a member of the faculty at the University of Alabama.

²¹⁴ Steve Budman, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, September 22, 1972. p. 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5040/fh19720922.pdf?sequence=1>.

²¹⁵ Larry Diehl, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, May 12, 1972, p. 5. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3870/fh19720512.pdf?sequence=1>.

²¹⁶ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 13, 1973. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5088/fh19730413.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 2.

²¹⁷ Courtney George, *Encyclopedia of Alabama*, Trudier Harris, September 17, 2010. At <http://www.encyclopediaofalabama.org/face/Article.jsp?id=h-2438>.

Professor Harris reports finding the English Department at William and Mary most welcoming and her departmental colleagues “mostly fine.”²¹⁸

“What got to me finally was the racial/cultural isolation and the incredible burden of overuse (that is, I was expected to be on practically everything connected with black folks). You may know that I was 100% of the African American faculty at W&M at that time and 50% of the faculty made up of people of African descent (a Haitian, Louis Noisin, was spread over Anthropology, Political Science, and French). So, my situation was challenging under any circumstances. . . . Another thing that made it challenging was that I was trained in African American literature and folklore, but my options to teach folklore courses became increasingly smaller as the demands for composition classes took center stage.

“I got into the habit of leaving Williamsburg every three months or so (for conferences or trips home to Alabama) just so that I could see living mirrors (more frequently for trips to Hampton and other places nearby).”

An “interdisciplinary major in Black Studies” was recommended in Spring 1973 by the Board of Student Affairs on the basis of a report by Kermit Dance, BSA Senior Class Representative. The Editors of *The Flat Hat* voted “Aye,” . . . “Such a broad step into the twentieth century is part of the jolt that this sleepy old Southern institution needs.”²¹⁹

Evidently, it was nearly 25 years before such a program became a formal entity.

“Established in the Fall of 1997 as an undergraduate, academic unit within Arts & Sciences, Black Studies, at the College of William and Mary, provides an interdisciplinary framework for examining the experiences of people of African heritage. The curriculum engages students in the critical examination of black diasporac (*sic*) cultural traditions and race relations in Africa, the Caribbean Basin and especially North America; Black Studies regards black people and their cultures as essential, organic components of the societies in which they live. The major and minor in Black Studies draw on fields such as history, sociology, economics, anthropology, literature, music, drama, dance, film, and the visual arts.”²²⁰

The “new concentration in Black Studies” was proposed and approved in a meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences²²¹ in February 1997, where

“discussion focused on the question of whether Black Studies was ‘a step in the right direction’ for the college Many members of the faculty spoke strongly in support of Black Studies as a discipline as well as attesting to the particular strengths of the

²¹⁸ Personal communication, by email, August 2, 2014.

²¹⁹ Editorial, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, April 20, 1973, p. 6. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/5207/fh19730420.pdf?sequence=1>.

²²⁰ Africana Studies Program, Special Collections Research Center Wiki, Swem Library, William and Mary, May 18, 2013. At African Americans at the College of William and Mary, Special Collections Research Center Wiki, Swem Library, William and Mary, August 7, 2014, Swem Library, William and Mary. At http://scdb.swem.wm.edu/wiki/index.php/Africana_Studies_Program.

²²¹ Minutes of the Meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, William and Mary, February 4, 1997. At <http://www.wm.edu/as/facultyresources/fas/minutes/19970204.pdf>.

proposed William and Mary program, which moves beyond a traditional humanities focus to include a significant social sciences component. Indeed, it was pointed out that William and Mary is playing ‘catch up’ in the area of Cultural Studies, and the proposed program marks a major step forward for the college. . . . In addition to articulating the discipline's intellectual integrity and stressing that the proposed concentration stands entirely on its academic merits, proponents also pointed out a moral imperative for the college to support such a program that brings together students and faculty ‘of all colors’.”

In 2009, “Africana Studies was launched . . . as a new interdisciplinary program merging the major in Black Studies and the concentration in African Studies.”²²²

Affirmative Action.

The first William and Mary “Report on Affirmative Action” was issued from the President’s Office October 5, 1973 and published in *William and Mary News*, the faculty newsletter.²²³ Its focus was on equal opportunities for employment at the College:

“Affirmative Action does not involve preferential treatment. . . . rather it means to undo a preferential system that has existed many years and to redress the historic imbalance that has resulted, in part, from that system. The process of redressing this imbalance requires that employers affirmatively seek out minorities and women and place them in positions for which they are qualified but from which they have been excluded through past experience.”

The report went on to compare employment statistics at William and Mary with other universities and national averages: The national average for PhDs held by blacks was 1.0%, and by women 14.1%. The University of California, Berkeley, had 9.8% black faculty and staff and 9.5% female faculty and staff, with 5.2% in the “top administration” from minorities. At Yale, the faculty included 2.6% black faculty and 7.0% female faculty. At William and Mary, approximately 16% of the faculty was female, 2% minority, and less than 1% black. The report continued,

“The Yale Plan . . . is under examination by Federal authorities right now. If schools like Yale and the University of California remain in a vulnerable position with Affirmation [the preferred term in the report], it is clear that this College is vulnerable to strong Federal exertion. Out of respect to the realities of the situation, and also our own positive moral sense, we should seek to move twice as fast in our effort to overcome the disparate effect in regard to minorities.”

