

Integration at Work: The First Labor History of The College of William and Mary

Williamsburg has always been a quietly conservative town. Throughout the first half of the twentieth century to the time of the Civil Rights Act, change happened slowly. Opportunities for African American residents had changed little after the Civil War. The black community was largely regulated to separate schools, segregated residential districts, and menial labor and unskilled jobs in town. Even as the town experienced economic success following the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg in the early 1930s, African Americans did not receive a proportional share of that prosperity. As the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation bought up land in the center of town, the displaced community dispersed to racially segregated neighborhoods. Black residents were relegated to the physical and figurative margins of the town. More than ever, there was a social disconnect between the city, the African American community, and Williamsburg institutions including Colonial Williamsburg and the College of William and Mary.

As one of the town's largest employers, the College of William and Mary served both to create and reinforce this divide. While many African Americans found employment at the College, supervisory roles were without exception held by white workers, a trend that continued into the 1970s. While reinforcing notions of servility in its hiring practices, the College generally embodied traditional southern racial boundaries in its admissions policy as well. As in Williamsburg, change at the College was a gradual and halting process.

This resistance to change was characteristic of southern ideology of the time, but the gentle paternalism of Virginians in particular shaped the College's actions. Efforts to slow this change even further abounded; massive resistance, initiated by the statewide Byrd Organization, attempted to delay integration following *Brown vs. Board of Education* (1954). In Williamsburg

the already high quality of public education for African Americans, thanks to the Bruton Heights School founded 1940, meant that the Brown decision held little significance. But at William and Mary, integration was a sluggish process. The Williamsburg campus lacked the virulence of battles over desegregation in the Deep South, opening its doors in the mid-1960s to a few African American students a year. These minority freshmen found themselves at a school that was grudgingly willing to change, but unsure of how to fully integrate itself after 260 years of closed-door policies. The result was a student body that diversified at a glacial pace, and a College community bereft of services for black students facing a new and intimidating experience.

As the student population changed so too did the labor force. Black workers had always been a presence on campus, but with integration came calls for more minority faculty members, and more minority workers in skilled and supervisory positions. With the advent of Affirmative Action measures at William and Mary, transformation began to take hold by the mid-1970s. The extent and quality of that transformation, however, remained unsatisfying to many observers by the end of the decade. While racism had been written out of the College's policies, it would take more than new regulations and increased acceptance to turn William and Mary into an institution that truly represented its host community. Still struggling with such issues in the twenty-first century, despite a more progressive campus community it is evident that erasing nearly three centuries of segregation and oppression is a task for the long term. In the following chapters, we will explore the critical twentieth century battles over race at William and Mary, revealing a picture of struggle and marginal victory, a fight that continues to this day in a country still working to overcome its divided past.

Section I:

Race Relations and the Economic Condition of African Americans in Williamsburg

From the end of the Nineteenth Century until the Restoration of Colonial Williamsburg began in 1928, African Americans and whites shared their community. Although a few African Americans enjoyed relative economic success in the late Nineteenth Century, Williamsburg was never an egalitarian society. Since slavery ended, African Americans worked almost entirely in the service sector of the local economy or as laborers. The Restoration entrenched segregation and shifted the way in which the African American and white communities of Williamsburg interacted during the 1930s. The white elite reaped the greatest wealth from Williamsburg's economic success. Though increasingly denied a place, African Americans prospered from the improved economic and educational opportunities.

Williamsburg before the Restoration: 1880s to 1928

The Civil War devastated Williamsburg, Virginia, physically, economically, and emotionally. Williamsburg was a small, white-dominated, Southern community, proud of its heritage and strongly attached to its traditions. The town suffered from severe economic depression in the late Nineteenth Century. As resident Estelle Smith recalls, at the time “everybody in Williamsburg was poor” like much of the south.¹ The former colonial capital of Virginia was reduced to “a straggling, dusty ghost.”² The Depression of 1873 only exacerbated

¹ Estelle Smith, Columbia University Studies in Linguistics, July 1930, Williamsburg, VA. Include reference to repository-did you use the copies at CW or Swem?

² *Virginia: A Guide to the Old Dominion* (Work Projects Administration Writers' Program, New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), 315.

these problems.³ In 1881, the College of William and Mary, one of Williamsburg's two principal institutions and employers (the other was the Eastern State Hospital), closed due to lack of funds, having never recovered from the war. It was at this point that the city reached "the nadir of its fortunes."⁴ Economic recovery at the turn of the century allowed the city to quietly drift until it was awakened by the colonial restoration.

A close-knit, little town, Williamsburg was principally an agrarian community.⁵ The needs of its citizens were met by "five blacksmiths, two corn and flour mills, a saw mill, and twenty-two general merchants."⁶ There were "thirty-seven principle farms" in the area surrounding the city as well as numerous lesser ones.⁷ Sheep, cattle, chickens and other domesticated animals wandered at will, grazing on the town commons until the early 1900s, when the city banned the practice.⁸ Often described as a "backwater", Williamsburg depended on the employment of Eastern State Hospital. It was notoriously known as the town where "the lazy lived off the crazy."⁹

Fortunes seem to have turned around, and by 1890 Williamsburg experienced "a period of growth and development not seen in the nineteenth century."¹⁰ This economic revival was spurred by two important developments. The Chesapeake and Ohio railroad (C&O) had come to

³ Timothy E. Morgan, *Williamsburg: A City that History Made*, (Chicago: Arcadia Publishing, 2004), 110.

⁴ *Virginia: A Guide to the Old Dominion*, 315.

⁵ Harriet Elizabeth Skinner "Bessie" Gerst, Interviewed by Arthur Knight, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 6 April 2005, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

⁶ Julia Woodbridge Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920" in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), 157.

⁷ Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920," 157.

⁸ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 112; Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920," 157.

⁹ Anders Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002), 2; Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920", 167.

¹⁰ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 110.

Williamsburg in 1881, accompanied by telegraph service.¹¹ The C&O “carried passengers and freight all over the peninsula,” allowing greater access to the town.¹² A regular schedule commenced on 1 May 1882, which aided Williamsburg’s recovery.¹³ Secondly, the College of William and Mary had reopened in 1888 under the leadership of a new president, Lyon G. Tyler, the son of U.S. President John Tyler, after President Benjamin S. Ewell (1854-1888) secured state funding.¹⁴ Tyler placed the College on a stable footing, and the city’s “attractiveness” was greatly enhanced by the College’s revival.¹⁵ Once the College reopened, Williamsburg began the slow process of recovery.¹⁶

Between 1880 and 1910, Williamsburg grew by eighty percent, increasing from fifteen hundred persons to over twenty-seven hundred in thirty years.¹⁷ This dramatic shift was due primarily to “immigration from Europe, especially southeastern Europe.”¹⁸ Midwestern farmers, many of Scandinavian descent, were lured to Williamsburg and began to settle in the areas of present-day Norge and Toano, contributing to the economic recovery of the area.¹⁹ Many Greek immigrants arrived in the city between 1905 and 1914.²⁰ The rise and diversification of the

¹¹ Martha W. McCartney, *James City County: Keystone of the Commonwealth* (Virginia Beach: Donning Publishers, 1997), 362.

¹² Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 111.

¹³ Oxrieder, “Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920,” 158. Prior to the arrival of the C&O, one traveled principally by steamer from Norfolk or Richmond, landing at Kingsmill Wharf on the James River, or via an old stagecoach road, running down the peninsula. See CG Durfey, *Columbia University Studies in Linguistics*, 29 July 1930, Williamsburg, VA.

¹⁴ Thaddeus. W. Tate, Jr., “Town and Gown through Three Centuries: William & Mary in the Life of Williamsburg” in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), 146; Lyon G. Tyler, *Columbia University Studies in Linguistics*.

¹⁵ Lyon G. Tyler, *Columbia University Studies in Linguistics*, 30 July 1930, Williamsburg VA; Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 113.

¹⁶ *Virginia: A Guide to the Old Dominion*, 315

¹⁷ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 112; Oxrieder, “Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920,” 158.

¹⁸ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 113.

¹⁹ Oxrieder, “Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920,” 157; McCartney, 362.

²⁰ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 131.

population during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was a product of Williamsburg's relative prosperity.

The city experienced modest economic growth in the 1890s. James Banks opened a planing mill and corn and cob crusher in 1895, and an ice factory shortly followed in 1898.²¹ A steam laundry opened, and the Williamsburg Canning Company was established during the decade.²² In 1900, the Williamsburg Knitting Mill began operation, employing two hundred workers from the town.²³ The town's first bank, Peninsula Bank, was incorporated in 1897.²⁴

African American business thrived in the late Nineteenth Century.²⁵ Of the twenty-two merchants who served the Williamsburg community, four were African Americans.²⁶ Popular black businesses included Harris' Cheap Shop, Crump Restaurant, Crutchfield Barber Shop and Tea House, and Skinner's Tavern and meat market.²⁷ These establishments were patronized by members of both races.²⁸ The success of many black-owned businesses spurred the creation of a black, middle-class elite, which included the Harris, Potts, Cary, and Canaday families.²⁹ African Americans' entrepreneurial spirit contributed to the economic revival during the last decade of the Nineteenth Century.³⁰

²¹ Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920," 158.

²² McCartney, 374; Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920," 158.

²³ McCartney, 374; Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920," 159; the Knitting Mill went bankrupt in 1910 and closed for good in 1916.

²⁴ Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920," 158.

²⁵ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 108.

²⁶ Oxrieder, "Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920," 157.

²⁷ Philip D. Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg – James City County 1619-1984*. (Williamsburg – James City County Public Schools and the Virginia Foundation for the Humanities, 1985), 24.

²⁸ Linda Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945" in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), 124.

²⁹ Daniel Frederick Hodapp, *The Albert Durant Collection: African American Life in the 1940s and 1950s in Williamsburg, VA*. (Williamsburg: College of William and Mary, May 2003), 6; Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945," 125; Julia Woodbridge Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern* (New Church, Virginia: Miona Publications, 1998), 15.

³⁰ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 108.

The richest man in Williamsburg (and possibly the whole state) at the turn of the Twentieth Century was an African American man named Samuel Harris. From Richmond, Harris owed his success to his Cheap Store, which he opened on the corner of Botetourt and Duke of Gloucester Street in Williamsburg in 1872.³¹ By 1890, it was the largest commercial enterprise in the town, popular with both races for its wide variety of goods. Continuously reinvesting his profits, Harris became the leading merchant in town, owning “a stable, a barber shop, coal and lumber yards, a blacksmith’s shop, and a saloon.”³² He also purchased considerable amounts of land in the town and surrounding country. Of any shopkeeper, Harris paid the highest taxes.³³ He was even one of the original stockholders in the Peninsula Bank.³⁴ A black “aristocrat,” Harris was politically well-connected at the state level at a point when African Americans could fully exercise their political rights.³⁵

In fact, for a brief moment at the end of the Nineteenth Century it seemed as if a few elite African Americans in Williamsburg could level the playing field vis-à-vis their white counterparts. Following the Civil War, African Americans in Virginia possessed full civil and political rights for the first time, and continued to do so over the following decades.³⁶ Many voted for the first time, electing members of their own race to local and state offices. By 1890, blacks had been actively involved in Williamsburg politics for over two decades. The town

³¹ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 115; Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern*, 1-2.

³² Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern*, 8.

³³ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 225.

³⁴ Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern*, 9.

³⁵ Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern*, 16.

³⁶ Van C. Woodward argues that this occurred largely due to the lack of consensus in the post-Reconstruction years on the place of African-Americans in southern life. See Van C. Woodward, *Origins of the New South, 1877-1913*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951), 209. Robert R. Jones argues that African-Americans retained their political rights after Reconstruction because Virginia Conservatives - white supremacists - chose to neutralize black political power via a paternalistic approach, instead of blatant subjugation. See Robert R Jones, “James L. Kemper and the Virginia Redeemers Face the Race Question: A Reconsideration,” *Journal of Southern History* 38 (August 1972): 393-414.

elected two African Americans to its city council in the 1880s. John Cary, who served from 1888 to 1890, was the last African American on the city council for more than a century.³⁷ By the turn of the Twentieth Century, these rights were snatched away under the auspices of ‘Jim Crow’.

Although Virginia segregationists had been chipping away at the civil and political rights of African Americans since the end of Reconstruction, which in Virginia was in 1869, during the early 20th century the real assault began. Over the course of ninety years, the Virginia General Assembly passed racial segregation laws, known colloquially as ‘Jim Crow laws’. They began in 1870 when the legislature ordered separate educational facilities for blacks and whites. Over time, Jim Crow laws required the segregation of public facilities, including “hotels, theaters, restaurants, and auditoriums; transportation systems such as railroad coaches, streetcars, steamboats, and busses; privately-owned business establishments; and housing.”³⁸ Even churches were subject to de facto segregation; largely white congregations often “denied access to blacks or discouraged their attendance.”³⁹ The vast majority of African Americans lost their voting rights under the 1904 Virginia Constitution, which restricted black enfranchisement by means of property and poll taxes as well as a literacy test. The number of registered black voters in Williamsburg dropped from 190 in 1900 to 36 in 1904.⁴⁰

Proximity between African Americans and whites created a sense of community in pre-Jim Crow Williamsburg. Blacks and whites lived in integrated neighborhoods “as close

³⁷ Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern*, 15.

³⁸ McCartney, 360.

³⁹ McCartney, 360.

⁴⁰ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 117; Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern*, 16; Samuel Harris was one of African Americans who retained the right to vote. See Oxrieder, *Rich, Black, and Southern*, 16.

neighbors” and shopped in the same stores, some owned by blacks.⁴¹ According to local attorney Ashton Dovel, who lived in Williamsburg during the first half of the Twentieth Century, nearly everyone in the town gathered outside of Henly’s Drug Store on Sunday mornings to hear the local news and to “feel reasonably secure of the safety of the community before proceeding to their respective churches.”⁴² Although Jim Crow did not gain full legal credence until the Twentieth Century, whites consistently dominated the town. According to Anders Greenspan, interaction between the two races “was circumscribed as much by custom as by law.”⁴³ “[A]s long as blacks knew their place,” whites and blacks would continue to coexist amicably.⁴⁴ Foster speculates that “traditional beliefs instilled fear for both whites and African Americans to maintain existing race relations” that promoted white dominance.⁴⁵ Interaction in the daily lives of blacks and whites created cohesion within the racially stratified society.

By World War I, Jim Crow was entrenched in Williamsburg.⁴⁶ As per Virginia law, theaters, restaurants, and transportation in Williamsburg were segregated. While black business-owners continued to operate, their business was “increasingly confined to the black community.”⁴⁷ Even those on Duke of Gloucester street enjoyed fewer and fewer white customers. In their social lives, African Americans and whites were increasingly separate. The African American community formed its own groups, usually through the church, in order to “socialize, perform community service, and provide financial aid.”⁴⁸ Williamsburg’s black churches were “the soul of the African American community,” providing leadership and

⁴¹ Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern*, 16; Hodapp, 6.

⁴² Ashton Dovel, Columbia University Studies in Linguistics, July 1930, Williamsburg, VA.

⁴³ Anders Greenspan, *Creating Colonial Williamsburg* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2002), 16

⁴⁴ Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945," 122; Greenspan, 16.

⁴⁵ Foster, 16.

⁴⁶ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 117.

⁴⁷ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 117.

⁴⁸ Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945," 126.

organizing life and assistance.⁴⁹ While their parents existed in two separate social worlds, the children of Williamsburg played together “regardless of race.”⁵⁰ While not racially divided in every respect, African Americans and whites occupied distinct social spheres.

Since emancipation, the racial hierarchy of Williamsburg had restricted African American’s opportunities to the lowest strata of the economic system. As Anders Greenspan writes, “In a locale where poverty was the rule rather than the exception, African Americans generally bore the greater burden than did whites.”⁵¹ Though Williamsburg experienced relative economic growth in the late Nineteenth Century, the majority of its residents remained poor. Few white women worked outside the home, and white men had the most opportunities. White men occupied the majority of technical, craft, or professional jobs.⁵² A white male might pursue employment at Eastern State, the largest employer in Williamsburg in the early twentieth century, or at the College. According to Ashton Dovel, “it was custom to expect the youth, certainly the young men of Williamsburg” to work for a few years at “the Hospital.”⁵³ There were rarely any black professionals other than preachers or the occasional doctor, who enjoyed middle class status.⁵⁴ Professional employment was not available to African Americans. They worked menial jobs, usually employed by whites.⁵⁵ Black men often worked as domestics, laborers, porters, cooks, or janitors.⁵⁶ Black women performed domestic work in the homes of

⁴⁹ John Turner, "Three Hundred Years of Faith" in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), 116; Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945," 126.

⁵⁰ Oxrieder, *Rich, Black and Southern*, 16; Foster, 15.

⁵¹ Greenspan, 16.

⁵² Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 25.

⁵³ Ashton Dovel, Columbia University Studies in Linguistics, July 1930, Williamsburg, VA.

⁵⁴ Foster, 24.

⁵⁵ Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 24; Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 117.

⁵⁶ Foster, 26.

Williamsburg's white citizens.⁵⁷ Furthermore, African Americans were often barred from the better paying jobs, such as those at the mills, even if one had a college education.⁵⁸ In African Americans faced a sad reality where unemployment was high and many were thankful to have work.

Many African Americans farmed or sharecropped, reflecting the largely rural atmosphere of Williamsburg in the first decades of the Twentieth Century, and black tenant farmers from the surrounding country sold their produce in Williamsburg. Many African Americans owned small farms.⁵⁹ One hundred eighty black-owned farms existed in James City County in 1910, compared to two hundred and fifteen white-owned farms. By 1920, the average African American farm was only twenty-five acres, compared to 191 for white-owned farms. The black farms were more likely to be on the worst land.⁶⁰

Segregation was most apparent in Williamsburg's education system. Though the schools, white and black, generally improved in the Twentieth Century, the administration clearly favored white education. Housed at the Matthew Whaley School, the white school was better funded and supplied. School officials believed a proper education was essential to prepare young white children for "future roles as the caretakers of the nation."⁶¹ Thus, white children received more personal attention due to relatively low teacher-to-student ratios vis-à-vis the black school. By the early Twentieth Century, white teachers earned nearly twice as much as their black counterparts.⁶² Compared to the quality of white schools, African American facilities were often

⁵⁷ Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 24.

⁵⁸ Foster, 22.

⁵⁹ Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945," 126.

⁶⁰ Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 23.

⁶¹ Foster, 38.

⁶² Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 15.

“ill-equipped, understaffed, and overcrowded.”⁶³ Foster speculates this was due to the belief among many whites that African American education was “of little importance.”⁶⁴ The black school, James City County Training School, opened in 1924 and emphasized technical education as well as instruction for those interested in becoming a teacher.⁶⁵ It was the first high school for blacks. Before the Training School, black education lasted only six or seven years with seven month terms.⁶⁶ Overall, black education reflected the expected place in life of African American students, while simultaneously reinforcing white dominance.⁶⁷

At the turn of the twentieth century, Williamsburg was a small rural commercial and college community, a typical southern town. White-dominance and paternalism underwrote the relationships between black and white neighbors in the integrated community, though interaction was frequent and generally amicable. However, its “rural, pastoral flavor” was slipping away as change began to creep in. World War I brought a brief flurry of excitement. The town underwent partial modernization, including the installation of sewers, electric lights, and other utilities, forcing residents to adapt modern ways to old customs.⁶⁸ When the war boom ended, the town suffered a tremendous letdown. Williamsburg entered a slump and, according to resident Vernon Geddy, returned to its “quiet nature.”⁶⁹

⁶³ Foster, 40.

⁶⁴ Foster, 41.

⁶⁵ Rowe, “African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945”, 124; Linda H. Rowe, *A History of Black Education and Bruton Heights School, Williamsburg, Virginia* (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2000), 21.

⁶⁶ Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 17

⁶⁷ Foster, 43.

⁶⁸ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 117; Oxrieder, “Williamsburg Claims the Amenities of Life, 1880-1920,” 163.

⁶⁹ Vernon M. Geddy, Columbia University Studies in Linguistics, July 1930, Williamsburg, VA.

The Restoration of Colonial Williamsburg

The Restoration of Williamsburg to its colonial appearance was part of a transformation of the identity of the Williamsburg community. In the process, the white elite relinquished its connection to the Confederacy in order to connect with the town's colonial past. The Restoration brought significant economic prosperity and modernized the town. Simultaneously it stripped Williamsburg of its sense of community and cohesion. W.A.R. Goodwin's 'shrine to the nation' became a symbol of revisionist history, devoid of a place for African Americans.

William Archer Rutherford (W.A.R.) Goodwin was the deacon of Bruton Parish Church in Williamsburg, Virginia, in the early Twentieth Century. Goodwin oversaw the restoration of the church and the adjoining George Wythe House for the three hundredth anniversary of Jamestown in 1907.⁷⁰ He left Williamsburg in 1908 and returned in 1923 to the College.⁷¹ In 1924, Goodwin asked philanthropist J. D. Rockefeller, Jr. to fund the restoration of the City of Williamsburg to its colonial 'glory', Goodwin's long-held dream. After touring the town on a trip to the College in 1926 Rockefeller agreed.⁷²

At first, Rockefeller's involvement was a closely guarded secret as Goodwin began to purchase property in 1926, starting with the Ludwell-Paradise House.⁷³ When the Restoration, under the Williamsburg Holding Corporation (WHC) desired public spaces from the town, among them the Palace Green and Courthouse Green, it was decided that Mr. Rockefeller would

⁷⁰ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 122; Thomas H. Taylor, Jr., "The Restoration of Williamsburg" in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), 180.

⁷¹ Foster, 48.

⁷² Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 123; Vernon M. Geddy, *Columbia University Studies in Linguistics*, July 1930, Williamsburg, VA; DAR Goodwin, *Columbia University Studies in Linguistics*, July 1930, Williamsburg, VA.

⁷³ Taylor, 182.

reveal himself to the town in a meeting. The residents would vote to decide whether to deed the land.⁷⁴

Goodwin announced the plan for the Restoration and introduced Mr. Rockefeller, the benefactor, at a June 12, 1928 town meeting. The town's African American community, about a fourth of the town's population, was effectively excluded.⁷⁵ No one present raised a concern that their black neighbors had not been permitted to attend.⁷⁶ Thus, the outcome was based primarily on a white, male perspective, though women were present. As Foster argues, the "proposed shrine to the lives of the national builders would strengthen values in which whites continued to dominate town life, and would thereby perpetuate a belief in their exclusive right to do so."⁷⁷ Goodwin had already secured the support of the town's white, male elite, including Vernon Geddy, Ashton Dovell, and Channing M. Hall. These men assured that the Restoration proceeded smoothly. In exchange, they would remain the town's elite and the balance of power would not be shifted by the Restoration. These elites genuinely believed "in their position of responsibility over the community and city – having been passed down from their forefathers."⁷⁸ The Restoration entrenched paternalistic, white male power, denying proper space toward/for? African Americans, and segregating the outdoor museum. After the June 12th meeting, the Restoration began in earnest, fully supported by the town's white elite.

The Restoration involved restoring Williamsburg's Eighteenth Century structures. Most structures had to be completely rebuilt and newer building as well as their inhabitants and businesses removed. The Restoration favored white families when purchasing property. Rarely

⁷⁴ Vernon M. Geddy, Columbia University Studies in Linguistics, July 1930, Williamsburg, VA.

⁷⁵ Foster, 104.

⁷⁶ Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945," 127.

⁷⁷ Foster, 108.

⁷⁸ Foster, 66.

did an African American receive a relocation option. Normally, they were pressured to move, literally forced out.⁷⁹ Bessie Gerst, an African American resident, recalls that many blacks felt there was “nothing they could do about it.”⁸⁰ African American families received less money for equal property and were restricted to relocating to new segregated neighborhoods in less desirable areas.⁸¹ Gerst remembers her parents felt they “weren’t given a fair deal.”⁸² White residents with prominent housing were offered temporary lodging and many whites received new housing, were assisted in their search, or were resettled. Whites were paid more for their property and given more freedom to move, a reflection of the privilege granted to them by the Restoration.⁸³ Life tenure agreements were offered to prominent white homeowners. Special treatment was given by the Restoration to the town’s white elite with certain lots saved for ‘whites only’. Such offers were never made to African Americans.

Goodwin had special plans for dealing with African Americans. His orders for handling African American property included: “move and disregard, acquire and restore for whites” in the case of historic property, or “wreck.”⁸⁴ Goodwin never seemed to feel as though he had to treat the African American resident like human beings, let alone like he did the white residents. He believed that he could simply remove the African American residents and they would solve the housing problem for him by leaving Williamsburg.⁸⁵ The Restoration purchased thirty-five to

⁷⁹ Rex M. Ellis, "The African-American Community in Williamsburg (1947-1998)" in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), 231.

⁸⁰ Harriet Elizabeth Skinner “Bessie” Gerst, Interviewed by Arthur Knight, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 6 April 2005, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

⁸¹ Ellis, 231; Hodapp, 5.

⁸² Harriet Elizabeth Skinner “Bessie” Gerst, Interviewed by Arthur Knight, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 6 April 2005, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

⁸³ Foster, 186.

⁸⁴ Foster, 182.

⁸⁵ Foster, 182.

fifty percent of its property from African Americans, who according to African American resident Dennis Gardner “did not know the value” of their land.⁸⁶ According to white real estate broker Gardner T. Brooks, the Restoration “had trouble in some instances of buying property” from blacks, who were “suspicious.”⁸⁷ However, with plenty of money and time, the Restoration prevailed. All told, the Restoration displaced more black families than it did white.⁸⁸

The Restoration required a tremendous amount of manpower and Goodwin needed it cheap. There were few economic opportunities available to African Americans other than the Restoration, which “required a strong back, long hours, and a willingness to take orders.”⁸⁹ According to Fred Frechette, an early employee of the Restoration, nearly every African American “went to work for Colonial Williamsburg during the 1930s in one capacity or another.”⁹⁰ The Restoration ironically provided jobs for African Americans, who were employed in the process of tearing down their former churches, homes, and stores for a project that denied their history.⁹¹

Although relegated to menial labor, many African Americans saw employment at the Restoration as good work. Most other work was part-time and the Great Depression was dragging down the economy throughout the rest of the country. The Restoration offered fulltime, regular employment and the security of a steady paycheck.⁹² While some were able to learn a trade, the Restoration kept most African American workers in subservient roles, “jobs whites in the South traditionally considered appropriate for African Americans” as Linda Rowe

⁸⁶ Dennis Gardner, interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

⁸⁷ Gardner T. Brooks, Columbia University Studies in Linguistics, 29 July 1930, Williamsburg, VA.

⁸⁸ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 134.

⁸⁹ Rowe, “African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945,” 134.

⁹⁰ Fred L. Frechette, *Williamsburg: My Town* (Richmond: Dietz Press, 2006), 61.

⁹¹ Rowe, “African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945,” 128.

⁹² Foster, 160; Frechette, 61.

puts it.⁹³ Though severely displaced from their pre-Restoration communities, African Americans accepted the Restoration economy as a boon.

The Restoration of Williamsburg to its colonial image was in a sense a ‘shrine to the nation.’ Goodwin perpetuated white dominance by denying African Americans a place in Williamsburg’s colonial past. Williamsburg, restored to its colonial façade, reaffirmed the town’s white residents of their “association with tradition from the nation’s birth in which a small, elite group dominated community life.”⁹⁴

Effects of the Restoration on Williamsburg to 1950

A report from the Institute of Public Administration on Williamsburg in the 1930s noted an “upset” in “the traditional attitude of local negroes toward their own circumstances and environment.”⁹⁵ It deduced the problem to have been caused by fewer blacks employed as domestics, an increase in tourism, and an “influx of outside negroes.”⁹⁶ However, the report missed the core issue: As a result of the development of the 1930s Williamsburg had lost the social, economic, and political stability that had been forged after the Civil War. During this period, attitudes of white domination were strengthened. The restoration exacerbated segregation in Williamsburg, creating a new physical divide between the African American and white communities.

⁹³ Linda H. Rowe, *A History of Black Education and Bruton Heights School, Williamsburg, Virginia* (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 2000), 39.

⁹⁴ Foster, 223.

⁹⁵ Carl E. McCombs, *Williamsburg: 1930 – 1937* (New York: Institute of Public Administration: March, 1938), 14.

⁹⁶ McCombs, 14.

Williamsburg benefited economically and politically from the Restoration. The population increased and diversified.⁹⁷ Once the largest employer, Eastern State Hospital had “relatively little significance in the social and economic structure” of Williamsburg in the 1930s.⁹⁸ Colonial Williamsburg garnered the title of largest employer by the end of the decade. WHC built new municipal buildings for the town and helped to update utilities.⁹⁹ Due entirely to the Restoration effort and Rockefeller’s fund, the town skirted the Great Depression with no substantial effects.¹⁰⁰ Williamsburg enjoyed “more economic growth during the Depression (1929-1941) than at any time since the capital’s move to Richmond.”¹⁰¹ The Restoration was heralded as the town’s savior. During the 1930s, nearly everyone in the town, either directly or indirectly, supported the Restoration effort. Even during World War II, Colonial Williamsburg, though closed, kept the town alive. Partnerships with the Army and Navy at Fort Eustis and Camp Perry, respectively, brought thousands of servicemen to tour the restored colonial district and Williamsburg’s commercial areas. According to Vernon Geddy, the town was “teeming with military personnel” and business “began to increase tremendously.”¹⁰² A USO for white servicemen was set up in Merchants Square and one for blacks at the Bruton Heights School.¹⁰³ Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, Williamsburg’s economy boomed.

In 1930, Williamsburg began a period of intense urban planning. A report that year called for an update of all utilities, trash collection, beautification, and road repair and

⁹⁷ John Turner, "Three Hundred Years of Faith" in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), 117.

⁹⁸ McCombs, 2.

⁹⁹ Foster, 111.

¹⁰⁰ Taylor, 187.

¹⁰¹ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 127.

¹⁰² Vernon M. Geddy, Colonial Williamsburg Oral History Project, 29 February 1952, Williamsburg, VA.

¹⁰³ Will Molinuex, “A Busy and Purposeful Place: Williamsburg During World War II” in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000), 194; Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945," 134.

pavement.¹⁰⁴ Williamsburg's government created "a congenial, pleasant environment" for tourists.¹⁰⁵ Increased tax revenue allowed the city to update its utilities and provide better services to its citizens.¹⁰⁶ Improvements included a new sewer system and water treatment facility, road improvement, "better fire and police protection...better health and social welfare administration" among others.¹⁰⁷ However, these municipal improvements benefited the core areas of Williamsburg, where the more wealthy white population lived and tourists frequented. Typical of town officials, service was slow in coming to the periphery where African American neighborhoods and business were.¹⁰⁸ African Americans were underserved by the government compared to the town's white population.

Segregation was entrenched by the Restoration. The newly-constructed Merchants Square at the end of the Duke of Gloucester Street was created to replace the business districts lost in the Restoration. However, spaces were available for white shop-owners only. An African American business district was promoted in the triangle formed between Prince George, Scotland and Boundary streets, removed from the heart of the town and the Restoration.¹⁰⁹ The courthouse and train/bus station constructed by the Restoration featured segregated waiting rooms, while their predecessors had not.¹¹⁰ The Restoration ingrained segregation in the public buildings of Williamsburg. Even the benches in Merchants Square were segregated.¹¹¹

¹⁰⁴ McCombs, 13.

¹⁰⁵ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 126.

¹⁰⁶ McCombs, 10.

¹⁰⁷ McCombs, 9.

¹⁰⁸ Foster, 218

¹⁰⁹ Dennis Gardner, interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹¹⁰ Foster, 177, 179; Edith Heard, Interviewed by Daniel Sumerlin, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 3 May 2006, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹¹¹ Getta Doyle, Interviewed by Mary Teeter, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 20 April 2006, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

Preferential treatment of whites over African Americans and forced relocation resulted in racial segregation in “ways unknown before the town’s restoration.”¹¹² White domination of the segregated community prevailed in the 1930s and following decades.¹¹³

Spatial separation between the African American and white communities embedded racism into the fabric of Williamsburg’s race relations. As the town displaced both white and African American residents, they resettled in racially segregated neighborhoods, a concept “unknown in pre-restoration days.”¹¹⁴ Before, African Americans and whites “lived side by side” in integrated neighborhoods.¹¹⁵ After, distance between the two racial groups created a space in which prejudice grew. According to Dennis Gardner, the white population rarely associated with the black “[u]nless there was something that they need the black community to do for them...”¹¹⁶ African Americans and whites no longer viewed each other as neighbors. Without this bond it became easier to objectify a member of another race as the ‘other’ – an object, not a person. After the restoration, the town became very “racially discriminating.”¹¹⁷ As Getta Doyle recalls, one “didn’t see blacks other than as the help....”¹¹⁸

Social segregation remained a part of everyday life. There was the sense that both the white and African American communities got along perfectly fine, though a clear separation

¹¹² Foster, 180.

¹¹³ Rowe, "African Americans in Williamsburg, 1865-1945," 127.

¹¹⁴ Morgan, *Williamsburg*, 134.

¹¹⁵ McCartney, 499.

¹¹⁶ Dennis Gardner, interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹¹⁷ Getta Doyle, interviewed by Mary Teeter, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 20 April 2006, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹¹⁸ Getta Doyle, interviewed by Mary Teeter, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 20 April 2006, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

existed.¹¹⁹ Black and white did not associate unless necessary. Such as before the Restoration, African Americans could neither attend the all-white movie theater or the bowling alley nor sit down at the drug store. Dennis Gardner recounts not being able to see the white dentist except after-hours when “all the other patients had left.”¹²⁰ Likewise, African Americans could see the town’s white doctors “through the backdoor” until the first African American doctor, Blain Blayton, arrived in the early 1930s.¹²¹ Blacks were not welcomed at the Williamsburg Inn or Lodge and stayed in black-only boardinghouses in the town.¹²² John D. Rockefeller, Jr., personally wrote a form letter given to all non-whites, who arrived at one of the Restoration’s lodgings. It reads: ““The management has not thus far found it practicable to provide for both colored and white guests. I (or we are) am [sic] sorry we cannot accommodate you (or cannot take care of you; or cannot offer you hospitality.)””¹²³ As resident Rita Jackson recalls, it was a period when “blacks did their thing and the whites did theirs.”¹²⁴

The African American community retained its sense of cohesion despite being dispersed throughout Williamsburg by the restoration. Many African American families settled in planned communities like Carver Gardens, the Grove Community and Braxton Court when they sold their property to the restoration.¹²⁵ These communities were a source of pride because they were

¹¹⁹ Esterine Moyler, Interviewed by Vanessa Ponton, 19 October 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA; Rita Jackson, Interviewed by Salar Mohandesi, 5 November 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹²⁰ Dennis Gardner, interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹²¹ Dennis Gardner, interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.; Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 26.

¹²² Edith Heard, Interviewed by Daniel Sumerlin, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 3 May 2006, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹²³ John D. Rockefeller, Jr., as quoted in Greenspan, 72.

¹²⁴ Rita Jackson, Interviewed by Salar Mohandesi, 5 November 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹²⁵ Dennis Gardner, Interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

“built black, bought black, black owned.”¹²⁶ Williamsburg’s black communities, recalls Rita Jackson were “a place where everyone knew each other, where people felt safe not locking their doors and could sleep on their porches at night.”¹²⁷ The restoration also removed many black-owned businesses from the Duke of Gloucester Street and pushed them into the segregated peripheries.¹²⁸ African American business districts, such as the triangle area off Scotland St., serviced the community. The triangle business district included restaurants, a grocery store and other small businesses.¹²⁹ Dr. Blayton built his clinic for the black community in this area. With the addition of Dr. Pelger, the dentist, African Americans had full access to health care providers of their own for the first time. Such developments display the relative self-sustaining community that developed after the Restoration.¹³⁰

Educational opportunities were increasing during this time as well. Through the late 1930s, African American students of high school age or adults could attend the James City County Training School. This program provided training for teachers as well as other vocational skills. Additionally, the Training School became the center of African American life in Williamsburg, offering health services, entertainment and other aspects of life that white Williamsburg denied to African Americans. However, by the mid-1930s, the Training School had become run-down and in need of replacement.¹³¹

¹²⁶ Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 24.

¹²⁷ Rita Jackson, Interviewed by Salar Mohandesi, 5 November 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA, transcript, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

¹²⁸ Hodapp, 6.

¹²⁹ Dennis Gardner, interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹³⁰ Hodapp, 37.

¹³¹ Rowe, “African Americans in Williamsburg 1865-1945,” 131.

Through community action, a plan for a new black school, Bruton Heights, was developed.¹³² Built with funds raised by the African American community, Works Projects Administration grants, Abby Aldrich Rockefeller, and the Restoration, Bruton Heights School opened in September 1940.¹³³ Over the next decade the Bruton Heights School became a center of African American life in Williamsburg. Adult education classes, health clinics, movie screenings, and sports activities were organized at Bruton Heights. The “state-of-the-art school” provided both academic and vocational training for Williamsburg’s young African Americans.¹³⁴ The school boasted a large number of graduates attending college and pursuing professional occupations such as medicine, law, accounting, and engineering.¹³⁵ As local labor activist Edith Heard notes, Bruton Heights graduates “did not want to do service work, and there were no jobs here for them. So they did migrate into other cities.”¹³⁶ To the African American community, the school was the greatest gain from the Restoration.

After the Restoration the African American community became increasingly inward looking and “very close-knit,” as Dennis Gardner put it.¹³⁷ Though the restoration had historically and culturally excluded African Americans, the footing many gained working during the Depression helped the community achieve a relative level of success when the rest of the country stagnated. The children of those who worked on the Restoration reaped the benefit of a

¹³² Rowe, “African Americans in Williamsburg 1865-1945,” 129-132.

¹³³ Hodapp, 26.

¹³⁴ Edith Heard, Interviewed by Daniel Sumerlin, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 3 May 2006, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹³⁵ Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 18.

¹³⁶ Rowe, “African Americans in Williamsburg 1865-1945,” 132.; Edith Heard, Interviewed by Daniel Sumerlin, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 3 May 2006, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹³⁷ Dennis Gardner, Interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

quality education from Bruton Heights School and sought further studies in college.¹³⁸ Many black children did not even know they were segregated because they grew up so encapsulated within the community.¹³⁹ These youth did not see themselves bound by Goodwin's image. Though their lives were "circumscribed," Williamsburg's African American community would not be "overpowered by Jim Crow."¹⁴⁰

Still African Americans did not benefit from the Restoration like their white counterparts. Far little advancement was made in the employment opportunities of African Americans, who remained restricted to jobs in the service sector or as domestics, ironically, the jobs slaves performed earlier.¹⁴¹ The major employers of African Americans were the College, Eastern State Hospital, Colonial Williamsburg, and the Federal Government. By 1940, only a third of the African American males in the Williamsburg area were engaged in agriculture. That figure would drop to two percent a generation later.¹⁴²

Both Fred Frechette and Dennis Gardner remember limitations on advancement placed on African American employees at the time, due to the prevailing social norms. When Frechette, who was white, asked to promote an African American bellman, the Colonial Williamsburg Vice-President, Vernon Geddy, replied, "'there's nothing like that we can do for [him]'" because it was "'the way things are...'"¹⁴³ Although the service sector jobs expanded to include hotels and restaurants, as local black resident Dennis Gardner remembers, "most all of the jobs, not all,

¹³⁸ Frechette, 62.

¹³⁹ Hodapp, 5.

¹⁴⁰ Hodapp, 36.

¹⁴¹ Foster, 187.

¹⁴² Morgan, *Black Education in Williamsburg*, 23.

¹⁴³ Frechette, 58.

were unskilled jobs[;] there were no professionals.”¹⁴⁴ Rita Jackson recalls how “the blacks used to work for whites,” the ones with the money.¹⁴⁵ However, through the steady employment during the Restoration, many African Americans were able to enjoy a middle class lifestyle. While segregated from the white middle class, higher wages and consistent employment allowed local African Americans to improve their economic condition and advance their children through education.

Working at the College had an interesting meaning for the members of the African American community, who were the only people hired for low-skill jobs. While the appeal of working at the College seemed to be the desire for a consistent paycheck, the College also had greater opportunities for advancement to supervisory positions. While Colonial Williamsburg jobs were sensitive to the tourist season and construction work proved inconsistent, the College employed its workers year-round. Similarly, the unpredictable weather could influence a laborer’s pay in privately contracted jobs, as William Winston recalled, “you were never sure where your money” would come from “because the weather bad [*sic*]. . . .” However, if one worked at the College, “you had a guaranteed job.”¹⁴⁶ Most African American employees at the College cooked, cleaned, served, and maintained the grounds. The College also employed skilled African American craftsmen, like brick masons, for tasks such as constructing the walls surrounding the campus.¹⁴⁷

In a self-study report from the mid-1960s, the College recognized its maintenance jobs to

¹⁴⁴ Dennis Gardner, Interviewed by Ryan Clark, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

¹⁴⁵ Jackson, interview.

¹⁴⁶ William Winston, Interviewed by Kelly Brennan, 4 October 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA, transcript, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

¹⁴⁷ Bessie Gerst, Interviewed by Arthur Knight, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 8 August 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

be low-paying and undesirable compared to other local opportunities, including the military base and construction work.¹⁴⁸ A decade later, a similar self-study cites a lack of training, low wages, and lack of benefits, as factors in the poor maintenance services. In the same critique, the self-study also indicated “a strong correlation between types of jobs and the employee’s race; the custodial staff is black and the supervisory staff is white.”¹⁴⁹ The self-study reports show the College’s recognition of the undesirability of the employment offered to local African Americans.

Both reports focus on the maintenance staff, which was presumably mostly or all male, and similarly, much of the available research gives little insight into African American female opportunities in Williamsburg. It seems that from the pre-restoration period to the civil rights era, prospects changed little for black women. Their options included waiting tables in Colonial Williamsburg, cooking or cleaning for Colonial Williamsburg, or cooking or housekeeping at the College. Williamsburg resident and former College employee Esterine Moyler seems to represent common sentiment that the last job one wanted was a housekeeping job at the College, yet that position gave, at least marginally, more respect to its workers than Colonial Williamsburg restaurants and hotels and did not rely on the seasonal tourist trade.¹⁵⁰ Seemingly, African American women, while they had moved out of private homes were still cooking for, cleaning for, and serving whites, no matter where they worked.

The 1940s offered continued growth of opportunity for African Americans in

¹⁴⁸ College of William and Mary, *a Self-Study of the College of William and Mary in Virginia* (Williamsburg, VA: The College, 1964), 229.

¹⁴⁹ College of William and Mary, *a Self-Study of the College of William and Mary in Virginia* (Williamsburg, VA: The College, 1974), 311.

¹⁵⁰ Esterine Moyler, Interviewed by Vanessa Ponton, 19 October 2007, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA, transcript, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

Williamsburg. As the United States entered World War II, the defense industries surrounding Williamsburg swelled, and much of the white and black labor force entered into the service. Initially, many defense jobs were closed off to African Americans, but early in 1941, the State Defense Council of Virginia encouraged employers “not to make a mockery of democracy” in their hiring practices of African Americans.¹⁵¹ With African Americans filling the labor shortage in the defense industries, Colonial Williamsburg found itself with a labor shortage and had to bring workers in from farming communities in North Carolina, who would stay for the busy tourist season and then move back to their home region for the remainder of the year.¹⁵²

The 1950s and 60s, which held influential changes in other parts of the South, did not create much change for African Americans of Williamsburg, especially in the labor market. Although African Americans made some gains in the integration of education and public spaces, most workers faced the same discrimination, and thus the same low-paying, unskilled jobs.¹⁵³

Mysterious in the Williamsburg labor market is the process through which African Americans attained jobs. Want ads from local papers, the *Virginia Gazette* and the *Daily Press*, rarely contained more than a dozen total advertisements for available positions. In the late 1940s, both newspapers featured requests for “colored” wait staff, while other requests specified a white waitress. One ad in each paper requested the service of an “experience colored woman for housework.”¹⁵⁴ The classifieds often advertised opportunities for men as skilled laborers such as painters and carpenters. By the late 1960s, the process by which one applied for positions

¹⁵¹ Rowe, “African Americans in Williamsburg 1865-1945,” 133.

¹⁵² Greenspan, 72.

¹⁵³ Rex M. Ellis, “The African-American Community in Williamsburg (1947-1998)” in *Williamsburg, Virginia: A City Before the State 1699-1999*, ed. Robert P. Maccubbin (Williamsburg: The University Press of Virginia, 2000).

¹⁵⁴ “Classifieds,” Newport News, VA, *Daily Press*, 25 May 1947, A, 16.; “Classifieds,” Williamsburg, VA, *The Virginia Gazette*, 3 January 1947, 15.

appears to have changed. In earlier newspapers, applicants could just call; however, if the ad did not specify the desired applicant's race, the ad asked the applicant to call to make an appointment or come to the place of employment for an interview.¹⁵⁵ This trend suggests that over time, racism left the want ads, but became a tacit part of hiring practices.

Word-of-mouth played a huge role in the communication of available positions in Williamsburg, especially given the limited number of want ads featured in the local newspapers. Mrs. Moyler, Mr. Gardner, and several other Williamsburg residents indicated that African Americans understood their employment prospects: Colonial Williamsburg or the College. Friends and family members already employed at these locations often shared job openings, which facilitated African American employment or job switching.¹⁵⁶

From the late nineteenth century through to the 1940s, Williamsburg transformed itself from a sleepy backwater, agrarian town into a commercial, reconstructed colonial tourist destination. Economically, the town was thriving in the 1930s and 1940s, though this wealth was not shared equally. The town had been segregated since the nineteenth century, adhering to custom and tradition, which maintained interaction between the two races. African Americans traditionally occupied subservient roles, but had a space in the community. Within this context, Williamsburg entered the twentieth century. W.A.R. Goodwin destroyed the interracial community that defined Williamsburg before 1930. Goodwin's restoration of the town's colonial form fashioned an "imbalanced perception of the past" that attempted to erase the

¹⁵⁵ "Williamsburg Classified," Newport News, VA, *Daily Press*, 1 January 1967, C, 7

¹⁵⁶ Gardner, interview; Moyler, interview.

connections between African Americans and the history of the United States while glorifying the paternalistic culture of elite, white domination.¹⁵⁷

Prosperity came at a price. As Gerst recalls, “the Restoration took over.”¹⁵⁸ The nineteenth century was erased and African American history reserved as a mere side-note. With the development of Colonial Williamsburg, African Americans were offered more of the same unskilled jobs in which they served the white people of the town. However, regular employment and the town’s economic prosperity allowed many African Americans to achieve a relatively high level of success. The African American community prospered in the 1940s, and the Bruton Heights School allowed its children to excel academically. Educated, young African Americans would find it increasingly difficult to find a space for themselves in a town built around white tourism and white college students. African Americans’ historic place in Williamsburg was to serve. Those willing to do so had a place. Those who would not had to leave.

Section II:

¹⁵⁷ Foster, 4.

¹⁵⁸ Harriet Elizabeth Skinner “Bessie” Gerst, Interviewed by Arthur Knight, Williamsburg Documentary Project, College of William and Mary, 6 April 2005, digital voice recording, Williamsburg, VA.

“I go on forever.” The legacy of slavery, black labor at the College, and the curious career of

Henry “Doc” Billups

We will now move across the street to the College of William and Mary. Like the town, the College depended heavily on the labor of African Americans since the College’s inception. This paper will connect the tradition of African American employment in low paying, menial jobs to the legacy of slavery at the College. White behavior at the College reflected the commitment to conservatism and tradition apparent throughout the South during the late-Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries. In the first half of the twentieth century the College held fast to its conservatism and it did little to change the dynamics between faculty staff, and students. Despite physical growth and the challenges of two world wars, surprisingly little changed. Racism, sexism, and unfair labor practices continued to plague the workers at the College.

This section is also about a William and Mary legend. This man’s devotion to the College and relationship its students has never been surpassed. He was not a College president nor was he a member of the faculty. Instead, he came from the ranks of the traditionally anonymous janitorial staff. Henry “Doc” Billups’s career at William and Mary began in the late nineteenth century when free black labor varied little from generations of slaves. Billups performed many of the same tasks as William and Mary’s eighteenth century slaves. He served food, cleaned classrooms, and rang the bell in the College Building, but it was his unofficial work that made him famous. With no opportunities for professional advancement, Doc Billups’s career is exceptional not only for its length but for the fame he achieved as "Professor of Boozology" and a mediator between students and faculty. Historical examination of Billups’s career indicates that

his role on campus was more than that of a well-liked staff member.

Throughout the eighteenth century, slaves owned by the College of William and Mary performed similar tasks as privately-owned slaves in Williamsburg. Since Williamsburg was the capital of Virginia during this period, most slaves were retained by the city's elite to make their homes the model of gracious Southern hospitality.¹⁵⁹ In 1775, some of the College's slaves whose previous assignments are lost to history were reassigned to the College kitchen to cook and serve meals to students. These slaves were also responsible for cleaning classrooms as well as the students' rooms. Students would also bring their own slaves to serve as personal valets.¹⁶⁰

Not all of the College's slaves labored for the students' and faculty's comfort. Slaves owned by local "undertakers" or contractors were likely used to construct the College Building (now known as the Wren Building). Colonial Williamsburg architectural historians believe that slaves may have cut timber and dug the foundations of the buildings or hauled materials to the building site. It is unknown how many slaves provided skilled labor, but two of James Blair's slaves were hired out to work as carpenters on the College Building.¹⁶¹

Some slaves worked on the College's plantation up the James River. These slaves were field hands whose back-breaking labor yielded a tobacco crop that would offset some of the College's expenses.¹⁶² The College would also rent other people's slaves during harvesting season and rent out their own during slack times.¹⁶³ Slave renting was a common practice in the Chesapeake through which slave owners could make money and the society as a whole could

¹⁵⁹ Thad W. Tate, *The Negro in Eighteenth-Century Williamsburg*, (Williamsburg, VA: The Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, 1985) 33.

¹⁶⁰ Tate, 38-39.

¹⁶¹ Angela Cota "College's oldest buildings likely built by slaves, lecturer says" *The Flat Hat* 23 February 2007 http://www.flatthatnews.com/news/398/Colleges-oldest-buildings-likely-built-by-slaves-lecturer-says?zem_contact_send_article=yes 22 November 2007

¹⁶² Tate, 38.

¹⁶³ Tate, 38.

address issues of slave shortages and surpluses.¹⁶⁴ Tobacco profits, tuition, and slave renting was not enough to save the College from financial difficulty in the late eighteenth century and many slaves were sold off to pay for building repairs.¹⁶⁵

Williamsburg's nineteenth century slaves worked under the same conditions as their parents and grandparents. It was only the arrival of the Civil War in the city that things began to change. In the weeks leading up to the "Yankee occupation" rumors of the Union Army's imminent arrival encouraged free blacks working for the Eastern Lunatic Asylum (the city's largest employer of both blacks and whites)¹⁶⁶ to do anything but work.¹⁶⁷

After the war, many former slaves remained in the service of their masters. Richard S. Bright, who grew up in Williamsburg in the 1870's and 1880's reminisced about two of his father's slaves who continued to work for the family after the war. Bright's father paid them "of course, for their services." The former slaves reportedly said "Mr. Lincoln never bought them from Marse Robert."¹⁶⁸

One of these former slaves who remained in the service of the Ewell family was also in the service of the College. Malachi Gardiner, who continued to live in a house of the Ewell property after the war,¹⁶⁹ assisted College president Benjamin Ewell with looking after the campus when the College was closed from 1881 to 1888. President Ewell and "The Professor," as Ewell jokingly called Gardiner, would take daily trips from the Ewell property in James City County into Williamsburg.

¹⁶⁴ John Zaborney, "Slaves for Rent: Slave Hiring in Virginia," Ph.D. Diss, University of Maine, 1997, 9-12.

¹⁶⁵ Tate, 39.

¹⁶⁶ Carol Kettenburg Dubbs, *Defend This Old Town: Williamsburg During the Civil War*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 2002) 2-3.

¹⁶⁷ Dubbs, 277-278.

¹⁶⁸ Richard S. Bright, *Memories of Williamsburg*, (Richmond, VA: Garrett & Massie, 1941) 9.

¹⁶⁹ Anne W. Chapman, "Benjamin Stoddert Ewell: A Biography" (Ph.D. diss., The College of William and Mary, 1984), 277.

Ewell and Gardiner were on campus every day from eleven to two P. M. Ewell would ring the bell in the College Building and Gardiner would carry the keys as they inspected each of the structures on campus. Considering that Ewell was well into his seventies, severely arthritic, and going blind, it is probably safe to assume that Gardiner did most of the inspections.¹⁷⁰

Gardiner's relationship with Ewell tells us much about the dynamics between master and former slave. Richard Bright remembered how Ewell would stop to chat with his father on his way out of town. Gardiner "would become naturally restless" and would try to defend himself from the onslaught of mosquitoes. This greatly irritated Ewell and he threatened to make Gardiner walk home if he did not sit still. "'Malichi' [sic] would only grin, knowing that the Colonel was devoted to him and under no circumstances would he let him walk home."¹⁷¹

Gardiner's memories of Ewell also reflect the tension between the two men. In an article for the *Alumni Gazette* a student came back and wanted to see "the old bell-ringer." Gardiner reflected on his former boss/owner's personality. He described Ewell as "kind" but also as "bald and severe looking." He also said that "sometimes he got on his high horse."¹⁷² These guarded but telling statements demonstrate Gardiner's ambivalent relationship with Ewell.

Bright also recalled the changing of the bell-ringing guard. He described another black employee of the College as "Dr. Tyler's 'Malichi.'"¹⁷³ That employee was Henry 'Doc' Billups – the most famous and most loved employee of the early twentieth century.

Henry Billups began his career with the College of William and Mary when the school re-opened in 1888 and Bright might have been correct in drawing some parallels to Malachi

¹⁷⁰ Chapman, 277.

¹⁷¹ Bright, 18.

¹⁷² "Ancient Bell-Ringer Recalls Days 'When'" *The Alumni Gazette*, 31 March 1938, 2.

¹⁷³ Bright, 18.

Gardiner. Over the years, Billups had a wide variety of responsibilities but Dr. Tyler treated him in a similar fashion as Ewell had treated Gardiner. In one instance, Tyler sent Billups to explain to Colonel Richard Bright that Tyler's turkeys, which had gotten into Bright's orchard, were not eating Bright's fruit but the bugs on the fruit. When Billups returned to Tyler, Billups explained that the Colonel wanted to kill the bugs "heself."¹⁷⁴ This role of errand boy and mediator was one that Billups would play his entire career at the College.

From the beginning, Billups often served as a mediator between the College's faculty (and their rules) and the students. Too young to be hired as a janitor, Billups started as a waiter in the school's dining hall. He made six dollars a month plus "eats."¹⁷⁵ Newly-arrived homesick freshmen could count on him to cheer them up with an extra piece of pie, and when students arrived late for dinner and should not have been seated, Billups often seated them anyway and was rewarded with tips.¹⁷⁶

Billups would often go to great lengths to make sure students did not get in trouble for their antics. One student remembered: "I might add that Henry Billups was genuinely a good friend to all of the students and they all liked and respected him. Nothing was too much or too difficult for him to do for their pleasure."¹⁷⁷ A group of students in the 1890's would regularly have poker night in one of their dorm rooms. When the faculty caught wind of this they planned a raid. Aware of both the poker game and the impending raid, Billups warned the students. When the faculty arrived to catch the students participating in illicit activities, they were all quietly

¹⁷⁴ Bright, 18.

¹⁷⁵ "Henry Billups tells story as janitor here for forty-four years," *Alumni Gazette*, 31 December 1934, 1.

¹⁷⁶ Bill Greene, "Fifty Years with Henry Billups," *Alumni Gazette*, October 1938, 13.

¹⁷⁷ Ernest Jones in "'Doc' Henry Billups of the College and William and Mary in Virginia: Waiter, Janitor, head-Janitor, Prof. Boozology and Ambassador Plenipotentiary, 1888-1955," Compiled by Alyse Tyler Hutchinson, 1969-1975, unpublished. [What is this in the Billups Faculty-Alumni File? If so, include the following in the citation: University Archives Faculty-Alumni File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.]

studying.¹⁷⁸ Billups often referred to students as “my boys” and had a difficult time adjusting to the school going co-ed in 1918.¹⁷⁹

Billups’s permissive attitude with “his boys” often resulted in more work for him. Billups was one the few African Americans in town who owned a car, and while he was not a very talented driver, he was immensely proud of his car.¹⁸⁰ He would often lend his car to students and it would sometimes break down. The students would then call Billups at the College and he would have to go pick up the car.¹⁸¹

Likewise, a revolutionary war-era cannon known as “Old Spotswood” often ended up on the second and third floors of the Wren Building or left on the president’s porch. Dr. Tyler ordered Billups to haul the “cussed thing” down to the lake but Billups “forgot” because he knew how much the students loved it.¹⁸² Students would also tie bells to the tails of the cows grazing in front of the College Building and, on occasion, bring a cow into the building and tie its tail to the College bell. Students knew who would be responsible for untying the bells and taking the cow back outside (not to mention cleaning up any manure it may have left behind).¹⁸³ Even though they were fond of “Doc” Billups and thankful for his help in times of trouble, it seems that students’ “pleasure” increased Billups’s workload.

Billups was hired a janitor in 1890 and from then on his tasks ranged from cleaning and trimming the oil lamps in the students’ rooms to ringing the bell at the end of each class and

¹⁷⁸ “Wright Comments on Recent Article,” *Daily Press*, 26 May 1946.

¹⁷⁹ Greene, 13.

¹⁸⁰ Harris, 10.

¹⁸¹ “Henry Billups tells story . . .” 4.

¹⁸² Lloyd Haynes Williams, “Doc Billups faithful William-Mary Employee,” *Daily Press*. 12 May 1946.

¹⁸³ Trudier Harris, “Henry Billups, Bell Ringer at the College of William and Mary, 1888-1955,” undated, 6-7, University Archives Faculty-Alumni File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

everything in-between.¹⁸⁴ Billups was best known for his duties as bell ringer, calling the students to class and the signal for their release from it. He took great pride in this particular task and would often let the children of the tourists who wandered into the College Building ring it.¹⁸⁵ There is some indication that Billups was not always the most attentive to his janitorial duties. An anonymous student recalled Dr. Chandler asking Billups after noticing some cobwebs in the College Building, “Henry, don’t you ever look up from your sweeping?”¹⁸⁶

Despite his duties, Billups was well known for always looking sharp being always well dressed in a shirt and tie irrespective of the day’s duties. After work he would go home and change into a fresh shirt to go out and socialize with his friends.¹⁸⁷ His social life often got him in trouble because he was notorious for getting drunk. He was once fired on a Friday for getting drunk, but was then reinstated on Monday morning when there was no one to ring the bell.¹⁸⁸ He also once lost a ceremonial bell given to him by the alumni association while playing dice with his friends.¹⁸⁹ It was found shortly thereafter, but this incident demonstrates the power of drink in Billups’s life and calls into question Billups’s reputation as a well behaved servant of the College.