“The Commitment”

The Board of Visitors endorsed two resolutions at the end of 1973 that “could result in the first major action in the history of the College to visibly increase the number of minority

²²² Africana Studies, William and Mary. At <http://www.wm.edu/as/africanastudies/about/index.php>.

²²³ *William and Mary News*, William and Mary, October 9, 1973, p. 2. At <https://digitalarchive.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/19014/WMN19731009.pdf?sequence=1>.

See, also, Paige Eversole, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, October 12, 1973, p. 3. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3569/fh19731012.pdf?sequence=1>.

students at William and Mary.”²²⁴ The first resolution concerned the Law School and the Council of Legal Educational Opportunity (CLEO), a program usually in effect for one summer and for which “the number of applicants is small and highly specialized.” Assistant Dean of Admissions Juanita Wallace, the first and then still the only full-time black administrator at the College, was unimpressed. “If the College is going to set aside \$10,000 for a program such as CLEO and use it for a shining example, I’m inclined not to applaud them. That just doesn’t impress me as really doing something.”

However, Wallace and “other staunch critics of the College’s past reluctance to become involved” were more hopeful for the three-part plan in the second resolution which proposed (1) to hire the first full-time recruitment officer, (2) to create a summer program for high school students between their junior and senior years, and (3) a “substantial” increase in bussing area high school students to visit the William and Mary campus. The cost of starting the plan was estimated to be at least \$32,000.

The College Affirmative Action coordinator reported that “the College has guaranteed ‘to scrape off the top a minimum of \$20,000,’ and that President Thomas Graves has requested that College business affairs administrators search for approximately \$30,000 for the program. . . . Graves commented that the new recruitment program must be a primary concern of the College in the immediate future.”

In a *Flat Hat* interview, Wallace was asked “what do you tell an interested student?,” and she answered:

“I tell a kid, look, William and Mary is beyond a doubt an outstanding institution, and if you’re thinking about college, consider it. As you apply, think William and Mary. Then they will ask, ‘How many blacks are there? How many black faculty?’ Well, it’s small, but the only way we’ll get more is if more come. So come, if under these conditions you can survive, because most important to us is that the student has whatever it takes to survive, whatever the ability is—call it survival quotient.”²²⁵

She also pointed out that outstanding black students identified in the last year or two were lost to Harvard, Duke, Brown, Smith and some of the other “better schools. The University of Virginia, of course, ‘steals’ a number of them because the money is a little more accessible than the money we have here. We just haven’t the money to compete.”

The Black Student Organization president, Willie Webb, described academic life at the College as “challenging and competitive.” He explains to the prospective black student that “‘because we are few in number, there are problems,’ but quickly adds that the only way blacks can increase their influence in the College community is [if] more blacks come to the College.”

An editorial weighed in,

²²⁴ Jim Rees, *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 7, 1973, pp. 1, 2. At <https://dspace.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3847/fh19731207.pdf?sequence=1>.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 3

“There is nothing like being black at William and Mary. The courses offer such a wide range of study that by the end of four years it becomes clear that you know more about the history of white American culture than you ever thought possible. You have had the support and the advice of the black administrators on campus—all one of them.

“. . . It is not the task of the administration alone. It is a challenge that demands the personal commitment of every student and every faculty member. Even the best recruiting efforts cannot erase the bias and tokenism that characterize the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant atmosphere that permeates William and Mary. We must initiate a penetrating self-analysis of the College community’s inner prejudices and a facing up to the monumental injustices blacks face on campuses across the nation.”²²⁶

At the close of 1973, 70 black students were enrolled among the approximately 4,000 undergraduates at William and Mary.²²⁷

Epilogue, 2014

In a letter to the editor at the end of 1973, a 1970 graduate wrote:

“While recently enjoying an evening with friends and some good bourbon an interesting comment arose after attention was given to last year’s Colonial Echo: ‘You don’t have many black students at William and Mary, do you?’

“My friend attends the University of Mississippi.”²²⁸

His letter eerily echoed a letter seven years earlier and quoted above (page 10), testifying that progress toward a racially integrated campus continued to be achingly slow ten years after passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

I suspect that continued efforts to integrate the College in the forty years after the period covered in this report were not easy. However, anyone driving eastward on either Jamestown or Richmond Roads today, past William and Mary towards Colonial Williamsburg, can see diversity on campus. Progress has been made.

With a few clicks on a computer it is now possible to take a virtual tour of William and Mary and both Richard Bland College and Virginia State University. Virginia State won the battle in 1971 but has still not won the war for Virginia. Yes, the websites for both William and Mary and Richard Bland College show black students on campus but far more white students, while the Virginia State University website shows many more black students and far fewer white students.

²²⁶ Editorial, *Ibid.* p. 10

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 2.

²²⁸ *Flat Hat*, William and Mary, December 12 1973. At <https://dSPACE.swem.wm.edu/bitstream/handle/10288/3847/fh19731207.pdf?sequence=1>, p. 10.