His life off campus also shaped his behavior on campus. He shared this love of alcohol with the students and often provided them with strong, and strictly prohibited, spirits. While the faculty was not fond of this practice, it continued unabated until prohibition made it impossible for him to “get the appropriate materials.” He was known around campus as the “Professor of

¹⁸⁴ “Henry Billups tells story . . .” 4; Harris, 2.

¹⁸⁵ Paula Black, “Dependable Tolling of Bell Symbolizes Billups’s 66 Years of Faithful Service,” *The Alumni Gazette* 3 November 1953, 11.

¹⁸⁶ Anonymous students in “‘Doc’ Henry Billups . . .”

¹⁸⁷ Harris, 2.

¹⁸⁸ Greene, 13.

¹⁸⁹ Greene, 14.

Boozology” and he was also known to “take nips now at then” while at work.¹⁹⁰ Billups’s drinking habit was likely responsible for his poor driving skills.

Despite (or perhaps because of) this habit, Billups was celebrated on campus. Billups would ride in an open car in the homecoming parade and when he died in 1955 the Alumni Association sent the car out empty as a symbolic gesture of mourning.¹⁹¹ In 1935, one of the students Billups saved from the poker raid raised money to buy Billups a pocket watch. It was presented to him during the homecoming celebration and the newspaper ran a picture of Billups, Wright (the student), and the watch. It is important to note that Wright is standing on the steps in this photograph so Billups does not tower over him.¹⁹² Billups had previously been presented with a large ceremonial broom wrapped in green and gold ribbon in thanks for his many years of service.¹⁹³

By the 1950’s alumni felt that Billups was less of a presence on campus. By that time Billups was “ . . . just that old Darkey who rang the bell most of his life.”¹⁹⁴ Many alums cited the arrival of women on campus for this changing attitude. They indicate that he was less willing to participate in the students’ hijinks now that there were women on the campus.¹⁹⁵ Considering that a black man’s interaction with young white women was fraught with peril, it was understandable that Billups withdrew from his former activities.

Even as his fame on campus began to wane, Billups’s love for the College did not. In 1945 Billups attended a zoning meeting in the city of Williamsburg. At the meeting someone said

¹⁹⁰ Harris, 8.

¹⁹¹ Hugh DeSamper, “Henry Billups 1872-1955” *Alumni Gazette*.

¹⁹² “Wright presents watch” *Richmond News Leader* 6 November 1935.

¹⁹³ Harris, 5.

¹⁹⁴ DeSamper, 7.

¹⁹⁵ “Henry’s Doctorate” *The Alumni Gazette*, undated.

something derisive about the College and Billups stood up and replied, “I represents the College of William and Mary and when you talk about the College you talk about me.”¹⁹⁶ These are strong words from a black man at a public meeting at which it was unlikely Billups was officially representing the College.

Twenty-two years after Billups’s death the College automated the bell, ending an era of bell-ringing staff members who did more for the College than just announce when class had started.¹⁹⁷ Billups, like Malichi Gardiner before him, escaped the anonymity of generations of black workers before him through this task. While his duties of food service and cleaning were the same kinds of work that countless unknown eighteenth and nineteenth century slaves performed, Billups became a legend. This ascent to stardom had to be more than the sixty-plus years of service Billups provided. It was made possible by a variety of startling factors.

It may be, as Professor Trudier Harris put forth in her work on Billups, that he was a living incarnation of the “briar rabbit-” type characters that were important to African American oral tradition and literature. Harris sees him living by his wits to buck the system in an effort to provide himself with some freedom. It is difficult to tell if this is an accurate depiction of Billups but activities like serving as the “Professor of Boozology” and assisting students in goofing off might support this argument.

Or did Billups live up to Richard S. Bright’s expectations that black workers should have been like his father’s former slaves who had been “honest, sincere, and faithful, believed that two and two made four, and are not contaminated by the crazy isms of today?”¹⁹⁸ The students and faculty might have seen Billups as a representation of the cheerful “darkies” that their

¹⁹⁶ Williams.

¹⁹⁷ “Bell Ringer Era Ends: College Automates Wren Bell” *Alumni Gazette*, January 1977.

¹⁹⁸ Bright, 22.

grandparents spoke of when reminiscing of the days before the Civil War. After all, he was loyal to the students and to the College even when it meant extra work or an unexpected trip to go pick up his car. Was Henry Billups no more than an “Uncle Tom?”

Both of these hypotheses strip Billups of his agency and ignore some fundamental things about his personality and his behavior. It would be wrong to argue that Billups was working in a power structure that gave him as much freedom as the students. But when Alyse Tyler Hutchinson reached out to other alumni in the mid-1960’s to write a book of Billups’s sayings, they responded in droves.¹⁹⁹ None of the former students’ submissions included Billups’s own words but rather the alumni’s impressions of him. When read together, these memories leave the reader with a better sense of Billups’s dynamic personality. It becomes clear that not all of the students saw him as some stock character in a minstrelsy show and would talk religion, politics, and the state of the College with him.

Billups’s drinking was an important aspect of his life that remains largely ignored. It is clear from accounts of his behavior that he clearly had a drinking problem. Whether he drank to cope with his job or could better cope because of his drinking will be forever unknown. The students’ willingness to encourage and benefit from his behavior sheds light on the nature of the relationship Billups had with the students. By all accounts, students found his drinking and his enthusiasm of providing alcohol to them funny and thought little about it beyond their own amusement.

Billups is unable to speak for himself. Unlike the workers interviewed in the rest of the paper, the only thing Billups left behind was his prized gold watch and the newspaper clipping file assembled by Swem Library staff. But he is the only black worker from this period for whom

¹⁹⁹ Hutchinson, “Introduction,” “‘Doc’ Henry Billups . . .”

such a file was made. As controversial as a figure he may be, he still managed to achieve the immortality at which he hinted; “Men may come and men may go, but I go on forever.”²⁰⁰

The Dawning of the Modern College: William and Mary from 1930-1950

From the 1930s to the 1950s The College of William and Mary changed dramatically in physical ways, but the ideologies and practices remained fixed in the past. As seen in the previous sections, the abolition of slavery did little to change the nature of work or African Americans’ economic situation in Williamsburg. The College employed African Americans for food service and janitorial work, just as it had for centuries. While these jobs were steady and highly sought after among the black population, they were not on par with the opportunities afforded to whites. In contrast to the town, the College provided no educational opportunities for the African American population. A strong black community successfully established schools for their children in the town, but they had to seek higher education elsewhere.

While these experiences were unique to the city of Williamsburg and The College of William and Mary, they were representative of long-standing southern traditions. This section focuses on the experience of College workers, faculty, and students at the College before the era of Civil Rights. In the twenty year period from 1930 to 1950, the College maintained a strict policy of conservatism, silencing those who challenged racism, sexism, and the College’s labor practices. This section will set the stage for the decades discussed later, which saw political, social, and economic change as the College and the country focused more on labor and equal rights.

²⁰⁰ Harris, 5.

The College began its years of change under the direction of J.A.C Chandler, who assumed office on July 1, 1919.²⁰¹ The previous president, Tyler, had lifted the College on to its feet after decades of failing funds and enrollment, but it was Chandler who really set the place into motion. In regards to the curriculum offered, during the Tyler years a William and Mary student could graduate with a bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, master of arts or a non-degree teacher's certificate.²⁰² Chandler added more degree programs and began implementing an admission process. His proposal was that "...all applicants would be screened for scholarship, personality, and character ...and they should present certificates from their principal and several teachers vouching for their truthfulness."²⁰³ Despite the selective new process of admission, the College's enrollment grew to 1,682 students for the 1931-1932 session, approximately eight times larger than that of the Tyler years.²⁰⁴ The College had hit a growth spurt, but growing pains were soon to follow.

One of the issues facing the College was the lack of funds to pay faculty. During the 1919-1920 academic year, the average salary for professors was only \$2,160. Despite a small pay increase, William and Mary faculty were still paid less than their colleagues at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Virginia Military Institute, and the University of Virginia.²⁰⁵ "In his June 1927 report to the Board of Visitors, [Chandler] complained that it was 'practically impossible to organize the faculty on the salaries paid,' and that fifteen members of the faculty, most of them people he wanted to keep, were leaving for higher-paid positions elsewhere."²⁰⁶ Chandler had

²⁰¹ Susan Godson, et al, "Entering the Modern World, 1919-1945," in *The College of William and Mary: a History*, (Williamsburg: King and Queen Press, 1993), 541.

²⁰² Godson, et al, 561.

²⁰³ Godson, et al, 597.

²⁰⁴ Godson, et al, 574.

²⁰⁵ Godson, et al, 582-583.

²⁰⁶ Godson, et al, 582-583.

allotted much of the College's budget to campus improvement and expansion in an attempt to deal with rising enrollment. The difficulty in paying competitive faculty salaries would haunt Chandler and many of his successors.

Students were aware of the inequitable pay awarded to professors and voiced their opinions about the continual loss of great teachers and subsequent increases in class size. An editorial in a 1927 issue of *The Flat Hat* entitled "William and Mary's Great Need," explains that "The best type of teaching cannot be had unless there is also to be had the best type of teacher. If the College does not have the funds to obtain or to keep the best, it must let them go and get inferior men."²⁰⁷ It seems as though the student population was acutely aware of the financial state of the College and would prefer its funds to be spent elsewhere. An editorial from about a year later stated that, "It is undeniably true that at many points that the College is lacking in number as well as caliber of instructors. *The Flat Hat* had rather see fewer coaches and buildings, and smaller classes."²⁰⁸ Students seemed to place more importance on the issue of "internal expansion" than on creating more buildings or pursuing athletic improvements. The struggle to maintain a consistent faculty would plague William and Mary during all of President Chandler's time in office.

The admission of women in 1918 brought a new dynamic to the campus. A whole new curriculum geared towards preparing women for marriage and the home was added to the course selection. The admission of women students also ushered in the beginning of women serving on the faculty. While women during the 1933-34 session accounted for 32 percent of faculty

²⁰⁷ "William and Mary's Great Need," *The Flat Hat*, 24 May 1927, 4.

²⁰⁸ "Expansion," *The Flat Hat*, 13 April 1928, 4.

members, most occupied lower ranking positions.²⁰⁹ The biggest limitation for these early women professors was the restriction enforced by the Board of Visitors to ban all married women from being on the faculty. For example, Madeleine Wales, an instructor of physical education for three years, married to Dr. Fichtner, an economic professor, on December 20, 1924.²¹⁰ School officials waited until the end of the academic year before taking action against her. According to historian Richard Sherman, "...[I]n June Chandler notified [Wales] that the Board of Visitors 'preferred not to appoint married women to positions at the College,' and thus her appointment would not be renewed. Chandler stated that he was 'sorry that the Board reached this decision.' ...But the discrimination against married women remained in force."²¹¹ The situation for women seeking professorships at the College would continue to worsen during President Bryan's term.

While *The Flat Hat* editorials voice strong opposition to the inequity of the faculty's salaries, it demonstrates that students were either unaware or apathetic towards the payments of staff or workers employed by the College. The May 24, 1927, editorial wondered, "We have a building endowment which is obtaining rapid and wonderful results. What about a professorship endowment campaign?"²¹² With all of the construction and improvement going on across the campus, no mention has been found of the treatment or pay of these employees. However, it can be deduced that if the College was struggling to pay their professors a competitive salary, their employees could hardly have been getting a fair shake either.

The onset of the Great Depression in the 1930s increasingly tightened an already taut budget. Virginia-wide budget reductions cost the College \$25,000, about 10 percent of its state

²⁰⁹ Godson, et al, 586.

²¹⁰ "Fichtner-Wales Wedding During the Holidays," *The Flat Hat*, 9 January 1925, 1.

²¹¹ Godson, et al, 586.

²¹² "William and Mary's Great Need" *The Flat Hat*, 24 May 1927, 4.

support.²¹³ Sherman explains that “[t]he coming of the New Deal in the spring of 1933 had presented William and Mary with opportunities for development of its physical plant that had been completely lacking since the onset of the Great Depression.”²¹⁴ The Citizen’s Conservation Corps [CCC] arrived to convert the 900-1000 acres of College property around Lake Matoaka to a usable park safe against the destruction of fire.²¹⁵ Therefore, despite budget crunching, President Chandler found a way to continue external expansion and campus projects through the 1930s. The establishment of a CCC camp for over 200 workers on the campus’s baseball field was underway by Thanksgiving of 1933.²¹⁶

This camp’s hierarchy, physical placement, and established goals speak volumes about 1930s attitudes towards job availability, the anxiety over race relations, and the education gap for blacks. The camp hierarchy was strictly divided along racial lines, with all white leaders commanding a crew of all black laborers. This translated into dramatically different salaries based on race. For “... the members [or workmen]... get \$30 a month. Of each man’s salary the government sends \$25 to his family as dependents”²¹⁷ This position, the only one available to black workers, was paid eleven dollars less than the lowest-earning job available to whites

The proximity of this camp of working men next to campus caused some initial unease within the community. A *Flat Hat* article explained:

Most E.C.W (Emergency Conservation Work) camps are away from towns where

²¹³ Godson, et al, 625.

²¹⁴ Godson, et al, 666.

²¹⁵ “Conservation Corps to be Established Soon on the Campus: One Thousand Acres of Unproductive Timber Land That Surrounds Lake Matoaka Will be Landscaped Under Relief Act: 200 Town Men Recruited,” *The Flat Hat*, 10 October 1933, 1.

²¹⁶ “Local C.C.C Unite to Fill New Camp: Construction Work of Civilian Laborers, to be Completed Soon; 200 Men will Occupy Buildings by Thanksgiving,” *The Flat Hat*, 21 November 1933, 1.

²¹⁷ “Temporary C.C.C Camp with Negro Contingent Established on Campus: Captain Demerritt is Commanding Officer; Lieutenant Stiskin is Second In Command Assisted By Two Non Commissioned Officers,” *The Flat Hat*, 7 November 1933, 5.

there is no possibility of disorder on the streets. Here the government is faced with the problem of putting a company on the campus of a staid co-educational institution with its southern background. For this reason, colored men will be more desirable here. There will be no fraternalizing with town people or students. In this community there are several negro villages where the colored men will prefer to spend their leave after they see that there is nothing for them to do in Williamsburg but clutter up the streets.²¹⁸

The editorial attempted to ensure the campus that all CCC Camps in Virginia were strictly segregated. Thus by creating an all-black labor force, rather than hiring white workers. Thus, the workers would be kept out of the College and town by an already legally enforced racial separation on the streets and in buildings.²¹⁹ The goal of the CCC camps and the E.C.W programs was to get men off of the streets and employ them in useful jobs.

Interestingly, the CCC instituted nightly classes into the routine of the black laborers, suggesting an education gap with their white counterparts. The school was established to teach basic courses in history, civics, reading, and composition. *The Flat Hat* reported that “A survey has been made of the education advancement of the negro contingent of the camp, and... [o]nly twenty percent of these men are grammar school graduates.” And “...several cases of illiteracy will be eradicated before the classes are disbanded,” promised camp officials.²²⁰ The professed goal of the program was to raise the current ranking of each man to one grade school level higher than that which they had entered. While CCC leadership seemed to think it worthwhile to educate these poor black laborers and give them the skills to obtain higher paying jobs, it is likely that the white people of Williamsburg, having maintained a racially segregated town, saw little need for these skills as few jobs would be available to educated black men.

²¹⁸ “Conservation Corps to be Established Soon on the Campus.”

²¹⁹ Godson, et al, 666.

²²⁰ “Lectures and Classes Instituted in C.C.C: Lt. Irwin I. Stiskin Announces that Five One-Hour Classes of School Subjects will be Held Daily,” *The Flat Hat*, 5 December 1933, 1.

Beyond the establishment of the CCC camp and the influx of over 200 black male workers, there is no mention of staff in *The Flat Hat* during this period. In fact, there are only brief mentions of the Colonial Williamsburg Restoration or the community at large. It seems to be an era of containment and inward campus focus. Chandler's administration worked very hard to expand the space and capabilities of the College. Staff were perhaps satisfied with the steady, year-round employment available to them at the College compared to the seasonal jobs in Colonial Williamsburg or if they were not, they had no outlet through which to voice their grievances. Maybe both were true. In any case, staff workers, with the exception of the beloved "Doc" Billups, were not on the radar of the administration, faculty, or students during Chandler's time in office.

After serving as the College's president for fifteen years, Chandler stepped down before the 1934 session. He left behind a College in the midst of a transition from a small, elite academy to a large, booming campus. Chandler was "[c]ommitted from the start to the expansion of William and Mary in many areas – enrollments, programs, buildings – he was willing to move ahead of resources in hopes that funds would eventually be found to cover his expenses."²²¹ However, alumnus Vernon L. Nunn stated that "William and Mary in the 1920s was still a very personal place. ...[It was] just like one family."²²² President John Stewart Bryan entered in the Fall of 1934 with a vision to continue the expansion of the College.

Faculty expansion seems to have been at the top of Bryan's list of priorities. As the Depression drew to a close, the College finally committed to recruiting and keeping a repertoire of qualified professors. "During his eight years in office, Bryan brought about thirty new faculty

²²¹ Godson, et al, 628.

²²² Godson, et al, 598.

members to William and Mary, increasing the overall size of the faculty from seventy-eight in 1933-34 to 102 in 1941-42. ...Many of the professors Bryan hired ...had earned their doctoral degrees at Harvard.”²²³ Bryan must have reallocated some of the budget away from the external expansion projects, which always took precedence in Chandler’s administration, and used the funds towards solidifying the faculty.

One result of Bryan’s Harvard bias, however, was a decline in the number of women on the faculty. As Harvard, and many other elite institutions of higher education, did not yet admit women, many did not meet Bryan’s expectations. “[D]uring the years of Bryan’s presidency women faculty definitely lost ground at William and Mary,” according to Dick Sherman. “During the 1933-34 session, Chandler’s last, the twenty-five women faculty members ...made up 32 percent of the total. But by 1940-41, their number had fallen to nineteen ...with most [women] serving in the lowest two ranks.”²²⁴ While the overall number of professors, length of stay, and number of doctorates among the faculty increased, women suffered at the hands of a persistently sexist academic world. The coming decades would see a change initiated by this underrepresented portion of the faculty.

Bryan resigned from his presidency after the spring of 1942 and his successor John E. Pomfret stepped into the position. Pomfret began his time in office with a clear vision to maintain a top-notch faculty with high scholarly achievement and continue campus improvements.²²⁵ Enrollment reached over 1,300 at the start of the 1942 term when Pomfret started to set his plans in action. However, World War II began to take its toll in the domestic sphere. Male students and faculty chose to serve their country or were drafted and laborers and

²²³ Godson, et al, 645.

²²⁴ Godson, et al, 646.

²²⁵ Godson, et al, 755.

maids were also absorbed in missions abroad or into the war effort. While there are many references to beloved faculty leaving campus to join the war effort and lists of students going abroad to fight, there is no mention by name of any staff workers or maids leaving. References to an overall shortage of laborers do exist, which implies that the predominantly black staff also left to support their country in some capacity. However, they were denied the valor and recognition awarded to the white members of the William and Mary community. Despite the unforeseen challenges of war, Pomfret successfully kept the College alive and even accomplished several of his stated goals.

From the beginning of his tenure as president, Pomfret scrambled to hold together a faculty which was still voicing grievances about salaries and leaving in droves to join the war effort. “In 1942 the average salary for a full professor was \$3,530. ...Five years later Pomfret spearheaded the movement for more state funds for salaries, and a new scale brought William and Mary faculty pay to the level that Pomfret considered competitive.”²²⁶ The College faculty was rising in the number of doctorates and research experience, thus raising the academic nature and credibility of the College – a shift which benefited the entire campus.

The 1940s were a unique time in the College’s history. The war changed faculty and student ratios dramatically. “Only 29 percent of the civilian students in 1943-1944 were men, and 74 percent of the men were freshmen.”²²⁷ Campus life was also affected by the shift in available workers, which seemed to raise a new consciousness and appreciation of the laborers employed by the College. A 1942 article on the front page of *The Flat Hat* expressed that students “...would like housemothers and other employees of the College to feel it their privilege

²²⁶ Godson, et al, 759.

²²⁷ Godson, et al, 703.

to go to the front of the line the cafeteria at all times, in accordance with a recommendation of the Student Assembly.”²²⁸ And while this seems to be the only mention of worker appreciation or a movement to investigate employees’ status, it suggests at least a growing awareness among students. Other articles mentioning College labor or employees seemed only to appear when students were inconvenienced by the war and its domestic effects. For example, a 1943 article discusses the end to a maid service which had been offered to all men on campus. It reads: “The ladies of the campus have been joined by the men in the division of housekeepers. For some time the girls at the College have been responsible for making their beds, while the men, living in absolute luxury, have become accustomed to having maids make theirs.”²²⁹ Despite the cutting back of campus services provided to students and their increasing self-reliance, a real discussion of employee treatment or practices regarding either racist or sexist discrimination were almost completely nonexistent on the 1940s campus, and the few attempts were immediately silenced.

Racial segregation was a way of life in Williamsburg and at The College of William and Mary, the South’s oldest university. Margetta Doyle, a student in the mid-1940s, did not dwell much on the conditions or whereabouts of the town’s black population. “They were pretty much the servers, you know they weren’t, you didn’t see them other than... for instance at the sorority house they were the maids and the cooks, you know, people we knew and liked, but not part of the same....”²³⁰ In other words, the average student did not spend their efforts working towards racial equality or seeking a change in the status quo. However, one brave woman from Jackson, Michigan decided it was time for a change and she shook the foundations of this conservative

²²⁸ “House Mothers to the Fore!,” *The Flat Hat*, 10 November 1942, 1.

²²⁹ “Labor Shortage Makes Maids of College Men,” *The Flat Hat*, 2 February 1943, 2.

²³⁰ Doyle, interview.

institution to its very core.

President Pomfret and the Board of Visitors had their fair share of differences during his time in office, “[o]n one thing, however, [they] completely agreed: racial segregation. In February 1945 *The Flat Hat* featured an inflammatory editorial, “Lincoln’s Job Half-Done,” which advocated equal opportunities for all races, including attendance at William and Mary and racial intermarriage. The South was not ready for such ideas.²³¹ Marilyn “Mac” Kaemmerle, senior and editor of *The Flat Hat*, wrote the article for Lincoln’s birthday. She raised such controversial arguments as “...Negroes differ from other people only in surface characteristics; inherently all are the same,” sought equal opportunity for all peoples, and labeled prejudice as “a Nazi strategy.”²³² President Pomfret and the administration acted very quickly to both replace Ms. Kaemmerle as editor of the paper and initiate faculty supervision of all campus publications. As Margetta Doyle, a student on campus at the time, put in, “Well, the you-know-what hit the fan. And she ultimately was genteelly sacked.”²³³ However, Kaemmerle had challenged the system of segregation and conservatism that for so long had defined the campus of William and Mary, both among students and employees.

It is impossible to tell what reaction Kaemmerle was hoping to generate from publishing the controversial article. The *Richmond Times Dispatch* stated that “... nobody else in the William and Mary student body agrees with the editor of *The Flat Hat* on this matter. Presumably hardly anybody in Virginia, whether white or colored, agrees with her.”²³⁴ After her dismissal from the paper, students seemed to express more concern over the potential for faculty

²³¹ Godson, et al, 766.

²³² “Lincoln’s Job Half-Done...,” *The Flat Hat*, 7 February 1945, 8.

²³³ Doyle, interview.

²³⁴ “Most Unfortunate,” *Times Dispatch*: Richmond, Virginia, 13 February 1945, in the Marilyn Kaemmerle Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary.

censorship of student publications than outrage about the unfair treatment of different races. The consensus of white Southerners seemed to be that, while seemingly intended with goodwill, her article actually hurt the plight of African American citizens. A Virginia paper stated that “[Kaemmerle’s] bid for attention has not been helpful to the Negro people whom she professes to be so interested in. ...[T]hey, like most intelligent whites, know there can be no happiness in the extremes of racial equality – intermarriage.”²³⁵ Her article seems to have put the white South on the extreme defensive rather than move anyone to change.

However, reactions from the North and from a select few faculty members were supportive of Miss Kaemmerle’s claims. An article from a Missouri paper suggested that “...despite the efforts of older Americans to keep the status quo as far as race relations is concerned [t]here are many white students and many young non-College whites who believe that the time has come for America to live up to her ideals if she is to be a leader in the world of the future.”²³⁶ An unnamed faculty member stated during a faculty assembly that the editorial was “...merely a grand gesture of good will to other races and so understood by them.”²³⁷ In fact, on a national level, “Senator William Langer, a Republican from North Dakota, introduced a measure which would deny federal funds to any College or university which discriminates in any way against any person because of ‘race, creed, or color,’ or because of that person’s views on racial matters. Sen. Langer admitted his bill was an outgrowth of the controversy over Miss

²³⁵ “Back Home to Michigan,” *The Register: Danville, Virginia*, 11 February 1945, in the Marilyn Kaemmerle Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary.

²³⁶ “Paying a Penalty for Being Democratic,” *Kansas City, Missouri Call*, 23 February 1945, in the Marilyn Kaemmerle Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary.

²³⁷ “Portion of Minutes of Faculty Meeting of February 13th Ordered Deleted,” 4, in the Marilyn Kaemmerle Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary.

Kaemmerle's editorial, which, he said, disposed of 'white supremacy nonsense.'²³⁸ However, the bill was immediately squelched. The nation, like the College, was not quite ready to accept the black student, faculty member, or employee as equal.

The College stood at the brink of changed by the end of Pomfret's term in 1951. He had "moved the College to a higher scholarly plateau by improving the caliber of the faculty and students and by tightening the curriculum."²³⁹ The era of Civil Rights was on the horizon and would arrive at the College in just a few short years. The issues of segregation, labor and employment, and sexism would be confronted on the national scale in the coming years. The city of Williamsburg with its blooming College kept up with the changes, just at its own steady, but conservative, pace.

The unique history of African American laborers in the city of Williamsburg and at the College of William and Mary presents a glance into the complicated dynamics of race relations from post-slavery, through the restoration of a Colonial capital, to the 1950s. It becomes apparent that blacks have been subordinated by whites throughout this narrative and relegated to jobs reminiscent of slavery. While triumphs such as the creation of a successful school within the public education system and the knitting of strong community ties existed for the African Americans in Williamsburg, the denial of equal rights and career and economic advancement would begin to create tension. The preceding sections set the stage for the dawning of the era of Civil Rights. Williamsburg and The College of William and Mary were just one of many acts

²³⁸ "Bill Introduced to Deny Federal Funds to Any Jim Crow College," *Kansas City, Missouri*, 23 February 1945, in the Marilyn Kaemmerle Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, The College of William and Mary.

²³⁹ Godson, et al, 773.

being played out across the country where formerly segregated spaces and opportunities began to be available to all. Change would come to this conservative southern town and College, their rich histories steeped in tradition, slowly but surely.

Section III:

All Deliberate Speed: The Fall of the Byrd Organization and Massive Resistance

The integration of the staff at the College of William and Mary was made possible by the integration of schools, which came about through a battle between segregationists in the Virginia government and federal legislation. Virginia's policy of Massive Resistance to the integration ordered by the Supreme Court in *Brown vs. Board of Education* had one goal: to delay the integration of the public schools as long as possible. Led by the patriarch of the Byrd

Organization, Harry F. Byrd, Sr., the Virginia state government explored every possible avenue of resistance, from setting school policies to laws explicitly prohibiting integration. In the first section of this chapter, we will show how the general state policy of Massive Resistance worked. Harry Byrd controlled Virginia politics at almost every level. He and his organization of state and county leaders, along with courthouse officials, were the driving force that kept Massive Resistance in place. In the second section, we will take a closer look at the internal workings of state politics, focusing on the rise of Mills E. Godwin, Jr., state Delegate, Senator, and eventually Governor. In the final section, we will show how it was primarily through legislation at the national level that Virginia began to change its laws, finally accepting the reality of integration. Virginia only began to change its laws on segregation when it was forced to do so by business and community leaders, Congress, and the federal courts.

The Supreme Court decision in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896)²⁴⁰ upheld the “separate but equal” doctrine which permitted state-mandated racial segregation in all areas of public life and legalized racial segregation and discrimination.²⁴¹ Nearly sixty years later, when the Court ruled in *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954)²⁴² that segregated schools were unconstitutional, Virginia Senator Harry F. Byrd rallied whites with this charge: “If we can organize the Southern States for massive resistance to this order I think that in time the rest of the country will realize that racial integration is not going to be accepted in the South.”²⁴³ So began Virginia’s belligerent campaign

240 *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 US 537 (1896).

241 Kwame A. Appiah and Henry Louis Gates, Jr. *Africana: The Encyclopedia of the African and African American Experience*. (New York: Basic Civitas Books, 1999), 446.

242 *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 US 483 (1954).

243 [http://www.lva.lib.va.us/The Library of Virginia/Virginia Responds/What Was Brown v. Board of Education?](http://www.lva.lib.va.us/The%20Library%20of%20Virginia/Virginia%20Responds/What%20Was%20Brown%20v.%20Board%20of%20Education?)
[Need the proper title, author, URL, and date accessed]

to openly subvert the law of the land in order to preserve a way of life predicated on racial hierarchy.²⁴⁴

Prior to the *Brown* decision, life in America for blacks, specifically in Southern states, was far from ideal. Author Harold Evan writes in *The American Century*,

America was living a lie for most of the 20th Century. The ideals that were supposed to define the nation were betrayed every hour, every day, for the one tenth of the population that was black. The oppression was, of course, starkly worse in the South, an area whose cherished 'way of life' was little different from South Africa's apartheid system. Schools, colleges, hospitals, churches, parks, swimming pools, restaurants, rest rooms, waiting rooms, elevators, buses and streetcars, theaters, cinemas, libraries, beauty parlors, bowling alleys, bars, prison, cemeteries and most labor unions were all segregated in the South and border states, which meant in practice that Negroes had access only to degraded services and employment in all these areas. They had no political muscle; they were prevented from voting in a one-party dictatorship dedicated to white supremacy. They were excluded from juries and certain of being convicted of anything a white man (or woman) alleged against them.

On April 23, 1951, Barbara Johns, a student at Robert R. Moton High School in Farmville, Virginia, called for a student assembly and organized a protest against the Prince Edward School Board for refusing to construct a new school for blacks. The whites-only high school was a large, beautiful brick building which served as a daily visual reminder to black students of the inequity between the two schools. The white school had a cafeteria, auditorium and a gym complete with lockers, whereas, the black school had no such amenities. The school board ignored the call for a new building for black students, but eventually constructed three plywood "additions" to alleviate overcrowding at the black facility. The students demonstrated their dissatisfaction by walking out of the substandard school.²⁴⁵

244 Alexander S. Leidholdt, *Standing Before the Shouting Mob: Lenoir Chambers and Virginia's Massive Resistance to Public-School Integration*. (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 1997), 64.

245 <http://www.lva.lib.va.us/The Library of Virginia/Virginia Responds/The Prince Edward Case and the Brown Decision>. [Need the proper title, author, URL, and date accessed]

The student strike kept approximately 400 students out of school for two weeks. Reaction among black parents to the student strike was mixed. Not all parents supported the actions of the students. Black parents who opposed the strike and NAACP involvement wanted to continue working with the school board in hope that their requests would eventually be granted. However, following a meeting led by Rev. L. Francis Griffin, chairman of Moton's Parent Teacher Association, the families agreed to seek legal assistance from the NAACP. Attorneys Oliver Hill and Spottswood Robinson who lived in Richmond, Virginia, met with the students in Farmville at a mass meeting. The attorneys convinced the parents and students to sue for the abolition of segregation instead of just for equal facilities. They agreed, and on May 23, 1951, Robinson filed *Dorothy Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia*.²⁴⁶

In October 1952, the Supreme Court made a decision that would be pivotal in the fight for equality for blacks when it agreed to hear all five of the pending school segregation cases collectively. This meant that the *Davis v. County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia* case would be consolidated into the *Brown v. Board of Education* case to be heard by the Supreme Court. This was significant in that school segregation was now seen as a national issue, not just a southern one. The following year, the Prince Edward County School Board appropriated the funds for and subsequently constructed the New Moton High School.²⁴⁷

On May 17, 1954 the Supreme Court ruled on *Brown v. Board of Education*. The Court decided that state-sanctioned segregation of public schools was a violation of the 14th

246 <http://www.lva.lib.va.us/The Library of Virginia/Virginia Responds/The Prince Edward Case and the Brown Decision>. [Need the proper title, author, URL, and date accessed]

247 <http://www.lva.lib.va.us/The Library of Virginia/Virginia Responds/The Prince Edward Case and the Brown Decision>. [Need the proper title, author, URL, and date accessed]

Amendment and was, therefore, unconstitutional. However, it was one thing to issue a decision, yet another matter entirely to enforce it.²⁴⁸ Virginia's response to *Brown v. Board of Education* was immediate and at first surprisingly moderate. Governor Thomas B. Stanley called for "cool heads, calm, steady and sound judgment." However, from within the state, the governor was pressured to adopt a more militant response to desegregation.²⁴⁹ Senator Harry F. Byrd, a conservative Democrat and the most powerful politician in Virginia, spoke out against the Court's controversial decision, saying that the decision "will bring implications and dangers of the greatest consequence." Byrd was the most vocal opponent of desegregation in Virginia. He had served as governor (1926-1930) and U.S. Senator since 1933, and controlled politics in Virginia via his "organization" which was a network of court clerks and judges.

In response to the *Brown* decision, the Byrd organization sprang into action to preserve the status quo of racial segregation in Virginia. The governor was under duress by Senator Byrd to harden his position. Senator Byrd pledged to "use all legal means"²⁵⁰ to continue segregated schools in Virginia. Gradually a policy of resistance to the federal government began to emerge. Finally, on June 25, Governor Stanley yielded to pressure and, reversing his previous position, vowed to "use every legal means at my command to proclaim resistance to the court order."²⁵¹ On August 30, the governor appointed the Gray Commission, led by his political friend Senator Garland Gray to explore ways to defy the *Brown* decision. It would take the commission over a year to arrive at recommendations to present to the Governor.

Through the remaining days of 1954, public opinion in the South was mixed and

248 James L. Roark, et. al. eds. *The American Promise: A History of the United States*. (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's. 2005), 1010.

249 Leidholdt, 64.

250 Francis M. Wilhoit, *The Politics of Massive Resistance*. (New York: G. Braziller, 1973), 55.

251 Leidholdt, 66-67.

cautiously hopeful. But in Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina and Virginia, segregationists were hostile and defiant.²⁵²

Virginia was not the only state that opposed desegregation. State legislatures in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina joined Virginia and adopted resolutions of “interposition and nullification” that declared the Court’s decision to be “null, void, and no effect.” Southern legislatures also passed laws that imposed sanctions on anyone who implemented desegregation, and enacted school closing plans that authorized the suspension of public education, and the disbursement of public funds to parents to send their children to private schools. Racial segregation in the schools continued.²⁵³

On May 31, 1955, the Supreme Court handed down a decision in *Brown II*²⁵⁴, ordering that desegregation occur with “all deliberate speed.”²⁵⁵ *Brown II* was intended to work out the mechanics of desegregation, yet states continued to resist desegregation. The term “all deliberate speed” was vague and its interpretation left to the discretion of the states.

While Virginia was trying to find ways to avoid or delay desegregation, many Virginia citizens were encouraging the governor to stop stalling. Governor Stanley’s vow to “use all legal means” to continue segregated schools in Virginia prompted Eliza E. Fitch of Charlottesville to write him a letter:

“You say you have listened for forty days to the people and the majority want our schools to remain separate as to race. It is possible that there are a good many people who, like I did, assumed that the hot heads naturally blew their tops when the Supreme Court decision was announced, but that it would all blow over, common decency would win out, and the decree would be accept in time. I have

252 John Egerton, *Speak Now Against the Day: The Generation Before the Civil Rights Movement in the South* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. 1994), 415.

253 Ibid.

254 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 349 US 294 (1955).

255 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 349 US 294 (1955).

discussed this matter with everyone I come in contact with and most of these people say if we have to do it O.K., even tho not all are enthused over the idea. These are the younger people, who are not prejudiced in the way many older people are. But these are the people whose children go to school...In the Army where desegregation was put into effect we are told the trouble predicted by one an d all, simply never developed. It is my sincere belief that we would have the same experience in our state.”²⁵⁶

But, there were also Virginians who sided with the governor. An announcement for a speech on the Supreme Court vs. the Constitution²⁵⁷ shows what white supremacy organizations thought about desegregation: “The Peninsula Citizens’ Council stands for continued separation of the white and colored schools. It is dedicated to the maintenance of peace, good order and domestic tranquility in our community and in our state, and to the preservation of our State’s rights.”

Finally after over a year of deliberating, in November 1955 the Gray Commission presented its recommendations for giving localities “broad discretion in meeting the requirements of the new law. Senator Gray proposed, a) that laws concerning school attendance be amended so that no child would be required to attend integrated school, b) that funds be allocated as tuition grants for parents who opposed schools comprised of white and black students, and c) that local school boards be authorized to assign white and black students to particular schools.”²⁵⁸

The commission’s recommendations were accepted and became the statewide Pupil Placement Board, an agency that had the power to assign students to schools and approve

256 Letter from Eliza E. Fitch, Charlottesville to Governor Thomas B. Stanley, Richmond dated June 26, 1955; Office of the Governor, Thomas B. Stanley Papers.

257 The Peninsula Citizens’ Council invites you to hear Hon. Henry D. Garnett, Commonwealth’s Attorney, Warwick, Virginia Speak on The Supreme Court vs. The Constitution, 1955.

258 *The Journal of Negro Education*, Vol. 25, No. 3, Educational Desegregation, 1956 (Summer, 1956), 345-351.

requests for transfer. Some leaders wanted the state to comply with the Court's decision in *Brown* (1954). But, Senator Byrd continued to defiantly oppose desegregation, and worked to persuade moderates to fight desegregation on February 24, 1956 he called for "massive resistance."²⁵⁹

Governors of South Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi and Virginia met in March and called on the southern states to declare that the federal government had no power to prohibit segregation and to "protest in appropriate language, against the encroachment of the central government upon the sovereignty of the several states and their people." Virginia was among the Southern states that passed a Resolution of Interposition which asserted that "when the general government usurps powers not delegated, the States have an inalienable right to interpose their sovereign powers so as to arrest the progress of the evil." A group of southern senators and congressmen also presented in Congress their "declaration of Constitutional Principles," commonly known as the "Southern Manifesto." The document condemned the desegregation decision as a usurpation of the powers of the states and encouraged the use of "every lawful means" to resist its implementation.²⁶⁰

Back in Virginia, the General Assembly convened for a special session in August 1956 to consider the Gray Commission's plan and other issues related to the *Brown* decision. After months of debate, led by Senator Byrd, Massive Resistance laws were passed. The laws gave power to the state to close any school system instead of integrating. Not all white Virginians supported the massive resistance laws; however, segregationists were determined to resist enforcement of school desegregation. Following passage of the Massive Resistance laws,

²⁵⁹ Francis M. Wilhoit, *The Politics of Massive Resistance*. (New York: G. Braziller, 1973), 55.

²⁶⁰ John Hope Franklin and Alfred A. Moss, Jr. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of African Americans*. (Boston: McGraw-Hill, 2000), 513.

Governor J. Lindsay Arnold closed white public schools in Charlottesville, Norfolk, and Warren County where federal judges ordered desegregation of white public schools. Classes were held in churches, houses and segregated private schools. Blacks generally lacked the resources available to whites, but some black students moved to other counties or out of state to attend school.

However, many black children received little or no real education at all during this period. Black parents continued to fight through the courts to force Virginia to reopen schools on an integrated basis, and white Virginians continued to resist desegregation. Community leaders resorted to economic reprisal against blacks who were active in the fight to desegregate the schools and against whites who favored compliance with the law.²⁶¹ Some white Virginians believed desegregation was inevitable and wrote letters to encourage Virginia politicians to stop delaying desegregation. One such citizen, Mr. Frank Nesbitt, wrote in a letter to Governor Almond, "I am not an integreatest (sic) but we must have public schools so we will have some integrating. This is as hard on me as the next person." It would take four more years of litigation over the issue of desegregation before Virginia's massive resistance would end.²⁶²

Virginia's massive resistance finally did end on January 19, 1959 when the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia handed down its ruling in one of the few cases favorable to desegregation, brought by white plaintiffs.²⁶³ On January 28, 1959 in a speech before the General Assembly, Governor Almond changed course and distanced himself from the segregationist policies of Senator Byrd: "I report as a fact, and not in a spirit of criticism, that the laws enacted to prevent the mixing of the races in our public schools...have been stricken down

261 [http://www.lva.lib.va.us/The Library of Virginia/Virginia Responds/The Prince Edward Case and the Brown Decision](http://www.lva.lib.va.us/The%20Library%20of%20Virginia/Virginia%20Responds/The%20Prince%20Edward%20Case%20and%20the%20Brown%20Decision) [Need the proper title, author, URL, and date accessed]

262 "Ruth Pendelton James, a minor, etc., et. al., Plaintiff v. J. Lindsay Almond, Jr., Governor of Virginia, et. al., Defendants," Argued November 19, 1958. JSTOR: *Journal of Negro Education*: Vol. 28, No. 2, p. 163.

263 Ibid.

by a Federal Court, and by the Supreme Court of Appeals of Virginia. The imminence of the peril to our people of the crisis thus engendered challenges the loyalty and dedication of our hearts and minds, and the prompt application of our talents and efforts, to the very best we can give in the service of Virginia.”²⁶⁴ He continued, “I have repeatedly stated that I did not possess the power and knew of none that could be evolved that would enable Virginia to overthrow or negate the overriding power of the Federal government.”²⁶⁵ Governor Almond’s speech was controversial to say the least, and angered politicians and citizens alike. Citizen groups drafted resolutions denouncing actions taken by the governor and the General Assembly to integrate schools.

Segregationists mourned the Court’s decision. Warren Spitler sent a “mourning” (sic) card to Governor Almond which stated, “Virginians are presently under the heel of the N.A.A.C.P. and the U.S. Supreme Court, and are in Mounring (sic), but will rise again!” However, Virginians who opposed segregation also wrote the governor after the Court’s decision. In a letter to the governor, John G. Bowman wrote to “...ask you to point out to the State Legislature that the “massive resistance” attitude must be further abandoned. The issue isn’t to find a path which can technically evade the Constitution of the United States and that of Virginia and permit the maximum degree of segregation. The issue is to allow the greatest degree of desegregation without sacrificing to too abrupt change. Segregation, racial or class, is outmoded. The letter continues, “if we cannot find that leadership in Virginia, we will have to yield to the Federal Government...But just now our greatest need is for Virginias of vision and integrity to find a way for Virginians – as well as an example for the rest of the southeastern

264 *Race Relations Law Reporter*, Spring 1959, 184.

265 *Ibid.*, 188.

States.” Lenoir Chambers, editor of the *Norfolk Virginian Pilot*, spoken harshly about the state’s massive resistance policy:

The massive resistance legislation was always considered by those who viewed it dispassionately to rest on most dubious constitutional pillars. It remained only for the courts to take a long, hard look at the monstrosities of the Stanley and Almond programs. This they have done, and the results are devastating. It remains now for the people of Virginia, including their elected officials, to ask themselves whether this distinguished commonwealth means to go on with the tragedy of legislative pretense that in practice has been legislative injustice and cruelty and perhaps permanent impairment to thousands of Virginia children.²⁶⁶

Some schools reopened and integrated, however the Prince Edward County Board of Supervisors refused to appropriate money for the schools to protest court rulings to desegregate.²⁶⁷ The clergy pleaded with the governor to reopen the schools in Prince Edward County: “We believe that the State has a legal and moral obligation in this matter that even transcends the County’s action; which action was taken to prevent colored children from obtaining rights guaranteed to them through the orderly processes of the law, and is adversely affecting all of the children of Prince Edward County. As teachers of righteousness, we assert that it is patently unfair to impose upon the colored citizens of the State certain restrictions and exclusions not imposed upon others who enjoy full and free liberty. It is unreasonable to expect such colored people to accept these restricts in a spirit of good will and quiet acquiescence.”²⁶⁸

The Prince Edward County schools did not reopen until 1964 when the Supreme Court heard *Griffin v. County School Board of Prince Edward County*.²⁶⁹ The Court ordered the county

²⁶⁶ *Virginian-Pilot*, 26 January 1959.

²⁶⁷ <http://www.lva.lib.va.us/The Library of Virginia/Virginia Responds/The Prince Edward Case and the Brown Decision> . [Need the proper title, author, URL, and date accessed]

²⁶⁸ Letter from Baptist Ministers’ Conference of Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Vicinity, to Governor James Lindsay Almond, Richmond. January 19, 1960. Office of the Governor, J. Lindsay Almond Papers.

²⁶⁹ *Griffin V. School Board of Prince Edward Count*, 377 U.S. 218 (1964)

to reopen schools on an integrated basis and to stop operating a whites-only private school system. Virginia politicians developed another strategy known as “The Freedom-of-Choice Plan” to maintain its segregated schools. The Plan required black students and their parents’ petition for admittance to the white schools. However, whites discouraged blacks from taking advantage of the plan through the use of economic reprisals and physical injury. The battle waged on in the courts, and finally in May 1968 the Supreme Court ruled on *Green v. New Kent County*.²⁷⁰ The Court found that the County had been operating separate school for whites and blacks – which had been deemed unconstitutional in *Brown*. The Court disapproved the county’s “freedom-of-choice” plan and ordered the county to develop a plan that would “convert promptly to a system without a ‘white’ school and a ‘Negro’ school, but just schools.”²⁷¹

Noted historian, J. Harvie Wilkinson, III considered Virginia’s massive resistance tactics as a “twilight performance”²⁷² for the Byrd Organization as well as the conservative Democratic Party which had fought to preserve segregation in Virginia. Wilkinson observed that this marked the first policy matter on which Senator Byrd and his organization of local courthouse officials did not have their way.²⁷³ Politicians, who were previously aligned with the Byrd Organization, followed Governor Almond’s example and began to adopt a more moderate position. One such politician was Senator Mills Godwin who was initially an outsider to the Byrd Organization. Godwin eventually gained acceptance by the Organization and became one of its most influential members.

Mills Godwin Jr. is more than just the only two term governor in the history of Virginia.

270 *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968)

271 *Green v. County School Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430 (1968)

272 J. Harvie Wilkinson, III. *Harry Byrd and the Changing Face of Virginia Politics, 1945-1966*. (Charlottesville: The University Press of Virginia), 1968, 282.

273 *Ibid.*, 150.

He is also a symbol of the changing face of Virginia politics during the Civil Rights era. Initially an outsider to the Byrd Organization, the powerful Democratic political machine that controlled politics in Virginia from the 1920s until the 1970s, he eventually gained its acceptance and became one of its most influential members. However, at the same time that Godwin was solidifying his place in the Byrd Organization, events that would change the national political landscape were beginning. The Supreme Court's decision in *Brown vs. Board of Education* started a series of events that led to the South's dismantling of a legal structure of separate but equal that had been in place for decades. Virginia's policy of Massive Resistance delayed school integration, but by the early the 1960s, all of that began to change. Throughout every part of Virginia's response to *Brown vs. Board of Education*, from Massive Resistance to reluctant acceptance, Mills Godwin played an important role. He, more than any other member of the Byrd Organization, was able to see the changing political landscape and adapt to it, allowing him to stay in power while others fell. The political events happening in both the United States in general and Virginia in particular were mirrored in the changing political beliefs of Mills Godwin, Jr.

Mills Edwin Godwin, Jr., was born in Nansemond County, which later became a part of the city of Suffolk, in the Hampton Roads area of southeastern Virginia. He first enrolled in the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary, which had only recently been created; however, after a year he transferred to the primary campus in Williamsburg. After graduating from William and Mary and from law school at the University of Virginia, Godwin started a three year stint in the Federal Bureau of Investigation.²⁷⁴ After leaving the FBI, he started an

274 James L. Bugg, Jr., "Mills Edwin Godwin, Jr.: A Man for All Seasons," in *The Governors of Virginia: 1860-1978*, ed. Edward Younger and James Tice Moore (Charlottesville: The University of Virginia Press, 1982), 374.

unlikely journey to the top of Virginia's state politics. Even though two of his relatives, his father Mills Godwin, Sr., and his uncle, state Senator Charles Moses, were well regarded members of the Byrd Organization, Mills Godwin, Jr. started his political journey without their support. Even though he supported the policies of Harry F. Byrd, Sr., he earned the Organization's "displeasure" by winning a seat in the House of Delegates by beating "an Organization incumbent" in the 1947 election. He also aroused the ire of the Organization by supporting one of his relatives, Horace Edwards, in the Democratic primary against the Organization sanctioned candidate, and eventual Governor, John Battle.²⁷⁵ He was therefore relegated to unimportant committee assignments, limiting the amount of power that he could wield. Godwin eventually began to rise in power when he was elected to the state Senate in an uncontested election in 1952. When he joined the Senate, he became one of the strongest proponents of the Byrd Organization tenets of "pay-as-you-go' financing', balanced budgets, and moderate taxes."²⁷⁶ in order to gain the trust of the Organization leaders. National issues would soon transform Godwin from just another senator from southeastern Virginia into one of the key members of the Byrd Organization.

When *Brown vs. Board of Education* was decided by the Supreme Court, it took most of the South by surprise. There were no contingency plans in place if the Supreme Court ordered intergration; many Southern governments thought that the status quo could last forever. State governments were faced with the challenge of what to do in the face of the Supreme Court's decision. A week after the decision, state Senator Garland Gray, a high level member of the Byrd Organization, sent a letter to U.S. Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., presenting him with a list of

²⁷⁵ Bugg, 374.

²⁷⁶ Bugg, 374.

options as to how the state could respond without creating “intensified class hatred.”²⁷⁷ A little over a month later, Virginia governor Thomas B. Stanley made a speech stating his views on segregation and a possible solution to the problem. One option that Stanley found favorable was the repeal of Section 129 of the Virginia Constitution, which said that the “General Assembly shall establish and maintain an efficient system of public free schools throughout the State.” This would have been a radical course of action to take, but it was one favored by many members of the Byrd Organization, including Harry Byrd himself. At the end of the speech, Stanley said that he was “convinced separate schools are in the best interest of all the people of the Commonwealth.”²⁷⁸ Almost immediately, more liberal members of the state Senate tried to prevent the Governor from taking such rash actions. Senator Armistead Boothe, from Alexandria, circulated a questionnaire throughout the state Senate, and found that there was a geographical divide between those who supported segregation and those who opposed it.²⁷⁹ He, among others, was able to urge the Governor to take more deliberative action.

Governor Stanley took a more deliberative plan of action than a constitutional convention, appointing a commission to formulate Virginia's response to *Brown vs. Board of Education*. It took the form of the thirty-two person Commission on Public Education, also known as the Gray Commission, after its chairman, Garland Gray,²⁸⁰ who was chosen partially due to his close association with and knowledge of the views of Senator Byrd. While the goals of this Commission, which was charged with holding public hearings and understanding the view

277 Letter, May 29, 1954, Garland Gray to Harry F. Byrd, Jr., Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Papers, Mss. 78 G54, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary (Hereafter Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers).

278 Speech, June 25, 1954, Thomas B. Stanley Executive Papers, Box 4, Accession Number 25184, Library of Virginia.

279 Letter, August 7 1954, Armistead L. Boothe to Thomas B. Stanley, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers.

280 Ronald L. Heinemann, “Thomas B. Stanley: Reluctant Resister,” in *The Governors of Virginia: 1860-1978*, ed. Edward Younger and James Tice Moore (Charlottesville: The University of Virginia Press, 1982), 342.

that the public had on integration, seemed to be unbiased, that was definitely not that case. The Commission was composed of 30 white, male Democrats and two white, male Republicans, all selected from different regions of the state. It included the young senator from Nansemond County, Mills Godwin. It was, however, rigged from the start. The chairman, Garland Gray, helped draft a statement for a group of legislators who wanted to record their “unalterable opposition to the principle of integration of the races in the schools.”²⁸¹ The Commission did listen to any Virginia who reinforced their own ideas about keeping segregation intact. Each member of the Commission took letters from his district and communicated those views to the Commission at large; the vast majority of the letters sent to Godwin received a form letter response which ended with the line “it shall certainly be my intention to do all that I can to find some legal way to keep our school system segregated.”²⁸² The Commission on Public Education never intended to affect any change; it was merely a tool created by the Byrd Organization to maintain segregation while adhering to the letter, but not the spirit, of *Brown vs. Board of Education*.

Before the Commission even had a chance to gather much evidence, it was clear what its goal was to be. Throughout their deliberations, many senators, including Godwin and Garland Gray, were communicating with Senator Harry F. Byrd, Sr., the patriarch of the Byrd Organization. However, this deliberation quickly disappeared. By the beginning of 1955, the Commission gave a report to the Governor, saying that its goal would be to work with the Attorney General, J. Lindsay Almond, to find a way to prevent the “forced integration” of the

281 Benjamin Muse, “Racial 'Study' Loaded Against Court,” *Washington Post and Times Herald*, Oct. 17, 1954, B2.

282 Letter, July 29, 1954, Mills Godwin Jr. to H.B. McLemore Jr., Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers.

public schools.²⁸³ Although Byrd supported the idea of holding a constitution convention to repeal section 129 of the state Constitution, he believed that Virginia was “confronting the most serious situation in many, many years” and that “due deliberation was necessary.”²⁸⁴ Eventually, the Commission bowed to the pressure of Governor Stanley, putting forth what it viewed as a compromise between the extremes of integration and a constitutional convention. Their original suggestion, upon which there was unanimous agreement, was what is known as the “local option,” in which the county school boards would be given the power to “assign their pupils in such a manner as will best serve the welfare of their communities and protect and foster the public schools.”²⁸⁵ This allowed for those school boards that desired integration to allow it, and those that did not want it to forbid it.

Governor Stanley forced the Commission to suggest another plan, one endorsed by himself and Senator Byrd. Their solution was to attach an amendment to the 1957-1958 State Appropriations Act, denying state funds to any school that integrated. Also, in places where there were integrated schools that were closed, the state offered tuition grants to certain schools,²⁸⁶ eventually known as “segregation academies.” When his pet commission gave an answer of which he disapproved, Stanley convinced it to say otherwise. Although Stanley's term as Governor ended soon after, his effect was still felt on William and Mary. In the early 1960s, he was appointed to the William and Mary Board of Visitors, a position that he held for ten

283 Letter, January 16, 1955, Commission on Public Education to Thomas B. Stanley, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers

284 Letter, December 24, 1955, Harry F. Byrd, Sr. to Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers

285 “Gray Report Text,” *The Washington Post and Times Herald*, Nov. 13, 1955, A14.

286 Robert E. Baker, “Gray Commission Yields to Pressure, Backs Stanley's No-Integration Plan,” *The Washington Post and Times Herald*, August 23, 1956, 1.

years.²⁸⁷

Godwin's place on the Gray Commission and his continued support of Massive Resistance was acknowledged by his movement into the upper echelon of the Byrd Organization. His communication with Harry Byrd shows the arrogance that many had in thinking that segregation would never happen, with Byrd saying that “[t]he Supreme Court has started something it cannot finish.” Byrd also told Godwin that he was confident that “the massive resistance program of the Southern States will result certainly in a very great delay, if not ultimate victory.”²⁸⁸ He sent a letter to Governor Stanley thanking him for his new choice for the Superintendent of Public Instruction, Davis Y. Paschall.²⁸⁹ From the letter, it seems like Godwin had some influence on the selection of Paschall, which would explain his need to thank Stanley for choosing someone for a seemingly minor post.²⁹⁰ However, this post is more important than it would seem, for the Superintendent of Public Instruction has an automatic spot on the William and Mary Board of Visitors. This gave the Byrd Organization a direct say on the affairs of William and Mary, and that say became even more permanent when Paschall became president of William and Mary in 1960.

Godwin was also a key person in creating support for J. Lindsay Almond's run for governor. Almond, who was Attorney General under Thomas Stanley and had served *ex officio* on the Gray Commission, was worried about an opponent “stirring up the colored vote,” and

287 Davis Y. Paschall, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary, p. 42.

288 Letter, April 1, 1957, Harry F. Byrd, Sr. to Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers.

289 Letter, March 15, 1957, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. to Thomas B. Stanley, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers.

290 Paschall's appointment was hardly minor, however. See Oscar Blayton's editorial, November 3, 2001 in the *Virginia Gazette*, which states that Paschall helped draft the speech that J. Lindsay Almond gave immediately after the Virginia Supreme Court struck down the Massive Resistance laws, which said that integrated schools have the “livid stench of sadism, sex, immorality, and juvenile pregnancy.”

therefore enlisted Godwin's help in contacting enough “key people”²⁹¹ to help bring out people to vote for him in both the primary and the general election. Godwin still has to answer to those who are more powerful than him in the Organization, for Almond's margin of victory was “exceedingly slim,” Godwin had to explain why it was not larger.²⁹² His explanation voter turnout was higher than expected because “a Negro was sentenced to the electric chair” by an all white jury for raping a white woman. When J. Lindsay Almond was elected governor, he was chosen with over 62% of the vote over Ted Dalton, a state Senator from Roanoke who was “a long time moderate regarding school integration.”²⁹³ However, things quickly came to a boiling point. On January 15, 1959, the Virginia State Supreme Court ruled that all of the Massive Resistance laws that had been passed by the General Assembly were unconstitutional and that the schools had to be integrated. The next day, the Governor made a speech to his State, saying that he would not “yield to that which I know to be wrong and will destroy every semblance of education for thousands of children of Virginia.”²⁹⁴ The election of Almond in 1958 marks one of the last true triumphs of the Byrd Organization, which quickly began to lose power with the Virginia Supreme Court ruling in 1959.

For all of his rhetoric, Almond was powerless to actually change anything; he had no redress in the state courts, and the federal courts had already ruled on this issue. Ten days after he said that he would not yield to integration, Almond had no choice but to go back to the General Assembly and tell them that the state has “no power to overthrow or negate the

291 Letter, June 1957, J. Lindsay Almond to Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers.

292 Letter, July 10, 1957, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. to J. Lindsay Almond, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Personal Papers.

293 Mills E. Godwin, Jr., *Some Recollections*, Self Published, 22.

294 Ibid., 23.

overriding power of the Federal Government.”²⁹⁵ This marked the beginning of the end of Massive Resistance, although there would be pockets of the state that would not integrate their schools until 1964. In response to the ruling, the Prince Edward County School Board refused to allocate any funds for their schools, which closed all of them, rather than integrate. Almost all of the white students of the county enrolled in a private academy, whereas the black students had to either go to a school in another county or receive no education at all.²⁹⁶ The death of Massive Resistance also meant the death of the Byrd Organization as a political machine.

As the power of the Byrd Organization began to wane, political races became more and more competitive, with statewide races becoming more than just a rubber stamp for the winner of the Democratic primary. Whereas in the 1950s, Mills Godwin had “tried all legal and honorable means”²⁹⁷ to prevent integration, he saw that the 1960s would require a different sort of strategy in order to win statewide office. Godwin recognized that there were “adjustments to be made to accept the inevitable.”²⁹⁸ When he campaigned against Armistead Boothe in his Democratic primary for Lt. Governor, the “segregation battle” was not an issue; Godwin's campaign language was one of “moderation and of progress;”²⁹⁹ not what one would expect from a person who, as late as three years before, had been one of the most outspoken advocates of school segregation. One of the main points that Godwin used to attack Boothe was the fact that he supported weakening the right to work law, which allowed for people to continue work even if they were not part of a union, and that Boothe had received the endorsement of the AFL-CIO.³⁰⁰

295 “Almond Faces the Facts,” *The Washington Post and Times Herald*, January 29, 1959, A16.

296 Godwin, *Some Recollections*, 30.

297 Godwin, *Some Recollections*, 23.

298 Godwin, *Some Recollections*, 23.

299 Robert E. Baker, “Excellent Thesis Picks Over 'Massive Resistance' Bones,” *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, November 25, 1964, A16.

300 Godwin, *Some Recollections*, 28.

Godwin won this race, but mostly through his own charisma and not through the power of the Byrd Organization.

In his own run for governor, the power of the Byrd Organization had faded even more, causing Godwin to move away from it. He realized that in the new world of Virginia politics, association with the Byrd Organization was more of a hindrance than an asset. Instead of staying with the old Democratic party line, Godwin courted the black vote and the labor vote by standing with President Lyndon Johnson.³⁰¹ Godwin had completely abandoned the traditional power base of the Democratic Party, instead concentrating on the groups that would form the party's new power base. In response to this shift in beliefs, William J. Story, a member of the state Senate, created the Virginia Conservative party, which gained an impressive 13.5% of the vote in their first year on the ballot.³⁰² Godwin's change in direction was a combination of acceptance of the times and a pragmatic need to find a larger pool of voters.

The new Mills Godwin had a vision of a “developing 'program for progress,’” which was in stark contrast to the Organization Mills Godwin, who wanted to keep the status quo of political patronage. Governor Mills Godwin’s legacy is improving the educational system of Virginia. It was his stated goal to allow for any student “capable of benefiting from the instruction can find his proper place.”³⁰³ In order to pay for this new educational system, and for other services that he wanted the state to provide for the people, Godwin abandoned the cornerstone of Byrd fiscal responsibility, the pay-as-you-go system. By taking out \$80 million in bonds, Godwin was able to create Virginia Commonwealth University, finish turning George

301 James J. Kirkpatrick, “Transitional Era in the South puts Politicians on the Hot Seat,” *Los Angeles Times*, November 11, 1965, A6.

302 George M. Kelley, “Va. Democrats' Victory Was Costly,” *The Washington Post, Times Herald* December 2, 1965, C1.

303 Don Robinson, “Va., Md. Push College Plans,” *The Washington Post, Times Herald*, January 20, 1968, B1.

Mason University into a four-year school, and expand the system of community colleges to twenty-three schools throughout Virginia.³⁰⁴ This is a dramatic departure from the Mills Godwin of the 1950s, who had supported continuing the segregation of African-Americans and whites by any possible measures. By the end of his term, the coalition which had put him into office, of old, Southern Democrats and the New Democrats, which included blacks and labor unions, was falling apart. The Southern Democrats would soon switch to the Republican Party, while the more liberal members of the Democratic Party began to hold sway. The last vestiges of the Byrd Organization had disappeared from Virginia state politics.

But while outwardly he had changed, it does not seem like Godwin's personal beliefs had changed much at all. Even in 1968, he was still involved with a fight against the federal government over the nature of integration, saying that integration still “creates unbearable problems for many.”³⁰⁵ Godwin preferred the least amount of federal intervention possible into how Virginia's schools were integrated, and preferred the least amount of integration possible as well. He continued to defend the state's miscegenation laws, saying that “they are in the public interest of all the people of this state.”³⁰⁶ The challenge to Virginia's anti-miscegenation, or interracial marriage, law became the test case that went to the Supreme Court striking down anti-miscegenation laws across the country. Davis Y. Paschall, formerly the Superintendent of Public Education and the president of the College of William and Mary from 1960 to 1971, sent Godwin a copy of a speech given at the College's law school, pointing out particularly a passage

304 Bugg, 378-379.

305 Letter, September 6, 1966, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. to P.D. Pruden, Jr., Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Executive Papers, Accession Number 27210, Library of Virginia. (Hereafter Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Executive Papers)

306 Letter, November 28, 1966, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. to Richard H. Zwicker, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Executive Papers.

that condemned the Supreme Court's decision to abolish the poll tax.³⁰⁷ While he made changes that benefited all Virginians, his racial beliefs were still quite the same as when he had entered politics thirty years before.

As the political climate in Virginia changed, so did Mills E. Godwin, Jr. He was able to go from a party outsider who always seemed to pick the wrong candidate to back to the highest ranks of the Byrd Organization. When the Organization began its downfall, he was able to court the support of blacks and the labor movement in order to be elected governor. James L. Bugg calls Mills Godwin “A Man for All Seasons,” and the term seems to be well suited to him.³⁰⁸ He was one of the only members of the Organization able to survive its downfall, eventually becoming a member of the Republican party for his second term as Governor. While his personal views seemed not to change, he put those aside in order to remain in power, and by doing so was able to help reform Virginia's education system, which in turn helped thousands of citizens, both black and white.

What was it then about the political climate of this new era that caused Godwin to make these changes in his public policy despite his personal reluctance to accept black citizens as political equals of white citizens? Why did this politician make the shift in his public image from vehement segregationist to champion of public education in Virginia? This was partially due to massive shifts in national public opinion, and to the ability of civil rights organizers to turn public opinion into grassroots political power.

While white Virginians were resisting change tooth and nail, the national scene in the Sixties saw a surge in public civil rights activism, and a revival of citizen interest in policy

307 Letter, May 12, 1967, Davis Y. Paschall to Mills E. Godwin, Jr., Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Executive Papers.

308 Bugg, 373.

making, particularly around issues of race. John F. Kennedy's assassination propelled Lyndon Johnson into the White House with a civil rights agenda and a mandate to pass it. The first result of Johnson's Great Society legislation was the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The passage of this legislation was a pointed example of the ways in which organized citizens changed US policy in favor of desegregation and universal civil rights. These changes in national law in turn diminished the power of individual states to maintain traditional racial hierarchies that encouraged the subjugation of black citizens. It was these changes at the national level forced state politicians like Mills Godwin and Harry Byrd to alter course on the issue of integration or fade from power.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is crucial to the legislative history of labor in the United States. This act banned employment discrimination based on race, religion, sex or national origin, except in some very narrow exceptions, in which a person's employment could still be determined by sex or religion. Title VII of the act provided for the creation of the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, a federal body that would hear and act on grievances from people who felt their employers or potential employers were in violation of the new bans on race-, religion-, sex-, and nationality-based discrimination. Additionally, the act banned discrimination in any organization receiving federal funds, and gave the US Attorney General the power to investigate and enforce claims against these organizations. With this act, the US government codified many of the gains for which civil rights leaders had been pushing for decades.

The act came at a specific point in civil rights history, as well as during a particular alignment of Congressional and Presidential power and opinion. President Kennedy announced

his intentions for the creation of a new Civil Rights Act in a speech early in 1963, though he did not propose any legislation until several months later.³⁰⁹ There were many reasons for Kennedy to be careful with potent civil rights legislation, perhaps the greatest of which was that this would alienate his Democratic base in the southern states. At the time, the Democratic Party depended on these votes in national elections, and President Kennedy intended to run for re-election in 1964.

In Congress, the cards were stacked against major civil rights legislation. Congress had in fact passed earlier Civil Rights Acts in 1957 and 1960, but these had been gutted by their opponents by the time they were ratified as law. A formidable obstacle to passing civil rights legislation in Congress was that all legislation had to pass through the House Rules Committee, which was then chaired by Howard W. Smith, a Virginian outspoken in his opposition to legislating racial issues.³¹⁰ When the Civil Rights Act of 1957 came before Congress, Smith said of the act: "The Southern people have never accepted the colored race as a race of people who had equal intelligence and education and social attainments as the white people of the South."³¹¹

Even if Kennedy could get a strong civil rights bill past Delegate Smith, he had another roadblock to overcome in the Senate; in just the decade leading up to 1964, James O. Eastland, a conservative Democrat from Mississippi, had used his position as chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee to stop over a hundred civil rights bills dead in their tracks.³¹²

And so, early in 1963, Kennedy could speak out against race-based discrimination and injustice, but politically, it seemed his chances at pushing effective civil rights legislation through

³⁰⁹ David Loevy, "A Brief History of the Civil Rights Act," in *The American Presidency*, ed. David C. Kozak (Chicago: Nelson Hall, 1985), 411-419; see p. 411.

³¹⁰ Loevy, 412.

³¹¹ "Republicans Change Portrait and Democrats are Furious," *New York Times*, 24 January 1995.

³¹² Loevy, 412.

Congress were slim. Then, in May of 1963, Martin Luther King, Jr. and an army of non-violent demonstrators in Birmingham, Alabama got national media attention.³¹³ The nation was shocked and appalled when a local police chief used fire-hoses and dogs against demonstrators. This was perhaps most effective in drawing national sentiment because the showing of images of graphic, real violence was unprecedented on American television at the time. Constituents began demanding that the federal government act to end segregation in the Jim Crow South.

In June of 1963, President Kennedy sent the first draft of his Civil Rights Act to Congress, in spite of the overwhelming opposition of Southern representatives, and the upcoming presidential election. Kennedy's proposal was met with enthusiasm from many civil rights organizations across the country. Just two months after his draft went to Congress, over 200,000 demonstrators participated in the now famous March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom, with "Pass that bill!" as one of many chants:

It appeared to be the apogee of the civil-rights movement. But it had not been so conceived, the unanimity was deceptive, and many of those who participated in and praised the march had opposed it when first announced by seventy-four-year-old A. Philip Randolph, the civil-rights movement's elder statesman.³¹⁴

President Kennedy had in fact tried to dissuade the organizers of the march from holding it at all in a meeting preceding the event. The march had originally been conceived as a "siege [on] Capitol Hill" specifically addressing unemployment among black Americans. Organizers altered these plans, and "shelved plans for a sit-in at the Capitol in favor of staging a mass rally to

³¹³ Harvard Sitkoff, *The Struggle for Black Equality: 1954-1992* (Canada: HarperCollinsCanadaLtd, 1993), 118.

³¹⁴ Sitkoff, 147.

support Kennedy's legislation."³¹⁵

These actions gained the support of civil rights moderates and mainstream politicians, but drew criticism from Malcom X and others who felt that peaceful demonstration and civil rights legislation were mild measures that would not help the nation's ongoing racial crises. In response to Martin Luther King's now famous "I Have a Dream" speech, one discontent is reported to have yelled "Fuck that dream, Martin. Now goddamit, NOW!"³¹⁶

Kennedy's original bill did not consider employment discrimination; his main objective was to end Jim Crow laws and the segregation of schools and businesses in the South. Title VII, which is perhaps of the most direct importance to labor laws, was added when the bill went to the House Judiciary Committee, which was then chaired by Emmanuel Celler, a liberal Democrat from New York.³¹⁷ Celler had a long political career; he remained the chair of the House Judiciary Committee from 1949 until 1973. During his tenure, this committee was involved in the passage of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968, and the Voting Rights Act into law. Early in his career, he had been particularly outspoken about Franklin D Roosevelt's refusal to admit Holocaust survivors into the states as refugees during the thirties and forties.³¹⁸

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 came out of Celler's committee fortified with provisions to end employment discrimination based on race, religion and national origin. The committee had wanted to extend to power of the US Attorney General to allow action not only against segregated schools, but also against any institution found in violation of Title VII. This second proposal was shot down in negotiations with other politicians, and a body known as the Equal

³¹⁵ Sitkoff, 149.

³¹⁶ Sitkoff, 153.

³¹⁷ Loevy, 414.

³¹⁸ Jewish Virtual Library, "Emanuel Celler," (2007)
<<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/biography/Celler.html>>.

Employment Opportunity Commission was instead proposed to resolve disputes arising from Title VII.³¹⁹

The EEOC was created to resolve disputes between parties outside of court. The body only has power to conciliate between employer and employee; it cannot demand damages on its own, though it can file a suit on behalf of an employee if it decides to do so.³²⁰ This was done for several reasons. First, creating the EEOC instead of giving federal courts direct responsibility for cases involving employment discrimination was a concession to detractors of the Civil Rights bill.³²¹ Secondly, it was clear that federal intervention of some sort was needed. It was obvious that trying employment discrimination cases in state courts with all white juries would have no effect on altering racial hierarchies in the South.³²² The creation of the EEOC was, perhaps, an imperfect solution, but at least it moved these cases into the jurisdiction of supposedly more impartial federal courts.

At this stage, the Civil Rights Bill was sent to Howard Smith's House Rules Committee, where Delegate Smith made clear his intentions of never releasing the bill to the House floor; this would be the first big fight for the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Shortly after the bill went to the Rules Committee, President Kennedy was assassinated in Texas while campaigning for the upcoming election. Lyndon Johnson assumed office, and went straight to work on Kennedy's Civil Rights Act. Johnson intended to pass this bill before his short term was out, and he had certain advantages in accomplishing this that Kennedy did not. For one, Johnson was a Texan;

³¹⁹ Loevy, 414.

³²⁰ Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, "Federal Laws Prohibiting Job Discrimination: Questions and Answers," (2002) <<http://www.eeoc.gov/facts/qanda.html>>.

³²¹ Loevy, 414.

³²² Huey L. Perry, "Pluralist Theory and Black National Politics in the United States," *Polity* Vol. 23, No. 4 (Summer 1991): 549-565; see pp. 555.

he did not need to fight for the Southern vote the same way Kennedy had. In fact, it was Northern and Western support that Johnson was lacking, and this bill seemed like the perfect way to build credentials with Democrats outside of the South.³²³

Supporters of the future Civil Rights Act of 1964 made their move to get the bill out of the House Rules Committee at the close of the year in 1963. In order to move the bill straight to the House floor, they would need a majority of delegate signatures on a petition to discharge the bill from Smith's committee. Civil rights groups across the country rallied behind this bill, encouraging voters to make their views on the bill clear to their House representatives. Religious groups were particularly active in gaining the support of Midwestern delegates, where labor and civil rights groups were weak, and churchgoers had great leverage with their representatives.³²⁴ As the number of signatures on the discharge petition grew, Delegate Smith gave in and released the bill from his committee to the House floor.

What has been read as Smith's last attempt to sabotage the bill occurred during the debates in the House, when he proposed an amendment adding "sex" to the list of protections from employment discrimination included in Title VII. Sources seem unsure as to Smith's motives for this addition. One of Smith's contemporaries is quoted in several sources as saying: "Smith didn't give a damn about women's rights...he was trying to knock off votes either then or down the line because there was always a hard core of men who didn't favor women's rights."³²⁵ This is perhaps the most likely of several possible conclusions.

Others have posited that Smith added a ban on sex discrimination to the Civil Rights Act

³²³ Loevy, 415.

³²⁴ James F. Findlay, "Religion and Politics in the Sixties: The Churches and the Civil Rights Act of 1964," *The Journal of American History* Vol. 77, No. 1 (June, 1990): 66-92; see pp. 73.

³²⁵ Bruce J. Dierenfield, *Keeper of the Rules: Congressman Howard W. Smith of Virginia* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1987), pp. 194.

because he wanted to ensure that at least some white people could draw direct benefit from this legislation. One scholar writes:

Although no one will ever be able to say for sure, it is probably safe to guess that Smith's motives were mixed. He saw an opportunity to take a swipe at the civil rights bill, but as a chivalrous old southern gentleman, he also believed that it was only fair that women, specifically white women, be granted the same legal protections that the government was preparing to afford black men.³²⁶

This concern for chivalry is echoed in Representative James Tuten's affirmation that "Some men in some areas of the country might support legislation which would discriminate against women, but never let it be said that a southern gentleman would vote for such legislation."³²⁷

Representative Martha Griffiths, a Democrat from Michigan, also expressed concern that the bill would make white women "last at the hiring gate," since black women, by her estimate, would be protected by Title VII because of their race, while white women would have no recourse for sex-based discrimination.³²⁸

Whatever his reasons, it seems ironic that this conservative, Southern representative's only addition to the Civil Rights Bill served to make it more progressive. Otherwise, the bill maintained most of the same content it had after Celler's revisions to Kennedy's draft.³²⁹ In the Senate, the bill faced the threat of the chair of the Judiciary Committee to withhold the bill indefinitely from the Senate floor. James Eastland staunchly opposed racial integration in the South, proclaiming after the Supreme Court ruling in *Brown V. Board of Education*: "On May 17,

³²⁶ Carl M. Brauer, "Women Activists, Southern Conservatives, and the Prohibition of Sex Discrimination in Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act," *The Journal of Southern History* Vol. 49, No. 1 (Feb. 1983): 37-56; see pp. 45.

³²⁷ Brauer, 50.

³²⁸ Brauer, 49.

³²⁹ Loevy, 415.

1954, the Constitution of the United States was destroyed because the Supreme Court disregarded the law and decided integration was right... You are not required to obey any court which passes out such a ruling. In fact, you are obliged to defy it."³³⁰

Eastland's threats were quickly bypassed when the Senate voted to move the bill directly from the House to the Senate floor. The next obstacle the bill would face would undoubtedly be an extended filibuster by Southern Senators. Senators who were otherwise powerless to stop a bill would often resort to a filibuster, putting all Senate business on hold until concessions were made, or the bill was dropped. Johnson knew this, and was careful to push through all of the legislation that was important to him before the civil rights bill made it to the Senate floor.³³¹ At the end of March, a three-month filibuster was underway.

There is a provision called a cloture vote that allows the Senate to shut down a filibuster, though this tactic is rarely successful. A filibuster must end if two-thirds of the Senate votes to end discussion of the bill that is being filibustered. Cloture votes had been attempted to end filibusters of other civil rights legislation in the past, but they had never been successful. Now though, in 1964, this bill stood a better chance of passing than similar bills attempted previously, with the president's adamant support, and public favor turning towards effective civil rights legislation.

To say that this bill had more support than civil rights legislation had ever had in the past is not to say that this bill did not have its opponents. Outside of the halls of the US government, white Southerners – employers, business owners, legislators, parents, teachers, policemen – mounted a considerable opposition to the federal government's proposal to interfere with the

³³⁰ Bradley W. Joondeph, "Missouri v. Jenkins and the De Facto Abandonment of Court Enforced Desegregation" *The Washington Law Review* 71 (July 1996): 598-681; see pp. 604.

³³¹ Loevy, 416.

state of racial discrimination and segregation in the South. In 1964, these discontents rallied behind a Southern presidential candidate who hoped to beat Johnson in the Democratic primary.

George Wallace Jr. had been a delegate to the Alabama House of Representatives, a Circuit Court judge, and was elected the state's governor in 1962. Until his successful bid for governor, Wallace took a moderate stance on racial issues. His success in this campaign has been attributed to a change in attitude. In an inaugural speech written by Asa Carter, Wallace took a clear stance on segregation: "In the name of the greatest people that have ever trod this earth, I draw the line in the dust and toss the gauntlet before the feet of tyranny, and I say segregation now, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever."³³² Whether the then-governor, as he later claimed, regretted these words as soon as he read them or not, his strong stance resonated with enough constituents to justify his entrance into the 1964 presidential primary.³³³ Though he was ultimately defeated, Wallace gained a surprising amount of support during this campaign, demonstrating the extent of Southern and Midwestern opposition to civil rights legislation then extant.³³⁴

With such vehement Southern opposition, the bill would need wide bipartisan support from representatives outside of the South to obtain a cloture vote to stop the Southern filibuster in the Senate. Gaining this support would be difficult, as most of the Western and Midwestern Republicans did not want to lessen the power of any filibuster, despite their support for strong civil rights legislation. President Johnson identified Everett Dirksen, the Senate's Republican

³³² "The Inaugural Address of Governor George C. Wallace," Alabama Department of Archives and History (January 14, 1963) <http://www.archives.state.al.us/govs_list/inauguralspeech.html>.

³³³ Daniel McCabe, Paul Stekler, Steve Fayer, *George Wallace: Settin' the Woods on Fire* (transcript), PBS documentary (2000) <<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/amex/wallace/filmmore/transcript/index.html>>.

³³⁴ Loevy, 417.

leader, as being key to growing momentum for a cloture vote against the Southern filibuster.³³⁵

Hubert Humphrey, the Democratic whip in the Senate, and President Johnson took on the task of gaining Dirksen's in Congress.

Religious organizations were particularly active in the grassroots, nation-wide campaign to push this bill through Congress. And as previously mentioned, these groups were crucial to gaining the support of Midwestern senators. The National Council of Churches held workshops on civil rights and on effective organizing in churches, community centers, schools and work places across the country, but particularly in the Midwest.³³⁶ During the filibuster of what would become the Civil Rights Act of 1964, religious groups held a series of demonstrations in Washington, the largest of which took place at Georgetown University and included 6,500 churchgoers:

On April 29 at the Lutheran Church of the Reformation, just a block from the Capitol, the National Council of Churches initiated daily worship services that would not end until "a strong and just civil rights bill was passed." For six weeks the services continued, presided over by 125 Protestant and Orthodox church leaders invited to Washington to lead these daily "demonstrations."³³⁷

Religious leaders were also busy gaining support at home. Between January and June of 1964, 39% of the mail received by Senator Dirksen supporting civil rights legislation came from people who clearly identified themselves as churchgoers. This percentage is similar to statistics on mail received by other Midwestern senators.³³⁸

³³⁵ Loevy, 417.

³³⁶ Findlay, 79.

³³⁷ Findlay, 80.

³³⁸ Findlay, 82.

While the Southern filibuster was ongoing, Senators and civil rights leaders met in Dirksen's office to negotiate amendments that might make the bill more appealing to Midwestern and Western senators – particularly Republicans. Dirksen, who was from Illinois, wanted to ensure that the bill only affected states and businesses where discrimination could be shown to be a “pattern of practice;” he wanted to be sure that this law would not make individuals and isolated instances of discrimination susceptible to the US government.³³⁹ This process mirrored the negotiations that would have happened had the bill ended up in a senate committee that was willing to hear the bill. When negotiations were completed, the bill had Dirksen's support, as well as that of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, though later analysts have traced the ultimate weakness of the EEOC to the addition of this provision for a “pattern of practice.”³⁴⁰

In early June, the Senate voted to end the Southern filibuster, and by July, the amended Civil Rights Act of 1964 was passed into law. Upon the passage of this bill, President Johnson remarked of the Democratic Party, “We've lost the South for a generation.”³⁴¹

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the first effective, strong civil rights legislation that restricted employers from discriminating on the basis of race, national origin, sex or religion both in their employees and with their customers. Two important civil rights bills followed this act – one ensuring equal access to voting, and another, equal access to housing. While these bills are not directly relevant to issues of employment, their enactment was crucial to the ongoing process of ensuring the full participation of every US citizen in this society.

The Voting Rights Act came to Congress on the heels of massive political organizing in

³³⁹ Loevy, 418.

³⁴⁰ L. K. III, “Tort Remedies for Employment Discrimination Under Title VII,” *Virginia Law Review* Vol. 54, No. 3 (April, 1968): 491-504; see pp. 492.

³⁴¹ “From Texas, Coming to a Statehouse Near You,” *New York Times*, 23 May 2003.

the South intended to dissolve impediments to voting leveled against black Southerners. The civil rights foment of previous years prompted President Johnson's administration to draft this act. It outlawed most of the tactics employed by the Jim Crow South to prevent black citizens from voting, including literacy tests, poll taxes and grandfather clauses, requiring voters to prove that their grandfathers had been registered voters as well. It also enabled the federal government to monitor elections in contested areas, and to act against corrupt districts.

The Civil Rights Act of 1968, also known as the Fair Housing Act, protected renters and potential home buyers from discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin or religion. A Department of Housing and Urban Development was authorized to process grievances related to this act against landlords and real estate agents. The act passed a week after the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr, and is thought to have gained considerable support in the government because of his death.³⁴² The act was subsequently amended to include protections for people with disabilities, and people with children.

This chapter has traced changes in the racial and political climate in Virginia starting in the early fifties outward to policy changes that took place on the national level during the mid-sixties and beyond. In reading this document, it is crucial to remember that these policies did not change themselves; that is, laws in and of themselves did not change minds during this time period. Laws *and* minds changed as a result of uncountable hours of work by individuals acting as lobbyists, demonstrators, constituents, politicians and citizens. It was these actions that ultimately effected legislative change, and a swing in the general mindset of the country.

Changes in policy did, however, effect changes in the balance of power in the South.

³⁴² US Department of Housing and Urban Development, "A History of Fair Housing" (2007) <<http://www.hud.gov/offices/fheo/aboutfheo/history.cfm>>.

Though laws are often changed as a result of collective action, it is often the case that powerful regimes are most expediently overturned by other powerful regimes. This is why changes in national legislation and mechanisms of federal enforcement of these new laws were so important to crumbling power in groups like the Byrd Organization. Similarly, the enforcement of national civil rights legislation at William and Mary led to the integration of the faculty and the student body. Staff, on the other hand, remained largely segregated into the seventies due to a failure on the part of the school, the state and the federal government under Nixon to enforce Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Section IV:

The Ice Starts to Crack: The College in a Time of Change

Never before in its history had the College of William and Mary been anything other than

an exclusively white institution. Comfortably entrenched in southern tradition and quiet conservatism, the College had been left to manage its own affairs for centuries. In the 1950s, however, new legal precedents forced the College to directly confront the Civil Rights Movement and the necessary changes that it demanded. However these changes did not materialize immediately: the College responded to the courts and to a rising tide of activism on campus which left the administration no choice but to reluctantly inch towards change.

The transition was not smooth. Integration of the student body began in the 1950s and simultaneously plateaued with the most token integration. The administration took few steps toward recruitment or making itself more accommodating toward minority groups. Student, staff, and faculty activism was necessary to finish this half-completed job. The campus community agitated not only for integration, but also equal employment opportunities, a better grievance system, increased agency in College affairs and a general change in the college climate. As attitudes on campus shifted and national events opened the community's eyes to the struggle for fundamental civil rights and liberties, students, faculty and staff began to organize themselves into groups that pressured the administration, such as the Black Student Organization, the Grievance Committee of 1969, the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women. Although these groups each targeted specific issues, they were part of one unified and interconnected struggle.

“As White Bread As You Can Get:” The Integration of William and Mary’s Student Body

While the integration of the student body at the College of William and Mary appears to have occurred without the kind of major upheaval that characterized many such similar events

throughout the country during the 1950s and 1960s, the transition was, as could be expected, anything but smooth. Though hardly a case of early pro-integration sentiment on the College's part, the first black student, Hulon L. Willis, arrived at William and Mary in 1951. Willis joined the graduate Physical Education program after the Supreme Court, upholding *Plessy vs. Ferguson*'s "separate but equal" ruling, enforced a state rule requiring historically white universities to admit qualified African-American students to graduate programs that were not provided by historically black schools. Edward A. Travis would follow at the law school that fall.³⁴³ Still, these men were the exception; the undergraduate population would not see its first African-American member until the fall of 1963, when Oscar Blayton, the son of the doctor who ran Williamsburg's single black clinic, Blayton Hospital, began taking classes.³⁴⁴

At the time, integration "was hardly on anyone's radar," says Sam Sadler, a student in the early 1960s who now serves as Vice President for Student Affairs at William and Mary. "[T]he place was totally white. I mean, it was as white bread as you can get." Sadler remembers that, at the time of Blayton's admission, few people took more than a passing notice of his presence in the classroom. "He wasn't on campus that much," Sadler states. "The early sixties were much like the fifties; it was a time when no one challenged anything. There was no movement that I could detect on the part of the university to do anything to diversify. And there was no push from the students to diversify because they were all pretty much [of] the same cloth, and it wasn't even discussed."³⁴⁵

This quiet would end in the latter half of the decade, following the passage in 1964 of the

³⁴³ Ibid, 767. [Is this a Godson, et al ibid?]

³⁴⁴ Ibid, 829.

³⁴⁵ Sam Sadler, interviewed by Ben Bromley and Caroline Murray, transcribed, October 11, 2007, page 4 of the transcription, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

federal Civil Rights Act, which included among its provisions a requirement that public institutions of higher education open themselves to applicants from all racial backgrounds. With the federal mandate came increased discussion of the topic. “When I came back in 1967 [to work for the Admissions Office],” Sadler states, “then it [integration] was a big deal. And by then, students were really getting into the whole civil rights movement, organizing around it, and... the dominant mood on campus was, ‘Why aren’t we doing more about this?’”³⁴⁶

Sadler’s hiring to the Admissions Office was part of an initial push to answer this question with action, as he and a few other recruiters were sent to predominantly African-American high schools in the region. Progress, though, was slow; William and Mary admitted just four African-American students in the fall of 1967.³⁴⁷ The numbers of incoming black freshmen changed little over the next two years. Meanwhile, the College’s administration stated publicly that its doors were open to any student who met the school’s academic standards, regardless of race. President Davis Paschall spoke glowingly of the College’s openness in a statement to the Bureau of Higher Education in 1965, stating that the institution’s “admissions program is non-discriminatory in respect to race, creed or color.... It’s [*sic*] dormitories, cafeteria, infirmary, athletic facilities, auditoriums, and all other facilities are integrated.” Yet, in that particular year, the school appears to have had no minority students. Paschall took pains to trumpet William and Mary’s past diversity, however: “The College of William and Mary – the second oldest in the nation – was the first integrated institution in America, this fact being

³⁴⁶ Ibid, 4.

³⁴⁷ Godson, et al, 829.

attributed to the provision for education of Indians in 1723.”³⁴⁸ Paschall neglected to mention that many of those Native American students had been kidnapped by one local tribe from another, and then sold to the College.³⁴⁹

All distorted history aside, the true integration of the College was slow, and routes of acceptance at the College were hard earned. For some students, athletic scholarships became a new way to get in the door. “[F]or people who looked at me, if they wanted to explain [my presence] away, it was, ‘okay, you can play football,’” states Booker Hargrove, who was offered a scholarship by Coach Marv Levy in 1969 to play for the Tribe. In Levy, Hargrove found a respected member of the white William and Mary community that was eager to have him on campus, not just for his athleticism, but for his academic potential. “Marv Levy was probably the deciding factor [in my decision to attend] William and Mary.... I remember the first time we talked we spent ten-to-fifteen minutes talking about football, and about the next 45 minutes about how my experience at school [would tie into] the rest of my life.” Hargrove, whose interests were far more scholastic than athletic, says that Levy’s recruiting approach, which took as a matter of fact Hargrove’s suitability for study at the College, reassured him that William and Mary would be a place where he could develop his interests.³⁵⁰

The situation, however, had changed by the time Hargrove arrived on campus in the fall. Levy had left for another coaching job, and had been replaced with Lou Holtz, whose support for his players’ academic interests, Hargrove states, was not as strong as his predecessor’s. “[H]e

³⁴⁸ Davis Y. Paschall, “Statement made to Mr. Howard Bryant by Davis Y. Paschall, President of the College of William and Mary,” dated June 21, 1965, Office of the President Davis Y. Paschall Records, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

³⁴⁹ “The Brafferton,” Colonial Williamsburg’s Historic Sites and Places Web site, Colonial Williamsburg Foundation, <http://www.history.org/Almanack/places/hb/hbbraff.cfm>, accessed December 1, 2007.

³⁵⁰ Booker Hargrove, interviewed by Kelly Brennan and Zach Hilpert, transcribed, November 29, 2007, page 1 of the transcription, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

stressed that William and Mary was a great academic institution, so therefore we needed to apply ourselves to the books to be eligible to play,” Hargrove said. “If you’re looking to play professional he’s a great coach. If you’re not, maybe he’s not such a good fit.” Having expected Levy to serve as a source of support in his academic studies, Hargrove now found that Holtz’s lack of scholarly focus left him with few other sources of support on campus.³⁵¹

Many accounts of the campus environment at the time paint a similar picture; support for African-American students, who were entering a stressful situation where they saw few faces similar to theirs, was lacking. The issue, it seems, was not so much overt racism as it was entrenched racist attitudes, ignorance of perceived “others,” and a hesitancy on the part of the College to act in a way that could be perceived as showing favoritism toward the slowly growing black population on campus. “I think the College fumbled, is the way I would describe it, in its efforts to become an integrated... environment,” says Sadler. “[T]here wasn’t much preparation in the culture of the place, for the kind of adjustment that both the campus and the students... of color needed to make.”

“The pain of their experience was being ignored,” Sadler noted. They were “being treated like they weren’t there. It took somebody pretty strong to be here in the [nineteen]sixties,” Sadler states.³⁵²

Edward Crapol, hired in 1967 to the History faculty, remembers a campus community led by a president who was less than eager to see change. It was “a struggle from [19]67 on to get the administration to admit more students of color and different ethnic groups,” Crapol recalls. “The administration that was here when I came, that was President [Davis] Paschall,... I think he

³⁵¹ Ibid, 2.

³⁵² Sadler, interview, 6.

was the epitome of a Virginia gentleman.... He wasn't an overt racist... but you knew in the long run where he stood."³⁵³ According to those who were on campus at the time, the environment was one of open doors, but also of limited understanding and, at times, limited welcome.

Hargrove recounts a particular instance of such attitudes. "I took a 'History of the South' course," Hargrove recalls. "I walked into the class and the professor was standing at the podium, and there was a big Confederate flag tacked to the wall... And I'm thinking, 'This is going to be an experience... I may not have had before.' [The professor's] whole perception of Southern history, the Civil War; I had never heard of it." The professor, Hargrove remembers, held a number of firm views on the South and on race relations which the young student disputed. "On the [first] test," Hargrove recalled,

we could choose which [questions] we wanted to answer.... I picked a couple questions and went to my notes and wrote my answers and didn't blatantly disagree with what he said. But I just thought, 'here is an alternative,' and I got a C, which didn't surprise me. Ok. Ok. Maybe I was a bit bold. The mid-term came, the second exam and I changed it just a little bit and I got a C. So now, before the final, I brought a tape recorder to the class, I did all the readings, all the lectures, I listened to all of them before the final; studied. Now for the final some of my answers were 'yes, the wholly innocent South were invaded by the heathens from the North and forced this unnatural way of life on the South.' And I got a C!

So I scheduled an appointment and I took all my tests and my notes and said 'Doctor, can I ask you a question? What did I do wrong? What do I have to do to make some changes to my grade? I think my tests are different.' He said, 'Yeah, you obviously made some changes,' [he said]. 'But my grade's the same.' He said, 'I thought someone like you would be glad to get a C at a place like this.'³⁵⁴

Others Hargrove came across were more willing to give him a chance. "[I]t ran the spectrum from professors who were very supportive, professors who were questioning, to professors who, before they even saw me, said, 'I know who you are and this [treatment] is what

³⁵³ Edward P. Crapol, interviewed by Salar Mohandesi and Sean Walsh, transcribed, November 19, 2007, pages 3-4 of the transcript, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

³⁵⁴ Hargrove, interview, 5.

you should expect.”³⁵⁵ In this environment, Hargrove decided a constructive approach would benefit him the most, personally; he states that he recognized in himself, the faculty, and his fellow students a need for all sides to better understand the other’s views of the world. “We were like fish in opposite bowls, looking at each other,” he says. “We had the opportunity to interact with people we hadn’t before, and if you’re somewhat open... to it, you can come away a better person, or at least a more informed person.”³⁵⁶ Hargrove today recalls spending many nights sitting up with friends he had made among the white student population, working out that kind of understanding. “There were people who were open to it,” Hargrove states. “[T]here were people there looking at that experience as an opportunity to expand themselves as a human being.”³⁵⁷

In at least a few areas, attitudes of openness were growing around campus at the close of the 1960s. The faculty, which in the mid-1940s had supported the decision to remove an editor-in-chief of the student newspaper based on her pro-integration stance, was now calling, by 1970, for increased recruitment of minorities.³⁵⁸ The Faculty Committee on Admissions continued to posit the idea that the greatest barrier to recruiting African-American students lay in the College’s minimal efforts to provide on-campus support for them. A report from the committee that year stated that,

An important factor [in the perception of the College] seems to be the wide-spread feeling among poverty-minority students that they are not welcome, even when they have received statements to the contrary from the College.... [Additionally,] The difficulty

³⁵⁵ Ibid, 6.

³⁵⁶ Ibid, 3-4.

³⁵⁷ Ibid, 5-6.

³⁵⁸ Faculty Committee on Admissions, “Report and Recommendations of the Faculty Committee on Admissions, May, 1970,” 2-3, Office of the President Davis Y. Paschall Records, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

encountered thus far is believed partly attributable to the added social pressures to which [African-American students] are subjected... We also conclude that insufficient attention has been paid to the problem of “culture shock” or social adjustment facing the matriculated poverty-minority students.

While the report goes on to state that some doubts as to the “academic abilities” of the students persisted among the faculty, the main source of trouble was the feeling on campus that, despite the school’s official status as an integrated institution, the College was not yet prepared to provide a supportive atmosphere for students who would be, for all intents and purposes, breaking a nearly 270-year-old color barrier.

As the 1960s turned to the 1970s, fears such as these continued to be one of the dominant themes on campus. Change, however, was equally prominent; aside from continuing integration, President Paschall retired in 1971, and was replaced soon thereafter by Thomas Graves. “[W]ith Graves, [it was] a whole different atmosphere,” Crapol recalls. “[H]e got away from the provincialism.” Graves’s administration would begin to take a more proactive approach to the recruitment of minority students, partially due to a more progressive philosophy, and partially due to increased federal pressure. Early in his tenure, Graves approved the opening of a new office on campus tasked with serving the needs of the growing minority student population. Referring to it as “[t]he most encouraging progress in affirmative action at the College” to date, those on campus who actively supported the heightened recruitment of minority students cheered the creation during the 1973-74 academic year of a new post, the Director of Minority Student

Affairs, which was staffed by Leroy Moore.³⁵⁹ Moore's office coordinated the recruitment of minority student applicants to William and Mary, and then served them upon arrival with advisors, personal counseling services, and administrative go-betweens for the minority student population. Recruitment efforts by the Office of Minority Student Affairs during its first years in existence varied, from high school visitations and invitations to prospective students for campus visits, to the use of "outside student referral services," which made available to clients lists of promising minority high school students eager to be contacted by top universities.³⁶⁰

Moore's efforts led to steadily increasing numbers of applications from minority students, along with increased acceptance and enrollment figures; one report from his office shows that in 1975, 139 prospective minority students (including African-Americans, people of Asian descent, Hispanic people, and Native American people) applied, 90 were accepted, and 32 chose to enroll; two years later those numbers had risen to 274, 134, and 75, respectively. While these numbers were still far from matching a proportional representation compared to the size of each group nationally, it was hard to argue that these initiatives were not producing positive results. Progress, however slowly, was being made.³⁶¹

Still, the picture was far from rosy. Aside from the continuing paucity of minority students on campus, problems lingered in the College's efforts to make them feel at home. In a report by the Affirmative Action Committee submitted June 10, 1975, to President Graves, many members of the committee expressed a feeling that, while the situation was improving, evidence

³⁵⁹ Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, "Report for the 1973-74 Academic Year," June 10, 1974, 1, Office of Affirmative Action Records, College of William and Mary, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

³⁶⁰ Leroy Moore, "Annual Report [of the Director of Minority Student Affairs] for 1976-77," 1, the Office of the President Thomas A. Graves Records, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

³⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 2.

continued to demonstrate that African-American students were not happy on campus. The committee recounted the (in its own words) “shocking” results of a survey of African-American students:

Of the 47 black students who completed the questionnaire, “34% felt unwanted here;” “47% feel that most faculty members are not genuinely interested in students as people;” “58% feel that administrators are insensitive to their needs;” “61% feel that faculty is unfair in grading practices;” [and] “74% state that if they had the choice to make again, they would not attend William and Mary.”³⁶²

Little evidence exists to suggest that these trends changed before the end of the decade.

African-American students made their own efforts to reach out to each other during this period. For example, according to Sadler, Warren Buck founded William and Mary’s Black Student Organization in 1966, despite the fact that Buck was the only black student on campus at the time.³⁶³ By the mid-1970s, the group, which represented the College’s black students, was organizing activities on campus – including Black Culture Week, choral concerts, and art exhibits – and publishing its own newsletter, called *speaking of black*.... Aside from being a source of information for the African-American student community, *speaking of black*... connected its constituency to one another in a personal way. The four-page newsletter individually welcomed new black students, provided profiles of the incoming class members, and listed birthdays. In Sadler’s estimation, the Black Student Organization, more than any other group or College initiative, played the most prominent role in fostering a sense of community for African-American students on campus in the late 1960s.³⁶⁴ That it took another six years – and a change in leadership – for the College’s administration to form its own specifically minority

³⁶² Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, “Report for the 1974-75 Academic Year,” June 10, 1975, University Archives Committees Collection, College of William and Mary, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

³⁶³ Sadler, interview, 5.

³⁶⁴ Ibid, 5-6.

student-oriented office could not have passed unnoticed.

The story of the integration of the College of William and Mary is dotted with successes and failures. While efforts to open the school to historically unwelcomed groups met with some resistance, it is also worthy of note that, by and large, those people cited above who today recall the era characterize it as a period of relative calm. That calm, of course, produced good and bad results; African-American students were not, it appears, regularly subject to the overtly racist, often violent acts that many of their peers at other institutions faced during the mid-1960s. But at the same time, the sense of calm also seemed to translate into a lack of affirmative action on the part of the Paschall administration. The advent of the Graves administration, and the increasing assertiveness of African-American students to organize themselves into advocacy groups like the BSO, moved the campus in positive directions. Judging by the number of minority students on campus by the late 1970s compared to the population of Virginia, though, great strides remained to be made.

“We will continue to offer out best efforts to the college,” African-American student Carson Jones wrote in the February 1977 issue of *speaking of black....* “Whether those efforts are appreciated and acknowledged is left up to William and Mary. But the Black student community will continue to progress and take advantage of the educational opportunities of the College.”³⁶⁵

The Existence of a Movement?

Though notoriously conservative throughout its history, even the College of William and Mary experienced the turbulence of student activism and the momentous changes brought on by

³⁶⁵ Carson Jones, “William and Mary – A Local Student’s View,” *speaking of black....*, February, 1977, 4. Attached to: Moore, “Annual Report,” Office of Affirmative Action Records, College of William and Mary, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

the mounting civil rights movement. Over the centuries, the College had craftily fashioned an image of itself based on the notions of Southern gentility, exclusivity, and pride. Even after admitting a few black students, integration plodded unhurriedly along, and the College basically remained the same. By 1965, however, this relatively placid state of affairs began to change as definite signs of growing, vocalized discontent started surfacing. As was the case with most American universities during this decade, the beginnings of any kind of coherent ‘movement’ at the College of William and Mary initially emerged from two main sources: liberal or radical students, many of whom either participated directly in or were heavily influenced by the civil rights movement in the South, and liberal or radical professors, many of whom came to teach from already radicalized universities in the North.

In 1965, activist students – the initial stimulus in the creation of the movement – made their appearance known with the founding of the Students for Liberal Action (SLA). According to Edward Crapol, a history professor who first taught at the College in 1967, Students for a Democratic Society (SDS), the largest radical student organization in the nation, “wanted to organize a chapter here, but that was too radical for William and Mary” so the group chose to adopt the name Students for Liberal Action instead.³⁶⁶ Despite the change in appellation, however, the group still shared the same radical aspirations as SDS and eventually began organizing “sporadic protests, peace vigils,” and later “participating in the National Moratorium Day for peace in Vietnam.”³⁶⁷ Though at first focusing primarily on civil rights, the group soon stretched out its arms, covering both national subjects (such as opposition to the Vietnam War) as well as more local concerns specific to the College (such as opposition to the various stringent

³⁶⁶ Crapol, interview..

³⁶⁷ Godson, et al, 826.

parietal rules firmly entrenched on campus). In the latter category, some of the issues in contention included “dress codes, cars, social rules, drinking, class attendance, participation in making decisions that affected the entire College, and, most especially, visitation by the opposite sex in the dormitories.”³⁶⁸ The most detested, of course, was the umbrella policy of *in loco parentis*.

What was most notable about the sprouting student movement at William and Mary was that from the outset it was inseparable from the rapidly developing civil rights movement. In fact, in some senses, the student movement at William and Mary *emerged* out of the civil rights movement and for much of its initial history, focused almost exclusively on civil rights matters, working on such projects as the advancement of integration at the College and in the greater community, the recruitment of a more ethnically diverse student population, and the organization of local African-American communities mired in destitution. As an example of this firm attachment to civil rights, on May 3, 1966 the SLA issued a one-page statement, doubtlessly intended for massive reproduction, criticizing the excessively sluggish integration process at the College of William and Mary. The statement noted that “as of the present semester” there were “only two Negroes in attendance” at the College and that both were only day students.³⁶⁹ After arguing that this could “hardly be considered even token integration,” the statement went on to locate the underlying cause of this travesty, revealing that ultimately, this was “not the result of a discriminatory admissions policy” but because African-Americans, for good reason, simply did not want to apply to such an elitist and comparatively unfriendly institution.³⁷⁰ The statement

³⁶⁸ Godson, et al, 826.

³⁶⁹ Pamphlet printed by Students for Liberal Action, May 3, 1966, in Student Organizations Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

³⁷⁰ Ibid.

ended with a call to action explaining that “real integration will only be achieved on a social basis” and that such a dramatic and necessary change could not just be simply legislated:

William and Mary students could and should “make a positive start” by “assuming responsibility for building an integrated and better society,” which could be done by putting pressure on the College to recruit from predominantly African-American high schools and by asking the Administration to insert a statement in its admissions policy declaring “non-discrimination on grounds of race, religion, creed, or national origin.”³⁷¹

The SLA apparently also had close ties with other civil rights organizations. The group seemed to have been affiliated with the Virginia Students’ Civil Rights Committee (VCRS), a specifically Virginia-centered civil rights organization that grew out of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), and it is likely that the two groups shared some common members and worked on similar projects. Though there is no direct evidence definitively proving that the SLA ever voted to directly ally itself with the VCRS, the SLA did read and distribute a variety of VCRS newsletters and pamphlets, signifying some kind of close contact between the two groups. Indeed, it is highly plausible that some students at the College participated in both groups as there is factual evidence that throughout its existence, many students in the SLA had membership in several other organizations, notably the infamous SDS.³⁷²

Describing its origins, an April 21, 1966 VCRS pamphlet stated that the “Committee was set up in December 1964 at a SNCC Conference held at Hampton Institute, Hampton

³⁷¹ Ibid.

³⁷² Mark Wurzbacher, “A Comparative Study on the Origin and Development of Political Beliefs and Attitudes in Student Liberal Activists and Student Conservatives,” Honors Thesis, College of William and Mary, June 1969, 25.

Virginia.”³⁷³ The September 1965 issue of the *Southern Patriot* described the organization as “very much like the 1964 Mississippi Summer Project in miniature – except that the accents of most of the workers are Southern.”³⁷⁴ The Committee, composed of both African-American and white students from schools throughout Virginia (such as UVA and Mary Washington) declared itself to be “a new kind of organization for Virginia and for the South.”³⁷⁵ Dedicated to attacking the “roots of the social evils of poverty, deprivation, and segregation” the members of VCRS identified themselves as community organizers, believing that “by living in the local community and becoming a part of the people” they could “discover the issues around which people” would rally: “from small and often slow starts – a baseball team, school desegregation, a road paved, sewage disposal – we hope to build community interest and confidence to attack the larger problems – housing, voting, jobs, and poor educational and recreational facilities.”³⁷⁶ Reflecting its commitment to further expanding the process of integration, one of the principle aims of the VCRS operation was to “develop a coalition of Negroes and poor whites.”³⁷⁷ Predictably, the organizational efforts, tactics, and aims of the SLA, the VCRS, its parent organization SNCC, and SDS were all very similar, revealing the unified and national nature of the student movement as a whole. Furthermore, all of these groups began to stress a totalistic perspective in regards to the pressing issues of the times, arguing that the issues were not merely isolated, but that they were all connected, from campus reform to Vietnam to civil rights.³⁷⁸ It is in this sense that those

³⁷³ Pamphlet printed by Virginia Students’ Civil Rights Committee, April 21, 1966, in Student Organizations Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

³⁷⁴ Staff Reporter, “Experiment in Virginia,” *The Southern Patriot* 23, no. 7 (September 1965): 1.

³⁷⁵ Pamphlet, Virginia Students’ Civil Rights Committee.

³⁷⁶ Ibid.

³⁷⁷ Ibid.

³⁷⁸ *The New Virginia: Newsletter of the VSCR* (Kenbridge, Va.), Volume 2, no. 2, April 1966 in Student Organizations Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

involved in these efforts considered themselves to be part of a vast, far-reaching, and meaningful movement; and it is in this sense that the student movement at William and Mary, in spite of its somewhat late emergence and timid temperament, can be positioned as an element within this national movement.

However, the movement, both on a national and local level, was not confined to just the students. In fact, the second agent of galvanization at the College was the entrance of a host of young, liberal professors from the North. During this period, the later-half of the 1960s, the College exploded in terms of growth: the “student body nearly doubled in size;” William and Mary underwent a “vast expansion of graduate studies with four doctoral programs, an additional eight master’s programs, and four new schools;” and an “entire new campus” was gradually constructed.³⁷⁹ To fulfill these newly created positions and to match the incredible institutional enlargement, numerous professors were hired. Crapol recalls that in 1967 alone, the administration “hired eighty-five people throughout the College.”³⁸⁰ Most of these professors were young, in their late twenties or early thirties, and relatively liberal in their political orientation. As Crapol noted, “a lot of those were people like me, you know, had come from Northern institutions, had a different outlook on racial matters, and were intent on changing things.”³⁸¹ Crapol himself arrived from the University of Madison at Wisconsin, where he was completing his PhD work. By 1967, Madison had seen its fair share of tumultuous moments, while the College of William and Mary was just beginning to experience its own. It was this temporal disjuncture that Crapol perspicuously described as “a certain time lapse.”³⁸² Northern

³⁷⁹ Godson, et al, 831.

³⁸⁰ Crapol, interview.

³⁸¹ Crapol, interview.

³⁸² Crapol, interview.

professors who came to teach at William and Mary saw a campus that was about three years behind in terms of activism and a fledgling movement that was just groping its way out of infancy.

Though students had already begun, before the arrival of the new professors, to take the first steps towards making constructive changes in Williamsburg, the valuable experiences of these liberal or even radical faculty members – people such as Dave Jones in the Philosophy department, Kelly Shaver in the Psychology department,³⁸³ or Bob Welch in Physics – provided a sort of impetus for the expansion this embryonic movement.³⁸⁴ In a way, they represented a kind of much needed emergency dose of liberalism to a place that had for a longtime been frozen in an icy winter of rigid conservatism. Sam Sadler, also shared the view that the new faculty constituted an electrifying element, mentioning that “the faculty had begun to change a bit. The faculty didn’t look any different. It was just as lily-white looking as it was when I was a student, but you had more liberal voices.”³⁸⁵ Immediately upon their arrival, these professors associated with like-minded students and expeditiously set about sculpting an extensive, comprehensive, multi-issue movement. Opposition to the war had by then become a central pillar, but equally important was a concentration on community organizing, which often times took the form of voter registration drives, the settlement of employment disputes, and the easing of racial tensions in Williamsburg. For example, Crapol, almost without delay, met with members of the community and professors from the College, both white and African-American, and formed the Human Relations Council, a kind of human relations organization intended “to promote racial equality and justice and to ease the process of desegregation” while working to bring blacks and

³⁸³ Crapol, interview.

³⁸⁴ Sadler, interview.

³⁸⁵ Sadler, interview.

whites together.³⁸⁶

Because students and professors worked together on the same fundamental issues, frequently attending the same meetings and regularly participating in the same events, their actions could definitely be interpreted as belonging to part of a coherent movement, marked by its own common set of tactics and common set of articulated goals. With considerable speed, the movement expanded beyond the small core of student activists and began to incorporate many previously apolitical students. Sam Sadler recalls that by around 1967 “students were really getting into the whole civil rights movement, organizing around it, and I would say the dominant mood on campus was, ‘Why aren’t we doing more about this?’”³⁸⁷ The movement progressed rapidly, expanding beyond civil rights, and tackling a broad variety of issues as it grew. Within a year agitation had dramatically increased, both in terms of the sheer numbers of actions as well as in the more radicalized content of these actions: students and professors organized a “Free College at Williamsburg” open to the community, the number of anti-war demonstrations rose, and actions against the College’s parietal rules grew more militant.³⁸⁸ Sadler remembers that “there were big teach-ins on the Sunken Gardens, there were demonstrations on campus. Faculty participated, students participated.”³⁸⁹ On October 25, 1969 the “Student Association, with the backing of other student groups, staged a Dorm-In at the men’s dormitories and fraternity houses.”³⁹⁰ Then dean of men Carson H. Barnes Jr. responded coldly, provoking an “impromptu sit-in” at James Blair Hall “in front of Barnes’ office.”³⁹¹ In an act that revealed their close ties to

³⁸⁶ Crapol, interview.

³⁸⁷ Sadler, interview.

³⁸⁸ “Free College to Hold Signing Up Saturday,” *The Flat Hat*, 57, no. 15, February 16, 1968, 1, 12.

³⁸⁹ Sadler, interview.

³⁹⁰ Godson, et al, 827.

³⁹¹ Godson, et al, 828.

the students, the faculty organized an emergency meeting to investigate the matter and discuss the administration's "arbitrary use of power" in dealing with the students.³⁹² When Barnes denounced the faculty, they responded by vociferously protesting and then by censuring him with a vote of no confidence, something "unheard of at William and Mary."³⁹³

Though the movement did touch on labor issues, it did not do so explicitly. It appears that some students made attempts to "link up with labor organizations in Newport News and in the shipyard,"³⁹⁴ but aside from this, the relationship between students and labor was limited.³⁹⁵ Furthermore, though there was a strong, almost indissoluble connection between the students and the faculty, there was far less association with the staff. It is likely that some of the staff attended a few of the more spectacular demonstrations and teach-ins held on the Sunken Gardens, but that they most likely did not play a major role.³⁹⁶ Rita Jackson a longtime employee at the College, for example, barely recalls any kind of movement at William and Mary and never participated in any events.³⁹⁷ One obvious reason for this lack of participation is that many staff workers may have been afraid, believing, and probably correctly, that taking part could result in losing one's job. A similar kind of reasoning, though differing considerably in the specifics, also went for the administration – as Sadler matter-of-factly commented, "it was, shall we say, risky for administrators to be involved."³⁹⁸ Thus, the movement remained a largely student and faculty

³⁹² Godson, et al, 826.

³⁹³ Crapol, interview.

³⁹⁴ Crapol, interview.

³⁹⁵ The attempt to organize around Newport News makes sense as there is some evidence that some shipyard workers also became employees in Williamsburg: according to Esterine Moyler, a longtime employee at the College, her husband worked at the shipyard before getting hired at William and Mary. Esterine Moyler, interview by Vanessa Ponton and Kim Lincoln, October 19, 2007, tape recording, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

³⁹⁶ Sadler, interview.

³⁹⁷ Jackson, interview.

³⁹⁸ Sadler, interview.

affair.

Nonetheless, the incessant agitation on the part of the students and faculty, though separated from expressly labor issues, probably encouraged the staff into taking action as well. The staff certainly had aspirations of change and the entire period was just as turbulent for the staff as it was for the students. On April 7, 1969, a black janitor, James Langley and his white supervisor, W. E. Jones, found themselves in a violent confrontation that ultimately resulted in the Langley's dismissal. On May 16, 1969 an article written by Marshall Emm in *The Flat Hat* reported that Jones ordered Langley to stay at work past 2:00, forcibly preventing him from leaving for home. In the confrontation, Jones allegedly "lifted up his hammer" in an effort to strike the janitor, but Langley fought back, managing to wrestle the weapon out of his supervisor's hands.³⁹⁹ After the two were forcibly separated, they clashed again, this time with Langley putting a knife to Jones' throat.⁴⁰⁰

Though the exact details of the incident still remain shrouded in mystery, they illustrate, quite graphically, that the situation at the College was from serene. The event was not some remote and anomalous phenomenon; it reflected the general mood of the staff and probably served as the trigger to collective action. Indeed, only a week after the incident, a custodial Grievance Committee was formed and one of the several issues it discussed in its May 8, 1969 meeting with the administration was the need for a formal investigation of the Jones-Langley affair.⁴⁰¹

The Grievance Committee for Custodians and Maids deserves special attention as it

³⁹⁹ Marshall Emm, "Janitor Dismissed After Fight Involving Supervisor Last Month." *The Flat Hat* 58, no. 27, May 16, 1969, 1.

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁰¹ "Custodial Committee Sees Group of Administrators," *The Flat Hat*, 58, no. 26, May 9, 1969, 1.

arguably reflects the first real effort at collective organization and action from the staff during this period. On April 14, exactly one week after the violent incident that concluded in Langley's dismissal, a mass meeting of maintenance employees was held where "wide-spread dissatisfaction was expressed with a number of working conditions within the department."⁴⁰² One of the actions of the meeting was to name a "committee of employees and interested citizens to draw up" a list of grievances.⁴⁰³ The finalized list contained twelve specific points (see Appendix A).

On April 30, Phillip Cooke, a local realtor, insurance salesman,⁴⁰⁴ and member of the NAACP labor relations board,⁴⁰⁵ called Mr. Farmer, the Buildings and Grounds Director, notifying him that "he and his Committee would like to come over and discuss" a number of grievances.⁴⁰⁶ Farmer contacted Robert T. English Jr., the Bursar, who requested that Cooke, who identified himself as the chairman of this Committee, set down the grievances in writing before a meeting could be held. English, filled with trepidation, dutifully sent a comprehensive letter to President Paschall describing the situation and making a few conclusions of his own.⁴⁰⁷ From the contents of the letter, it is abundantly clear that English had investigated the matter meticulously. He noted that Marshall Emm, a student associated with the *Flat Hat* and the author of the May 1969 article investigating the dismissal of James Langley, was working on an article "concerning custodial employees wages at the college with other operations such as Colonial Williamsburg,

⁴⁰² Robert T. English, Jr. to President Paschall, May 1, 1969, in *The President's Papers*, File #9, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁰³ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁴ "Custodial Committee Sees Group of Administrators," *The Flat Hat*, 58, no. 26, May 9, 1969, 1.

⁴⁰⁵ Mike Savage, "Discontent Grows Among College's Service Employees," *The Flat Hat* 61, no. 18, February 4, 1972, 2, 6.

⁴⁰⁶ English to Paschall, May 1, 1969.

⁴⁰⁷ Ibid.

Dow Badische, etc.”⁴⁰⁸ English also mentioned that Emm had planned to attend the Grievance Committee meeting but was unable to do so because of his work on the aforementioned article. He also stated that some members of the faculty had in fact attended, specifically Professor David Gray, an associate professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, as well as a certain Professor Laura Rhyne. English goes on to reveal that he set up a meeting with Emm to ascertain this information and that during the exchange, Emm “stated that he understood there was some discussion of the custodial employees going on strike, but that ‘cooler’ heads prevailed and they decided not to do so.”⁴⁰⁹ It seems as though this did little to assuage the Bursar’s fears because, English, still concerned about the potentially volatile situation, did some research regarding strikes and attached a copy of Article 2, Code of Virginia “Strikes by Government Employees” to his letter to the President.⁴¹⁰

The grievance meeting itself, held with English, Dennis Cogle (Asst. Bursar), I. H. Robitshek (Director of Personnel), and Farmer, took place on May 8, 1969 and dealt “primarily with ‘working conditions’ of janitors and maids at the College, work-loads, wages, procedures, treatment,”⁴¹¹ in short, the twelve grievances drafted by the Committee. Phillip Cooke, in an interview with the *Flat Hat*, stated, “we realize that some things are going to take longer than others. Some things will be done in a matter of days and it may be a matter of weeks before some things will be changed, but they will be changed. At the close of the meeting, in summary, we were assured that the list would be given as fair consideration as is humanly possible.”⁴¹²

Though the Committee dissipated after only two meetings with the Administration and is

⁴⁰⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid.

⁴¹⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹¹ “Custodial Committee Sees Group of Administrators,” 1.

⁴¹² Ibid.

generally forgotten altogether today, its existence proved to be a rather profound episode in the history of labor at the College. For the first time in this period, a group of staff workers decided to transform their discontent into collective action. They became cognizant of the nuanced dimensions of their oppression and realized that as isolated monads, their struggles could only remain personal problems and that only by organizing together and by discussing their common concerns could they begin to push for genuine change. Even more remarkable is the fact that the Committee drew “60-70% employee participation” in a time and place where speaking out as African-American workers could result in serious consequences, poignantly revealing that the Committee was not the work of a few outside agitators, but that in reality, these workers were responding to real conditions and felt compelled to act.⁴¹³

The set of grievances composed by the workers also reveals this developing sense of consciousness: they were not simply protesting one separated “issue,” but rather, they were critiquing, albeit in only a semi-conscious manner, a whole totality of social relations. The grievances were extensive and engaged with the many, fundamentally interwoven, aspects of their social lives (for example, working conditions, wages, integration, dignity, and increased decision-making power). In some cases, particularly in respects to integration, it is clear that the custodial workers sought to grasp the root of the matter, refusing to be content with mere appearances. For example, although the administration had begun to integrate the College by recruiting and admitting black students and even by considering hiring black faculty, this kind of integration still bordered on tokenism because a sharp and rigid hierarchy between whites and blacks still existed. Thus, point nine challenged this state of affairs by explicitly calling for a

⁴¹³ Mike Savage, “Discontent Grows Among College’s Service Employees,” *The Flat Hat* 61, no. 18, February 4, 1972, 2, 6.

more profound variety of integration that could actually produce fundamental changes by giving some kind of genuine power to African-Americans as opposed to relegating them to marginal and ineffectual positions that merely functioned to appease some kind of abstract law. Though the demands were obviously far from revolutionary, given William and Mary's history of vicious conservatism, they represented a significant and radical achievement.

Though it is difficult to ascertain the precise outcomes of the Committee's actions, it is nevertheless clear that there were some definite changes during this period. Most noticeably, opportunities for African-Americans began to open up and multiply. Juanita Wallace, the first full-time black administrator at the college, was hired in the summer of 1970, soon after the Committee made its appearance.⁴¹⁴ As Esterine Moyler, a longtime employee at the Post Office descriptively put it, "things has started to, you know, as my mom used to say, 'the ice had started to crack.'" ⁴¹⁵

However, the more fundamental problems were not ameliorated. In the early 1970s, an issue of *The Flat Hat* printed an "in-depth news analysis" of the growing discontent among the College's service employees due to poor working conditions, low pay, and lack of respect. In fact, conditions were so bad, according to Mike Savage, that some College employees decided to launch a second collective action in 1971. This time, about "fifty women working as secretaries in James Blair Hall"⁴¹⁶ – which was at that time the main administration building – presented Robert English with a petition demanding the creation of a women's lounge, a response to the fact that women employed at James Blair Hall were then forced to eat either outside of the

⁴¹⁴ Mark Reynolds, "Wallace Seeks To Erase 'White Institution' Image," *The Flat Hat* 61, no. 8, October 15, 1971, 1.

⁴¹⁵ Moyler, interview.

⁴¹⁶ "Discontent Grows Among College's Service Employees," 2, 6.

building or in the women's restrooms.

The article also mentioned the Grievance Committee of 1969, briefly summarizing its ephemeral history and particular grievances. Interestingly, Savage wrote that the "requests by this grievance committee were for the most part unfulfilled"⁴¹⁷ and that working conditions had been relatively unchanged. In fact, Savage repeatedly hinted that he would be unsurprised if employees decided to take immediate action, as "the resentment among workers [was] high." He went on to list such grievances as "poor equipment," "inadequate supplies," "unsafe working conditions," and a lack of maternity leave for pregnant employees, while disclosing the main point of dissatisfaction: the supervisors, specifically Buildings and Grounds Supervisor Kipps.⁴¹⁸ In closing the article, he remarked that in his opinion that "employees desire drastic changes in their situations."⁴¹⁹

There were also rumors about the unionization of workers. On January 18, 1972 Kenneth T. Lyons, the founder and president of the National Association of Government Employees, a federal employees union, wrote a letter to President Graves claiming that "the vast majority of the non-professional employees on the campus of the College of William and Mary" had joined the association and that these workers included "such classifications as cafeteria workers, maintenance employees, campus police officers, groundskeepers, custodial employees, as well as similar classifications."⁴²⁰ Lyons concluded the message by asking the College to "recognize the National Association of Government Employees as the collective bargaining representative" of

⁴¹⁷ Ibid.

⁴¹⁸ Ibid.

⁴¹⁹ Ibid.

⁴²⁰ Kenneth T. Lyons to President Graves, January 18, 1972, Office of the President Thomas A. Graves Records, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

the abovementioned workers.⁴²¹ Graves responded on February 3, 1972 refusing Lyons' request and citing the Senate Joint Resolution No. 12 1946 Acts of Assembly as evidence of why he could not recognize the National Association.⁴²² The correspondence was brief and the information tantalizing. Unfortunately it is impossible to know how much of Lyons' letter was hyperbole – were staff members from departments all over campus actually involved in efforts to organize a union? Like much of the history of labor at the College, much of this information is lost. All the same, what is clear is that although the Grievance Committee may have been disbanded, workers continued to voice their dissatisfaction throughout the early seventies. Few workers may have actually been involved in forming a union, but the episode demonstrates without a doubt that there was a kind of continuity in the efforts of the staff, almost a kind of hidden movement.

In 1973, a group of clerical employees developed a proposal for a program that would allow “classified employees to attend classes at the College at a lowered tuition and with time off from their jobs.”⁴²³ The Affirmative Action Committee, headed by Cam Walker, echoed the need for this kind of program and formally recommended that the Office of Personnel begin talking steps towards that end. It turns out, however, that the Office of Personnel intentionally ignored the request and employees were “neither told of the proposal nor were they asked to comment upon it.”⁴²⁴ This contemptible action on the part of the administration served as a catalyst for the eventual creation of a stable organization and throughout 1973 there were talks about forming a

⁴²¹ Ibid.

⁴²² President Graves to Kenneth T. Lyons, February 3, 1972, Office of the President Thomas A. Graves Records, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴²³ Pete Hegeman, “Employees form Staff association as alternative to Personnel Office,” *The Flat Hat* 62, no. 26, April 11, 1975, 5.

⁴²⁴ Ibid.

Staff Association.⁴²⁵ The 1974 Report of Self-Study came to the same conclusions, arguing that the “recognition of the classified employees of the College” and the need to share decision-making power were issues that deserved special attention.⁴²⁶ After much discussion, committed staff members finally arranged a meeting to “discuss organizing a staff association of the College” set to take place on March 6, 1975.⁴²⁷ Apparently, this was an idea that had been passed around the staff for quite some time. In fact, Cam Walker was a vocal proponent of the need to organize such a group. A *William and Mary News* article focusing on Cam Walker and the Affirmative Action Committee wrote that “in the area of classified employees she sees the need for a grievance committee to which employees can address problems and questions concerning such subjects as College policy on promotion and hiring, the possibility of taking College courses for credit and the transfer of employees from hourly to permanent status.”⁴²⁸

By early April, “ten of William and Mary’s approximately 600 classified employees” had organized themselves into a steering committee to form the William and Mary Staff Association.⁴²⁹ Two members of this nascent association, Kathleen Mickem, and Dan Coakley, disclosed to the *William and Mary News* that because of “significant dissatisfaction with the Office of Personnel,” an association was being created to serve as a kind of alternative to the paternalistic and bureaucratic Personnel Office.⁴³⁰ Coakley stated that “I don’t think the

⁴²⁵ “Staff to Evaluate Goals at Thursday Meeting,” *William and Mary News*, 3, no. 27, July 22, 1975, 1.

⁴²⁶ Quoted as the introduction to the Staff Association Statement of Aims attached in The William and Mary Staff Association to President Graves, June 24, 1975, Office of the President Thomas A. Graves Records, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴²⁷ “Meeting Scheduled on Staff association,” *William and Mary News*, 3, no. 23, May 4, 1975, 3.

⁴²⁸ “Affirmative Action Head ‘Frustrated’ But notes Some Progress on Campus,” *William and Mary News*, 3, no. 30, April 22, 1975, 7.

⁴²⁹ Pete Hegeman, “Employees form Staff association as alternative to Personnel Office,” *The Flat Hat* 62, no. 26, April 11, 1975, 5.

⁴³⁰ Ibid.

Personnel Office exactly has the best interests of the employees consistently in mind.”⁴³¹

Unsurprisingly, Irving H. Bobitshek, the Director of Personnel, found this position to be completely false and “totally without foundation.”⁴³² This opposition between the staff and the appendages of the administration was not of a fictitious nature; there was a clear and definite antagonism. And though probably created in direct response to the adversarial nature of the Office of Personnel, the Committee was actually intended to confront more pervasive concerns. As Coakley put it, “the main issue isn’t one current, particular problem . . .”⁴³³

On June 24, 1975, the newly created Staff Association, sent a letter to President Graves in the hopes of creating a correspondence and, more importantly, to inform him of the creation, intended functions, and structure, of the Association. They included a Statement of Aims that was “adopted by a poll vote of 199 from 248 responses”⁴³⁴ and noted that a Committee was currently drafting the bylaws (See Appendix B).⁴³⁵ In reply to Graves’ tepid and rather vague response, the Association immediately sent yet another letter to the President, including the recently-completed bylaws, and inviting him to a July 2 meeting in Millington Auditorium.⁴³⁶ The bylaws were rather mundane and legalistic, but the Long-Term Goals attached at the very end of the document have considerable value:

- 1.) A college-wide, parent controlled Day Care center
- 2.) Infirmary privileges for staff (and their families)

⁴³¹ Ibid.

⁴³² Ibid.

⁴³³ Ibid.

⁴³⁴ The William and Mary Staff Association to President Graves, June 24, 1975.

⁴³⁵ To be more precise, the breakdown was “198 for, 23 against and 28 undecided” as cited in “Staff to Evaluate Goals at Thursday Meeting,” *William and Mary News*, 3, no. 27, July 22, 1975, 1.

⁴³⁶ The William and Mary Staff Association to President Graves, June 30, 1975.

- 3.) Broadened Education opportunities for staff: class at reduced tuition (or free) for credit or for audit, on-the-job training, etc. to aid staff in upward mobility
- 4.) Investigation of employee benefits – Blue Cross-Blue shield, Virginia supplemental retirement system, etc., calling attention to those areas of the Virginia Personnel Act which may need updating
- 5.) Participation the the [sic] discussion of budget decisions which directly affect staff – lay-offs, staff reduction, etc.⁴³⁷

Copies of the proposed bylaws were “sent to each office on campus” and the Staff Association made “plans to solicit official college recognition; permission for membership meetings during working hours; use of College facilities for association business; and association selection of staff members to college wide committees and the President’s Advisory Council.”⁴³⁸ Unfortunately, but again, expectedly, the exact history of this group is buried away: aside from its birth pangs, there are almost no records of its existence. For the most part, it seemed to simply fizzle out. However, it has been identified as the “fore runner” to the Hourly And Classified Employees (HACE) a very stable, institutionalized organization that was founded in 1986 and continues to exist, though largely as a social organization.⁴³⁹ They describe their mission as “an organization through which hourly and classified employees [can] work toward common objectives by encouraging and supporting each other in their efforts to enhance their professional

⁴³⁷ The William and Mary Staff Association to President Graves, June 30, 1975.

⁴³⁸ “Staff to Evaluate Goals at Thursday Meeting,” 1.

⁴³⁹ “Staff Association of the College of William and Mary Biographical/Historical Note,” Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary, <http://src.swem.wm.edu/search.php?creatorid=1833> (accessed 29 November, 2007).

growth and development.”⁴⁴⁰

Trying to delineate the origins, content, and vicissitudes of a labor movement at the College of William and Mary is a daunting and almost impossible task. To begin with, unlike the easily spectacularized actions of the students, much of the activities of the staff have gone unnoticed and unrecorded. For example, Susan Godson’s history of the College includes a section on activism at the College during this period, but she writes absolutely nothing about the efforts of the staff; in her account, the Grievance Committee is completely obliterated from history. As a result of these – perhaps unintentional – obstacles, attempting to reconstruct this lost history is somewhat like embarking on an archeological expedition. Nonetheless, this buried narrative can be uncovered, though it necessarily involves contextualizing it first. The historical period in question, the 1960s and early 1970s at the College of William and Mary, was incontrovertibly a period of turmoil, transformation, idealistic dreams, and practical actions. A student and faculty led movement criticized, through both theory and practice, a whole set of interrelated issues: College policies, the war in Vietnam, drug use, civil rights, etc. In fact, the CIA itself perceived the movement at the College as constituting a dangerous threat and even launched its own operation to retaliate: Project Resistance. According to a government file received by *The Flat Hat* through the Freedom of Information Act, “the Central Intelligence Agency conducted a covert information-gathering operation on the William and Mary campus in the late 1960s and early 1970s.”⁴⁴¹ The report estimated that approximately “ten professors and less than 200 students” made up a dangerous radical population – though no names were released, most

⁴⁴⁰ HACE: Hourly and Classified Employees, “HACE Home,” The College of William and Mary, <http://www.wm.edu/hace/> (accessed 29, November 2007).

⁴⁴¹ Jennifer McBride, “The CIA on Campus: 1969 – 1971: File Reveals ‘Project Resistance’ Operation at W&M,” *The Flat Hat* 69, no. 25, April 18, 1980, 1, 2.

suspect that Crapol and Jones were among the ten.⁴⁴² Shockingly, the CIA informant, who may have been an assistant dean or even a dean, “concluded his April 1970 analysis by predicting that ‘the College of William and Mary will undergo severe ferment and disorder in the coming year regardless of the national scene because the radical elements control most student functions.’”⁴⁴³ At one point during this period, Jones “suspected that his phone was tapped and that his mail was being opened.”⁴⁴⁴ Even more astounding, at one draft counseling session, a “man dressed in a grey suit – with a pair of handcuffs partially hanging out of his pocket,” showed up and “sat in the back row. When asked to identify himself, the man neither spoke nor moved.”⁴⁴⁵

When examined from this perspective, it should come as no surprise that during this era of visible confrontation and struggle, labor – or to be more specific, the staff – also agitated for qualitative changes. Though its precise origins are impossible to locate, a veritable staff movement did in fact begin to take shape during this time. Its causes were certainly multifarious, both local and national in nature. On the one hand it is very likely that the staff was responding to national events – the late 1960s, the period when the staff movement truly began to constitute itself, was, on the national scale, a period of intense conflict and direct action. The College, although somewhat disconnected both geographically and temporally, did not exist in its own closed universe and therefore, must have been somehow affected by national and perhaps even international events. On the other hand, local developments also played an essential role as the boisterous student/faculty movement, though not focusing directly on labor concerns, probably helped to stimulate the creation of the staff movement.

⁴⁴² Ibid.

⁴⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid.

Putting aside the question of causation, in the end, two different, but still connected movements emerged: a student/faculty movement and a staff movement. These two movements should be regarded as distinct because few if any individuals were involved in both movements. For example, Crapol, an extraordinarily involved activist, recalls nothing about either the Grievance Committee of 1969 or of the Staff Association of 1975.⁴⁴⁶ Granted the composition of the Grievance Committee resembled that of a union of various elements – faculty (Laura Rhyne), notable members of the community (Reverend James Tabb), and possibly even some students (Marshall Emm) – it still was markedly separate from the student/faculty movement as almost none of those who participated in the Committee belonged to this other movement. However, these two movements, though in some senses distinct, should still be regarded as two lines within one coherent totality because both agitated for similar goals, but only did so in different spheres. Both fought for a change in social conditions, for the further development of integration, for increased decision-making powers in the operation of the College, etc. In a sense, their existence was like the parallel movement of two ships journeying through a chaotic storm, both heading in the same direction, sailing in similar fashions, but relatively unaware of each other's presence.

Though there was a labor movement at the College, cataloguing its exact contents is problematic. One can attempt to reconstruct a kind of theological narrative founded on the forms of the movement, thereby focusing on the three staff organizations: the Grievance Committee of 1969, the Staff Association of 1975, and HACE, formed in 1986. If one takes this approach then a clear pattern emerges, namely, the fact that the organizations became progressively less militant and spontaneous and more institutionalized and bureaucratic – while the Grievance Committee at one point discussed the possibility of a strike, HACE, the current staff association, is a static

⁴⁴⁶ Crapol, interview.

institution, that, operating in the vein of a company union, can do no more than hold annual luncheons, arrange irrelevant speeches, and hand out hollow awards.

This historicization is faulty, however, because it conflates the staff movement with the organizations of the staff movement. In reality, because workers struggles are frequently autonomous, regularly extending beyond the confines of organizations, documenting the labor movement at the College of William and Mary solely in regards to workers' organizations will inevitably result in an incomplete account. What constitutes a movement is not necessarily the individual organizations involved, but the sense of continuity in the efforts of the particular group in question. Thus, realizing that there was no discontinuity between the disbanding of the Grievance Committee of 1969 and the creation of a Staff Association of 1975 allows us to see how the efforts of the staff were part of a movement. It was not as if workers simply gave up after 1969, discontent abruptly ceased, everything returned to normal, and then magically, one mysterious day six years later they grew irate again. Rather, and as the efforts to unionize in 1972 demonstrate, during the years between the existence of these two organizations, there was still agitation, still dissatisfaction, still discussion, and therefore, still resistance. The movement did not vanish, it simply adopted a different set of tactics, tactics that went unreported and were therefore erased from history. The conditions at the College in the early seventies had been only nominally altered and so workers still remained critical of the College throughout the period. From this, it is clear that there was a continuous and coherent, albeit mild and relatively inarticulate, labor movement at the College of William and Mary, but it was fluid-like, travelling like an undulating wave: at times it reached an apex and tried to democratically organize itself, other times it chose to remain submerged and latent. When it transformed itself into an

underlying force, it went undocumented, when it raised its head and manifested itself in a potential organizational form, it was acknowledged and reported.

Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action

Interest in integration and affirmative action exploded across the nation during the 1960s and 1970s. While the debate echoed through the campus of the College of William and Mary, an entirely white and predominantly older generation of senior administrators fumbled in their attempts to reconcile new, federally-mandated, affirmative action policies with the College's conservative traditions. By 1974, the College's Affirmative Action Advisory Committee (AAAC) and Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women (AHCSW) were involved in heated discussions with the College's administration on issues from gender-based pay discrepancies to a nationally publicized scandal over their refusal to hire a black law professor.⁴⁴⁷ Responding largely to "initiatives welling up to the top from below," the administration took slow steps toward equal opportunity employment.⁴⁴⁸ Carol Sherman, chairman of both the AAAC and AHCSW in 1974, blamed the administration for not making affirmative action a priority and for relying on her committees for progressive policy ideas. Jerry Van Voorhis, the administrator in charge of affirmative action at the time, agreed that "...the suggestions and the initiations should be coming from the administration, and should be our ideas rather than ideas that are put to us." Those with the power to implement policy at the College had little interest in using it to promote affirmative action, and those with the interest had far too little "clout" to make the changes

⁴⁴⁷ "'Professor's Hiring Is Backed in Va.," *Washington Post*, May 17, 1974; Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, "Report for the 1973-74 Academic Year," June 10, 1974, "Affirmative Action Advisory Committee," University Archives Committees Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary (hereafter cited as AAAC Report, 1973-74).

⁴⁴⁸ AAAC Report, 1973-74, 2.

occur.⁴⁴⁹ Any steps that the administration took occurred at the last possible moment, when outside pressure or an impending deadline made reforms absolutely necessary.

The integration of College staff began during the last few years of Davis Y. Paschall's presidency, which lasted from 1960 to 1971.⁴⁵⁰ In 1970, the Department of Housing, Education and Welfare conducted a review of William and Mary's Equal Opportunity Employment Plan which included an analysis of the extent to which jobs on campus were integrated and detailed the areas in which the College was falling short in its commitment to Equal Opportunity Employment. The review found that there were no minorities serving as "Officials and Managers," "Professionals" or "Technicians" and "97% of all minority employees [were] in the three lowest occupational categories." The review listed several criticisms of the College's Equal Employment Opportunity plan. Citing the aforementioned statistics, HEW recommended "improved minority placement in the different categories" and pointed out the need for:

- a specific EEO policy for the College
- established goals for EEO hiring and a system for racially identifying applicants
- an administrative position explicitly committed to equal opportunity
- a procedure for monitoring the implementation of affirmative action policies throughout the departments
- the College's EEO policy to be better publicized "internally and externally"
- sufficient training for employees to advance

⁴⁴⁹ Jerry Van Voorhis to Thomas A. Graves, "Affirmative Action Conference," March 1, 1974, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary (hereafter Voorhis, "Affirmative Action Conference").

⁴⁵⁰ According to AAAC Chairman Cam Walker, Paschall was well-known in Virginia for his role in Massive Resistance as Virginia's Superintendent of Education. Interview with Cam Walker, interviewed by Maggie McDonald, Williamsburg, VA, November 5, 2007, transcribed by Maggie McDonlad, transcript, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

- consistent use of employment tests (inconsistent use of tests at the College was at risk of causing “inequities” in hiring.)⁴⁵¹

Paschall’s response to HEW’s review of the College included commitments to hire more minorities to upper-level positions and develop the College’s own EEO policy. He also informed HEW that “The Supervisor of Personnel will immediately and officially be designated as “Equal Opportunity Officer” who would be responsible for addressing the other problems pointed out by the review. Paschall also included goals for hiring 21 new black employees in the following year, in Managerial, Professional, Technical, Clerical, Craftsmen and Semi-Skilled positions. However, no plan for accomplishing these hiring goals was articulated.⁴⁵²

President Thomas A. Graves took office a year after HEW’s review. Soon after his arrival, he formed the AHCSW and AAAC, which set to work analyzing where women and minorities were represented on staff and what actions could be taken to improve the status of these employees. While the formation of these committees was ‘a step in the right direction’, by 1973 neither the state nor the College had formed a comprehensive affirmative action plan. On January 1, 1973, Governor Linwood Holton issued Executive Order Number 29 and for the first time, Virginia made a commitment to “maintain and promote equal employment opportunity.”⁴⁵³ Though the intent of the Order was clear, it amounted to little. Regarding faculty and staff, HEW criticized the state plan as “lack[ing] sufficient specificity as to the processes which will be used to effect this desegregation” and stated the need for numerical goals and recruitment program to

⁴⁵¹ John L. Hodgson of the Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare to Davis Y. Paschall, June 17, 1970, Office of the President, Davis Y. Paschall Records, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁵² Davis Y. Paschall to John L. Hodgson, June 18, 1970, Office of the President, Davis Y. Paschall Records, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, of William and Mary.

⁴⁵³ Office of the Governor, “Op. No. 05-094,” February 24, 2006, <http://www.oag.state.va.us/OPINIONS/2006opns/05-094w.pdf> (accessed December 1, 2007).

encourage non-traditional applicants.⁴⁵⁴ Without any law behind it and with no method of enforcement within it, the Order was largely ignored. As the year came to a close, the College's administration continued to evade commitments to any real affirmative action plan.⁴⁵⁵

The AAAC and AHCSW had emerged as staunch advocates for affirmative action on campus around 1973. Both committees were composed of faculty, staff, and students, and made recommendations to the administration, but had no power to implement policy changes. They attacked many pertinent issues, including a general lack of regard for the classified staff on the part of the administration, a cumbersome grievance procedure, a lack of childcare facilities for College employees, and inadequate methods of recruiting a more diverse faculty, staff, and student body.⁴⁵⁶

The AHSCW issued its report in May 1973, which found women and minorities disproportionately clustered in the lowest paying jobs. In the 1972-73 school year, 72% of minority employees were custodial workers and every custodial worker was non-white.⁴⁵⁷ The most integrated position appeared to be that of "Clerk" for minority men and "Clerk Typist" and "Accounting Machine Operator" for minority women. Interestingly, the AHSCW noted a climate of fear among women, with "a specifically expressed fear about the loss of one's job. Several

⁴⁵⁴ Peter E. Holmes to Lindwood Holton, November 1973, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁵⁵ Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women, "Statement Relative to Official Memoranda of 11/9/73 and 11/16/73," January 17, 1974, "Affirmative Action Advisory Committee," University Archives Committees Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary (hereafter cited as Statement Relative to Official Memoranda, AHCSW); Jerry Van Voorhis to Thomas A. Graves, "Minority Recruitment and Enrollment," December 11, 1973, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁵⁶ AAAC Report, 1973-74.

⁴⁵⁷ The Study on the Status of Women contains significant data on the race, sex, and pay of classified employees and faculty for the year 1972-1973 that deserves further attention but is beyond the scope of this study. "Classified Employees by Classification, College of William and Mary: Analysis of Job Classification 1972-73", Study on the Status of Women, March 14, 1973, "Committee on the Status of Women," University Archives Committees Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

direct references to this were expressed by secretaries at the time members of the College community were being interviewed for the make-up of this Committee... it is the feeling of the Committee that such is more the rule than the exception within the classified staff.” The AHCSW recommended the formation of a grievance committee to alleviate this problem.⁴⁵⁸ Early 1974, the AHCSW issued a memo to the President pointing out the lack of action around its recommendations. The memoranda also urged action on a day care center for student, faculty and staff use and stated generally that “in more than a year, virtually no progress has been made” in regards to their recommendations.⁴⁵⁹

The AHCSW’s frustration at a lack of administrative initiative was mirrored in the AAAC’s first report in June of 1974. Regarding staff, the AAAC again mirrored the AHCSW’s in stressing the need for a better grievance procedure. The AAAC criticized the grievance procedure available to classified employees as “inadequate” and “complicated.” It also advised that “the College take immediate administrative action to diversify the virtually all-female clerical-stenographic staff and virtually all minority custodial staff,” but offered no plan for doing so.⁴⁶⁰

Although the AAAC was frustrated with the administration, it praised several actions taken by the College in regards to classified staff. An employee handbook was distributed and “Revised College-wide committee appointments for 1973-74 include[d] classified employees on a number of committees.” Changes in policy made it so that staff was regularly informed of how

⁴⁵⁸ The Status Of Women at the College of William and Mary: A Report Submitted to the President of the College of William and Mary by the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women, May 1, 1973, “The Committee on the Status of Women,” University Archives Committees Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁵⁹ Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, “Report for the 1973-74 Academic Year,” June 10, 1974, “Affirmative Action Advisory Committee,” University Archives Committees Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid.

much leave they had, made it easier for staff to change positions on campus, and held supervisors accountable to staff regarding service ratings. Also this year, plans were made for a literacy program focused on giving more mobility to illiterate College employees and “the possibility of establishing a daycare center for children of College employees, faculty and students [began to be] explored.”⁴⁶¹

These concessions were not the pattern, however. Until the Virginia Plan for Equal Employment in Higher Education forced the College to take concrete steps towards affirmative action, the recommendations given by the AAAC and AHCSW were not taken as seriously.⁴⁶² The college administration always spoke in favor of affirmative action, but put no policies, deadlines, or goals into place. The college administration always spoke in favor of affirmative action, but put no policies, deadlines, or goals into place, occasionally explicitly delaying action. For example George Healy, Vice President for Academic Affairs, spoke against the creation of an Affirmative Action Office until the law explicitly demanded it. However, when the AAAC threatened to disband in their 1974 Report, stating that they had been “ineffective” in part because of the lack of a full-time Affirmative Action Office to implement their recommendations, President Graves met with them and promised to create the position of Affirmative Action Coordinator.⁴⁶³ Wesley Wilson was appointed to this post, and spent half his time working on affirmative action.⁴⁶⁴ Up until this point, Jerry Van Voorhis had dedicated only 20% of his time to the cause, and the administration had fallen under the scrutiny of the AHCSW

⁴⁶¹ Ibid.

⁴⁶² W&M segment of VAEOP Plan

⁴⁶³ AAAC Report, 1973-74.

⁴⁶⁴ AAAC Report, 1974-75.

for putting an established white administrator in charge of affirmative action cases.⁴⁶⁵

The Virginia Plan for Equal Employment Opportunity stemmed from Governor Mills Godwin's Executive Order Number 1, issued in 1974. The Executive Order followed Holton's precedent, but finally backed up the lofty ideals of the Orders. The Virginia Plan laid out the fundamentals of what institutions of higher learning should strive for in terms of affirmative action and equal employment opportunity. It finally provided a rough outline for the College, and required them to draft some type of Affirmative Action Plan. In July 1974, the Board of Visitors formally adopted the Plan, although it implemented no policy changes until September. Although the Virginia Plan was generally weak, it did spur the administration to action. Following the issue of the Virginia Plan, President Graves met several of the AAAC's demands in 1974, enough to convince the AAAC that it should continue to exist for at least another year. The AAAC report for 1974-1975 stated that the college had made "some progress in guaranteeing equal opportunity and equal treatment of all members of the campus community." In addition to the creation of two new positions – Affirmative Action Coordinator and Director of Minority Student Affairs – the College also established an adult-skills program for staff, used "more detailed listings in the William and Mary News," and issued salary adjustments for 29 female faculty members.⁴⁶⁶

Also in this year, Graves sent Van Voorhis to the Affirmative Action conference in D.C.

⁴⁶⁵ "W&M 'Inaction' On Affirmative Action Charged," *Daily Press*, Newport News, VA, July 16, 1974; "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary; Statement Relative to Official Memoranda, AHCSW.

⁴⁶⁶ "The William and Mary Segment of the 'Virginia Plan for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education: A Shared Responsibility'," September 1974, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library (hereafter cited as William and Mary Segment of the Virginia Plan); Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, Report of the Affirmative Action Advisory Committee for the 1974-75 Academic Year, June 19, 1975, "Affirmative Action Advisory Committee," University Archives Committees Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary (hereafter cited as AAAC Report, 1974-75).

In his report, Van Voorhis warned against the creation of a “superbureaucracy,” advising “decentralization... over centralization,” but stated the importance of having “someone within the institution have major direct responsibility for Affirmative Action” with enough authority in that position to enforce change. Voorhis also stressed the importance of a committed administration, echoing the concerns of AAAC Chairman Carol Sherman.⁴⁶⁷

While these gains were a definite step forward, an AHCSW statement issued in early 1974 demonstrates the continued tension between the administration and the committees. Responding to two official memoranda – one by the Personnel Office and one by the Vice President of Academic Affairs – the committee boldly criticized the administration’s outright dismissal of several of their recommendations. For example, when they suggested the creation of a grievance committee, the administration replied that Rule 14 of the Virginia Personnel Act already provided “an excellent grievance procedure” which was available to all employees at the College Personnel Office. The AHCSW responded that Rule 14 provided a cumbersome grievance procedure which was impossible for many employees, particularly members of the classified staff, to comprehend and utilize. Not only that, but staff did not know what the grievance procedure was because there was only one copy of the Virginia Personnel Act available at the Personnel Office.⁴⁶⁸

The AAAC also worked toward the improvement of the grievance structure. With equal frustration, their 1975-76 AAAC report stated, “Although the College has implemented most of the 1973 and 1974 recommendations, it has... ignored some of the more important ones.” The

⁴⁶⁷ Jerry Van Voorhis to Thomas A. Graves, “Affirmative Action Conference,” March 1, 1974, “Affirmative Action,” University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁶⁸ Statement Relative to Official Memoranda, AHCSW; Official Memoranda by Personnel Office, *William and Mary News*, November 13, 1973.

AAAC urged that the administration work closely with the William and Mary Staff Association, continue to recognize long-time employees, add classified staff to the Long-Range Planning Committee, “offer more in-service training and greater educational opportunities to members of the classified staff,” and support the amendment of the Virginia Personnel Act to, “encourage greater upward mobility among state employees.”⁴⁶⁹ In a *William and Mary News* article in the Spring of 1975, AAAC Chairman Cam Walker stressed the “need for a grievance committee to which employees can address problems and questions.” She hoped that if the Staff Council was organized, it would, “provide a useful forum for many of the questions employees now bring to the Affirmative Action Committee.”⁴⁷⁰

Other recommendations were also ignored by the administration. Both committees continued to recommend that the College found a daycare center for the children of employees and children. While George Healy claimed that he would help investigate “the feasibility of such a project,” this continued to be a low priority to the administration and a very high priority for female faculty and staff.

Pam Savage is a prime example of this disconnect between the administration’s priorities and the needs of the faculty and staff. Savage worked in the Cataloguing Department at Swem Library as a member of the clerical staff. In September 1974, she submitted her resignation, stating her sole reason as “financial pressure due to the cost of good child care for my children”. She had discussed her difficulties with both her superiors in the Cataloguing Department and

⁴⁶⁹ Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, “Report for the 1975-76 Academic Year.”

⁴⁷⁰ ‘Affirmative Action Head ‘frustrated’ But notes some Progress on Campus,” *William and Mary News*, Vol III no. 30 April 22, 1975.

with College administrators. Her resignation could not have been unexpected.⁴⁷¹ Her frustration with the administration's lack of regard for her was apparent in a letter to Jerry Van Voorhis where she stated, "Once Mr. Robitshek [the personnel supervisor] said to me that women in the College of William and Mary have no problem with babysitters. 'They make arrangements before they come to work.'"⁴⁷² This statement and Savage's experience highlight the College's misguided approach to affirmative action. Too often the administration simply disregarded the needs and complaints of the staff, particularly minorities and women.

Savage's hope that the College would someday provide free child care for its employees proved farfetched. In December 1975, the College was no closer to funding a day-care center, let alone a free one. Although a plan for a center was proposed and reviewed in 1974, President Graves said that implementation was impossible due to "budgetary considerations." At the end of that year, with no change in these "considerations," William and Mary was further than ever from opening a day-care center. The administration attempted to justify its inaction and stated, "It should be noted that several Day Care Centers do currently exist in the Williamsburg area for eligible children."⁴⁷³ But the College administration missed the entire issue. Child-care was always available, but at exorbitant rates and inconvenient locations. The responsibility of finding reliable day-care fell to women, and added yet another hurdle for female employees to leap before they could even enter the workplace.

Other administrative efforts also fell flat. The College of William and Mary attempted to

⁴⁷¹ Pam Savage to Mary Lou Cobb, September 11, 1974, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁷² Pam Savage to Jerry Van Voorhis, September 13, 1974, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁷³ William J. Carter to Wesley C. Wilson, Report of actions taken on certain of the recommendations made by the 1974-75 Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, December 30, 1975, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary (hereafter Carter Report, 1975).

diversify its faculty during this period. It was generally able to attract female faculty, but its successes fell short when it came to drawing in black professors. The situation reached its low point in 1974. In that year all black faculty candidates rejected the school's offers, except for Jeroyd X. Greene who was a controversial Richmond lawyer. As a Black Muslim, he represented many cases with radical arguments that offended the conservative sensibilities of many white Virginians. According to Greene, he had received a "binding" job offer from President Graves. Shortly afterward, State Senator George Willey threatened to slash the school's state funding if it gave Greene the job. When the William and Mary Board of Visitors met they voted not to offer Greene a contract, citing improper professional conduct. The Board's decision drew media attention, and many students and faculty members issued official statements condemning it. The controversy reinforced the College's reputation as an institution that did little to encourage diversification. The backlash against the school's decision may have been one of the factors that led to the administration's sudden interest in affirmative action. President Graves's promise to create the position of Affirmative Action Coordinator came within a month of the uproar over Greene's rejection.⁴⁷⁴

Though the Greene scandal should have been a wakeup call for the administration, the recruitment of minorities to the faculty continued to make little progress. As of May 1975 the College still had no comprehensive plan for equal opportunity employee recruitment. This was not merely negligent, but against federal law. In October 1972, Executive Order 11246 stated that every college and university "must make an explicit statement of its commitment to equal

⁴⁷⁴ Helen Dewar, "Black Lawyer Rejected: Va. College Appointment Not Offered," *Washington Post*, May 19, 1974; AAAC Report, 1973-74.

employment opportunity in all recruiting announcements and advertisements.”⁴⁷⁵ In general, the College followed Virginia state law over federal law, having decided early on that affirmative action was best implemented through “decentralization”.⁴⁷⁶ Since the Virginia Plan set few real deadlines and was generally viewed as “goal-less,” the decision to enact only its requirements slowed progress even further.⁴⁷⁷

The AAAC called this to the attention of the administration in June 1975. In November 1975, Wesley Wilson finally fulfilled the requirements of Executive Order 11246, but in response to changes in Virginia state law. His actions were a definite step toward fair and open hiring practices, but came a full three years after federal law demanded them. The new policy required that a current list of faculty and administrative vacancies be on file at all times, and vacancies in all departments were to be reported to the AA/EEO office, “to discuss the most effective and economical methods of complying with affirmative action guidelines on recruiting and hiring.”

⁴⁷⁸ In regards to recruitment, Wilson acknowledged that, “Since employment opportunities in the past have been restrictive to women and minorities, it is reasonable to assume that many sought employment elsewhere. It is, therefore, necessary to recruit outside the disciplines and through media never before utilized.” The guide states that in all job listings, the College should state its position as an AA/EEO employer. This document also included procedures for maintaining files on “ethnic, sex and age” make-up of applicants.⁴⁷⁹

It introduced a “Dial-a-Job” telephone service to provide information on all jobs currently

⁴⁷⁵ AAAC Report, 1974-75, 2.

⁴⁷⁶ Voorhis, “Affirmative Action Conference”.

⁴⁷⁷ AAAC Report, 1974-75.

⁴⁷⁸ Wesley Wilson to College Officials, November 5, 1975, “Affirmative Action,” University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁷⁹ Wesley C. Wilson, “Affirmative Action Guide,” 1975, “Affirmative Action,” University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

available at the College by calling a local number. Previously, prospective employees (especially classified staff) often received jobs through connections, such as relatives. The College referred to this informal process as “the traditional method,” and promoted the institution of handouts and the Dial-a-Phone service as ways of complying with the Governor’s Executive Order Number One.⁴⁸⁰ Wilson also compiled a list of places to post vacancies which included special interest groups such as Alpha Kappa Alpha (an African American fraternity), the National Urban League, the National Council of Negro Women, and the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.⁴⁸¹

These steps are some of the only evidence of the College’s somewhat more active effort to change the demographic makeup of its faculty and staff. The AAAC and others feared that without a shift in the racial profile of the faculty, the racial profile of the students was unlikely to change.⁴⁸² Although these efforts did help, they were not enough to make very significant headway. The committees continued to push, but it was an uphill battle. Cam Walker said, “It is clear by ’75 that the national tide is receding and that there’s not going to be as much pressure from Washington. So, then we were quite worried that if we didn’t keep pressing the College would just slip back.”⁴⁸³ These fears were not unfounded. The College moved listlessly forward, but even into the 1980s, the campus was seen as “overwhelmingly white”. As late as 1982, the AAAC claimed that the College had done little more than talk about the hiring of more minority

⁴⁸⁰ Interview with Edwin and Janet Davis, Ben Bromley and Caroline Murray, Williamsburg, VA, November 8, 2007, in the author’s possession; William and Mary Segment of the Virginia Plan.

⁴⁸¹ Wesley C. Wilson, Recommended Vacancy Posting List, December 1975, “Affirmative Action,” University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁸² AAAC Report, 1974-75, 3.

⁴⁸³ Walker, interview.

faculty.⁴⁸⁴

Yet in all of the efforts made by the College, the classified staff was often ignored entirely. The AAAC and AHCSW both made recommendations concerning the classified staff during these years, but their suggestions were rarely realized. The grievance policy, for example, remained unrevised and unnavigable for anyone without a high level of education. While faculty could work their way through the system, it was rare that a staff member would tackle the process successfully. Kathleen Graverson, a secretary in the Department of Economics, was a rare exception. She managed to lodge a complaint concerning the Virginia Unemployment Compensation Code that made its way to Richmond in October 1973. Graverson's husband had decided to begin attending William and Mary. Due to a section of the Code, Virginia law considered her job to be financial aid for her husband and Graverson was asked to waive her unemployment compensation. The rationale behind the law was that "spouse" (that is, the classified employee) would in most cases quit work upon her husband's graduation, relocate, and then attempt to collect unemployment compensation when she was unable to find a new job. Graverson asserted that "in this instance, spouse is simply a euphemism for wife."⁴⁸⁵

According to this law, nothing would change about Graverson's employment, except the removal of her right to unemployment compensation due to her husband's status as a student. Graverson's appeal that this section was implicitly sexist was answered by the Virginia Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinator, who found that it "applies to male and female spouses alike." In cases like this sexism was difficult to attack, because it lay not in the law itself but in

⁴⁸⁴ William Matthews, "College Is Categorized As Overwhelmingly White," *Daily Press*, Newport News, VA, February 2, 1982, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁸⁵ Kathleen Graverson to Gilman Roberts, October 5, 1973, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

its enforcement and application. Graverson made the point that this law should just as easily apply to male faculty whose wives took classes at the same university. The College of William and Mary was not to blame for the shortcomings of Virginia's legal code, but it was to blame for spotty enforcement.⁴⁸⁶

At the same time, the College did make some strides in the mid-seventies. Working conditions for some women and minority workers certainly improved. In 1974 for example, Eileen Donald, a black female employee hired as a Clerk Typist in 1973, was approached by her boss with an offer to receive new training that would result in a higher pay grade.⁴⁸⁷ Donald was (and continues to be) the only black employee in her office. While it is difficult to measure the frequency of Affirmative Action efforts such as offering training to advance minority employees, this occurrence indicates that at least in some departments, managers were acting with an Affirmative Action approach. Donald also recalls many awards and other recognitions, a reflection of an effort made by the College's administration to show appreciation for staff members. However, Donald concurred with what the AAAC reports continually showed: staff awards and recognition did not coincide with better pay or more respect in the workplace.⁴⁸⁸

One of the College's successes was the development of an adult skills program which aimed at increasing literacy among the staff, many of whom had never finished high school. The administration emphasized this program in a 1974 report. Despite overwhelming support from its attendees and the student volunteers who helped run it, the program constantly struggled to

⁴⁸⁶ David K McCloud to Carol Sherman, January 22, 1974, "Affirmative Action," University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁸⁷ Interview with Eileen Donald (assumed name for a William and Mary employee), interviewed by Cherie Seise and Constance Sisk, Williamsburg, VA, November 3, 2007, transcribed by Cherie Seise and Constance Sisk, transcript, , Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary. Unfortunately, the interviewee's department and job details cannot be disclosed due to potential legal ramifications.

⁴⁸⁸ Donald, interview.

maintain its funding.

The adult skills program, even in its unstable state, was one of the only improvements made for classified workers. Far more often, the College demonstrated a complete lack of consideration for the classified workers, masking this with superficial gestures of goodwill. In 1975 the AAAC also called on the College to “display greater concern” for classified staff. In response the administration began to recognize and thank employees for their years of dedication through the William and Mary News, and handed out two free tickets to each classified employee on a few designated “Employees’ Nights” during the basketball season. These workers received little more than tokens of gratitude from the administration. With these displays the administration could evade any real commitment to improving the pay, benefits or working conditions of their classified employees.⁴⁸⁹

In the second half of the decade, recruitment and employment practices changed but racial segregation of the workforce remained basically unchanged. The June 1975 update on the College’s Affirmative Action Plan showed both the College’s progress on plans made to execute affirmative action and its failures at actually diversifying staff. By this time, the College had developed a faculty and staff search committee handbook to aid in the recruitment of minority job applicants, was continuing to work in “[c]oordination with local minority civic, social and professional organizations... in order that they might assist in recruitment of minority graduates and undergraduates to Faculty and Staff” and had launched the Adult Skills Program in May. The update also included data on the number of “Full Time Permanent Employees as of January, 1975.” This data showed that there were only two black personnel in

⁴⁸⁹ Carter Report, 1975.

“Executive/Managerial/Administrative” positions, with 93% of minority applicants in “Non-Professional” jobs. During this same year, no minority full-time permanent employees were promoted, while 48 white employees were. Data for job applicants for the 76-77 school year were similarly dismal. Of 947 applicants, only 47—less than 5%--were minority applicants.⁴⁹⁰

In October 1977, the Chairman of the AAAC sent a letter to Graves regarding complaints about management-employee relations. The letter outlined points which might help the situation including that “employees should be informed of their rights,” and might “form their own organization... [to] represent such employees to management. The Chairman also suggested a State Management Division Training Series (MDTS) and “once monthly meetings... at which members of the classified staff and management could air their ideas.” The final recommendation was the hiring of an ombudsperson who “could dispassionately hear employee-management grievances.”⁴⁹¹

In July 1978, the AAAC issued another yearly report. Here, the AAAC praised the establishment of “a tuition-waiver program.” It also stated its support for the Adult Skills Program, which was at risk of losing its funding the coming year. The AAAC reported that it had “directed its attention to management-employee relations at the College which appear to have deteriorated, especially with regard to classified employees.” The recommended the Management Division Training Series “to foster improved communications” and suggested additional measures be taken to improve management-employee communications. The AAAC

⁴⁹⁰ Wesley C. Wilson to James A. McLean, ““Full-Time Permanent Employees as of January, 1975” and “Promotions of Employees from January, 1974 through January 1975” June 18, 1975, “Affirmative Action,” University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁹¹ Satoshi Ito to Thomas A. Graves, October 24, 1977, “Affirmative Action,” University Archives Subject File Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

found that the 1977-78 academic year was another in which, “no minority member was appointed at the administrative or faculty levels.” In its conclusion, the AAAC offered an evaluation much like that which HEW had given to Paschal eight years earlier: “The College must go beyond the spirit of affirmative action... and take more active steps to implement its policy.”⁴⁹²

The College of William and Mary was certainly slow to act in implementing real policies and commitments to support affirmative action, but it was not necessarily malicious in its actions. The slow shift toward diversity created an environment where older administrators suddenly found themselves far from the “lily-white” William and Mary of the 1960s.⁴⁹³ No administration before this period had had to consider and implement policies that would impact such a diverse group of people. Racial, sexual, generational, and class-based gaps between the administration and the staff created a period of misunderstandings and inadequate improvements, which mostly came from the bottom up. The multitude of necessary policy changes left the administration lost and overwhelmed. In a critical letter to President Graves, Jerry Van Voorhis vocalized the largest issues concerning the administration’s inaction. Perhaps the most telling aspect of his letter lays not the criticisms which the reader seems to accept, but in the notes that he or she has scrawled repeatedly in its margins: “OK, so what do we do?”⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹² Affirmative Action Advisory Committee, “Report for the 1977-78 Academic Year,” July 17, 1978, “Affirmative Action Advisory Committee,” University Archives Committees Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

⁴⁹³ Sadler, interview.

⁴⁹⁴ Voorhis, “Affirmative Action Conference.”

Conclusion

The history presented in the above chapters clearly communicates the fact that real changes occurred at the College of William and Mary once marginalized voices began to assert themselves, organize and protest for fundamental structural changes at the College. Though this process was one of incessant struggle - a delicate, though tedious, interplay between agitation from subaltern groups and resistance from the administration - there were definite gains and concrete developments. African-American students petitioned to be accepted into an entirely white institution and formed groups such as the Black Student Organization to consolidate and amplify their efforts; the custodial staff channeled its discontent into a Grievance Committee in 1969 and presented a list of twelve comprehensive grievances to the Administration; Affirmative Action, though perpetually ignored by the College, was forcibly introduced into discussions.

Copious evidence describes the existence of a student and faculty movement, as well as a staff movement at the College. Constructive institutional transformation occurred as a result of both mounting legal pressures and the actions of these two movements. Paradoxically, the oral histories of those who worked at the College during this period all reflect a surprising yet pervasive motif – the fact that nothing really happened and that there was really “no big thing in Williamsburg.”⁴⁹⁵ In regards to the clear antagonism that existed on the campus, factual evidence contradicts claims by almost every interviewee that there was relative calm and that the atmosphere at the College was, for the most part, rather placid. Certainly there was relative calm compared to Ole Miss, Columbia, Berkeley. There was no shooting, no National Guard, no student occupations of buildings, etc. William Winston remembers that there was “no trouble

⁴⁹⁵ William Winston, interview by Kelly Brennan and Sean Walsh, October 4, 2007, digital voice recording, University Archives Oral History Collection, Special Collections Research Center, Earl Gregg Swem Library, College of William and Mary.

there at all,”⁴⁹⁶ Edwin and Janet Davis both say they “enjoyed working there,”⁴⁹⁷ and Rita Jackson has only fond memories, “I mean, I really loved it. I really did.”⁴⁹⁸

As to the actual efforts and actions of staff, students, and faculty, most of those interviewed could remember nothing. Rita Jackson, who began working on campus in the early 1970s, recalls absolutely nothing about any kind of movement or even about the Staff Association of 1975. Winston flatly states that there was “nothing.”⁴⁹⁹ When asked why there was no movement - civil rights or otherwise - Edwin Davis responded, “I never could understand it myself, that there wasn’t a movement at that time.”⁵⁰⁰ This fissure between history and memory is most perplexing as things were obviously not well at the College. There is abundant information confirming that working conditions were poor - so poor that the custodial staff had to organize into a Committee and there were clear and persistent conflicts between the staff and the administration. In response, a movement undoubtedly emerged. However, the general situation improved only slightly (as the 1972 *Flat Hat* articles seem to corroborate). Agitation from below resulted in some public acknowledgement of a handful of groups, but nothing that left a lasting impression on our interview subjects. The central question, however, is why this gap exists between the facts and the interviewees’ perception. Ed Crapol suggests “fear of reprisal” as a possible reason for interviewees’ perception that there were no troubles in Williamsburg. As African American workers socialized in a period of extreme racism and oppression, it is likely that most of the interviewed staff felt uncomfortable expressing their genuine emotions to the interviewers, who were complete strangers. This also explains the predisposition on the part of

⁴⁹⁶ Winston, interview.

⁴⁹⁷ Davis and Davis, interview.

⁴⁹⁸ Jackson, interview.

⁴⁹⁹ Winston, interview.

⁵⁰⁰ Davis and Davis, interview.

most of those interviewed—even retired staff—to remain anonymous; speaking out against the College could result in a host of negative consequences. Additionally, there may have been a residual sense of trying to appease one's superiors. Regardless of the exact reasons, it is very clear that while most of those interviewed emphatically stated that all was well, archival research paints a very different image.

The interviewees also expressed little or no knowledge of campus advocacy organizations or the existence of an actual movement. This is far less difficult to understand. It is possible that only a few individuals were actually involved in these efforts or in the greater movement. This, however, is not supported by the facts. The Grievance Committee achieved approximately 60-70% employee participation. The Staff Association, though initially small, engaged in a huge publicity campaign in which it published meeting announcements in the *William and Mary News*, held several meetings throughout the year, as well as at different times during the day to allow for overlapping staff lunch breaks, and mailed copies of its Statement of Aims and Bylaws to every department at the College. Furthermore, both of these groups received notable coverage in the *Flat Hat*. Thus, it is unlikely these groups went completely unnoticed. Still, the possibility exists that those interviewed were individuals who genuinely did not know about these events, and therefore, did not participate.

Another, more likely, reason for their lack of awareness of any kind of movement in Williamsburg may be because, comparatively speaking, what existed in Williamsburg was relatively different from what existed elsewhere. In other words, perhaps they defined a movement strictly in relation to what they saw in the media (vicious police dogs, sit-ins turned violent, riot police, the Reverend Martin Luther King) and did not consider that movements

manifest themselves differently in different locations. A movement may be explosive and violent in one place in time, and yet in another time and place, such as at the College of William and Mary, it may be calm, apprehensive, and [otherwise unnoticed]. As Rita Jackson noted, “we heard about things.”⁵⁰¹ Thus, the movement was perceived as something that was on television, something that existed elsewhere, but not at the College. Repeated Struggles were not sudden and fiery, but rather gradual, taking much time to materialize. Moreover, the bulk of the battles were fought in the abstract realm of law.

The civil rights amnesia of our interview subjects may also be attributed to the glacial pace of change at the College. We tend to remember momentous changes not small ones. The introduction of new state and national laws often precipitated changes in work opportunities for African Americans. These laws had little impact until administrative forces at the State and College level were “willing” to implement the new legislation. The disinclination of leaders at the College to act on new legislation further slowed the rate of change.

The slow rate of change also contributed to the continuity between 1870 and 1970. Throughout the period examined here, the majority of black workers at the College were engaged in menial labor. By the late 1960’s students and faculty were looking to integrate their ranks, but thought little about the College’s staff. African Americans employed as janitors and food service workers performed the same types of tasks as the slaves owned by the College in the Eighteenth Century. The relegation of black workers to these jobs for over one hundred years was no accident. The “tradition” of racial segregation became a means by which to preserve a status quo where African Americans were disenfranchised and kept at the bottom of the economic ladder with no means for advancement. The Supreme Court’s call for desegregation

⁵⁰¹ Jackson, interview.

“with all deliberate speed” fell on deaf ears as southern resistance intensified. Desegregation threatened the “Southern way of life” and efforts to preserve it extended far beyond the College as the Commonwealth mounted a campaign of “Massive Resistance.” While this campaign focused on avoiding desegregation of the public school system, it also reveals ideas many whites had about racially appropriate opportunities. The difficulty of changing entrenched structures and ideas surrounding segregation was exacerbated by the political and social tensions of the times. For this reason, it is not surprising that black workers experienced little or no chances for career advancement at the College. Progress was made. It was slow and time-consuming, but it was progress nonetheless. You’ll have to give some examples here. I’m hard pressed. Indeed, taken in the greater historical context of the College’s history, the changes in the late 1960s and 1970s were, in fact, relatively groundbreaking. Further research is required to determine whether slow-and-steady change continued into the 1980’s.

This work began as a collaborative research project with the mission to provide a labor history of the College of William Mary during the Civil Rights era. This foundational work though extensive, is not exhaustive. This paper is the first step toward better understanding labor and race relations at the College, while placing it in the broader context of state and national movements. Additional research on women, HACE and the Black Faculty Staff Forum in the 1980s, on the Living Wage Campaign, and on Latino construction workers in recent years would be required to document the complete history of labor at the College. This work is presented in the hope of stimulating constructive discussions about the College’s labor history, and to inspire further research.

Appendix

A.) The Twelve Grievances of the Grievance Committee of Custodians and Maids (1969):

1. Additional maids and janitors should be hired to eliminate excessive work loads for present employees. 5 day work week.
2. Work should be allocated more equitably for various categories of employees; for example:
 - a. An 8-hour maid should have approximately the same work load as other 8-hour maids; A six-hour maid should have the same as other 6-hour maids.
 - b. All 6-hour maids should have proportionately less of a work load than 8-hour maids.
3. There should be established a clear specification of job requirements; and no maid should be required to do work demanding a man's strength such as handling mattresses, heavy scrubbing and climbing high ladders. All supervisors, maids, and janitors, should be fully informed on this point.
4. Employees feel that since their expenses run mainly on a weekly basis, they would like to be paid every other week rather than semi-monthly.
5. Employees should not be required to work on holidays except as a matter of necessity. In such cases, pay should be calculated on the basis of time and a half, and compensatory time off should be at the discretion of the employee.

6. Every employee is entitled to a decent living wage. No employee should be paid less than the minimum wage as determined by law.
7. Supervisors should be given more authority to make decisions in their specific areas of responsibility and should have better access to information.
8. Some channels for communicating complaints and appeals should be established as realistic procedures for the relief of grievances.
9. The maximum time an employee is expected to remain on a temporary basis should be clearly specified and should in any case, not exceed 60 days. This procedure would allow fully adequate time for assessing the performance of the worker.
10. Regular procedures of hiring should be followed rather than the present practice, which gives undue consideration to personal acquaintance. Age requirements should be included in hiring specifications.
11. Determined efforts should be made to hire qualified Negroes in administrative and clerical positions.
12. Every employee should be treated with proper respect; and any tendency to use fresh or abusive language or inappropriate behavior toward an employee should cease immediately.

B.) Body of the Statement of Aims for the Staff Association (1975):

“With the firm belief that all segments of the College Community should have a voice in those policy-making decisions which affect the university as a whole, and further, being committed to

the idea that each group within the College should have a voice in determining those policies which affect them directly, we, the Staff of the College of William and Mary, establish this association.

Name

The organization shall be called the Staff Association of the College of William and Mary in Virginia.

Aims

To provide a forum for discussion and communication of concerns and interests within the staff

To have a voice in the decision-making process of the College in both staff-related concerns and college-wide issues

To work for expanded opportunities and benefits for eligible staff employees

To determine and define the areas of need and concern of staff members, and to communicate these views to the college community as a whole, and to appropriate College officials and committees

To be a source of information on call-Staff related matters: e.g. administrative procedures, employee rights, rules and regulations, governing staff, working conditions, and programs and benefits available to the staff

To inform the staff of all College-wide issues and activities

To foster a sense of community among the staff and with the rest of the College community

To work, as a group with other organizations on matters of concern and need

Membership

All non-faculty, non-administrative employees (both salaried-classified and hourly) of the

College of William and Mary are eligible to participate in the staff association

Bibliography

(Constance should be sending this to you.)