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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Virginia Community College System, a network of 23 two-year public colleges, observed its twentieth anniversary in 1986. During a year-long celebration both community college leaders and other proponents extolled its virtues, from community proximity and low-cost tuition to the "Jeffersonian ideals" of democracy upon which it is said to be founded. In a newspaper feature entitled "College for Everyman," Chamberlain (1986) noted, "Virginia's statewide system of community colleges, which put higher education and lifelong learning within reach of every citizen, was started 20 years ago--just 187 years after Thomas Jefferson proposed the idea."

Community colleges in America have a much longer history than 20 years. The first public two-year colleges, called junior colleges, were initiated at the beginning of the twentieth century. They were called "junior colleges" because they were analogous to the first two years of a senior (four-year) institution. The first continuously operating (public) two-year junior college was established in Joliet, Illinois in 1901. Shortly thereafter California passed legislation (1907) authorizing high schools to offer post-graduate education equivalent to the first two years of college. This was the first state legislation to authorize junior colleges, although no financial support was provided (Vaughan, 1985, p. 4). In 1917 California passed
another significant bill, providing state and county support for junior college students in the same manner as that provided for the organization of independent junior college districts with their own boards, budgets, and operating procedures (Vaughan, 1985, p. 4). California was thus the leader of states in securing legislation which provided for local control, equated the first two years of university work, extended public education to the thirteenth and fourteenth years, and endorsed the concept of having public institutions of higher education available locally (Vaughan, 1985, p. 4). By 1920 public community colleges were also in place in Michigan, Kansas, Iowa, Missouri, and Texas, along with certain state-supported technical institutes and agriculture colleges which later became community colleges (Monroe, 1972, p. 12). While two-year "junior" colleges had their origins in the first half of the twentieth century, most of those institutions were quite different from the "comprehensive community" colleges of today. Most were private, and it was not until 1948 that the public institutions outnumbered the private ones. Since then the public community colleges have taken the lead.

The "community college" movement nationwide began in the late 1940s and early 1950s. Monroe (1972, p. 13) attributes the rapid growth of public community colleges after 1945 to such factors as the burgeoning number of high school graduates, increasing demands of business and industry for technically trained employees, community support, and parents and citizens who aspired to have their children fulfill the dream of a college education, but who were financially
unable to afford it.

Additionally, concerned parents and local civic leaders were supported in their quest for educational access by powerful governmental commissions and educational organizations which made recommendations and supported legislation in behalf of the local community college movement (Monroe, 1972, p. 13). And according to Monroe, one of the most powerful statements to be made in support of community colleges came through President Truman's Commission on Higher Education (1946-47). Included in the Commission's report was the following affirmation: "Equal educational opportunities for all persons, to the maximum of their individual abilities and without regard to economic status, race, creed, color, sex, national origin, or ancestry, is a major goal of American democracy. Only informed, thoughtful, tolerant people can maintain and develop a free society" (Monroe, 1972, p. 14).

From the time of the Truman Commission's stand for equal educational opportunity in 1947, democratization became a recurring topic in community college references. The "open-door" policy took place and became the synonym for the public community college. And from that time through the sixties, the public community college flourished. Over one hundred public two-year institutions evolved between 1947 and 1964.

The 1947 Junior College Directory listed 312 publicly supported junior colleges throughout 48 states. Only seven states had none, and nineteen had more than three. Although the two-year public community college was in general flourishing nationally, the scene in Virginia
followed an exceptional pattern. Virginia had three listings in the 1947 directory, and they were two-year branches of four-year institutions (William and Mary, Virginia State College, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute). The majority of public two-year colleges listed in other states were junior colleges which were independent (not attached to four-year institutions). The 1964 edition of the Junior College Directory cited 419 public junior colleges for 50 states. Again, all listed for Virginia (six) were affiliated with four-year institutions, and it would be two more years before the public community college as we know it today would arrive in Virginia.

In 1966 the Virginia General Assembly finally passed legislation calling for the establishment of a statewide system of public community colleges.

From a nationwide perspective, community colleges were relatively late in coming to Virginia. Yet, when the 1966 General Assembly passed the legislation establishing a state system of public community colleges, it acted in response to educational needs which had long been recognized in the state (Armistead, 1977, p. 7).

Studies had been authorized by the General Assembly dating back to the early years of this century according to both Armistead (1977) and Vaughan (1971). And in 1909, according to Vaughan (1971, pp. 3-4), J.D. Eggleston, Jr., the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, stated that "the great work to be done in this state is not merely to put children to school, but to put all people to school—that is, to put all people, young and old, to studying how to improve community conditions through proper cooperation."
One of the most significant studies to recommend a statewide system of publicly financed two-year comprehensive colleges for Virginia was the 1959 Martorana Study (Vaughan, 1971). In spite of its recommendation, seven years elapsed before the approval of a community college system became a reality in Virginia.

Virginia typically has been classified as a conservative state (tending to oppose change or innovation and favoring traditional values). And the conservatism of Virginia has been identified not only as a political stance, but also as a social code and state of mind (Elliott, 1963, p. 1). Policies favoring low taxes, financial starvation of public services, assumptions of white supremacy, and economy in government have been used to describe Virginia's conservatism (Elliott, 1963, p. 1). And particularly during the era of the "Byrd Machine" (the influence of Democrat Harry F. Byrd, Sr.--governor from 1926 to 1930 and United States Senator from 1933 to 1965), Virginia has been characterized as a state favoring "pay-as-you-go" financial policies as well as an efficient and effective government. Expenditures for education often have been viewed as frivolous.

Virginia has likewise been referred to as a state bound by tradition and elitism. Virginia's conservatism in educational spending has been related to dollars for public education, underscoring its tradition of elitism. The tradition in Virginia in education from its early beginnings has been that only a select few (Virginia "gentlemen") have access to education. And that education, by tradition, emphasized the liberal arts experience based on the
European model.

During the early 1900s two-year institutions equating to the first two years of college study were predominantly public in California and the midwestern states, but the overwhelming majority of Virginia's junior or two-year colleges were private. And the public schools which were first established before the Civil War were found principally in the Northeast states, slowly spreading across the country. Virginia and the South were last. With the planter aristocracy, southern children were either tutored or sent to England according to Bounds (1983) and Heatwole (1916, p. 69).

According to Chamberlain (1986), "Community colleges--or something like them--were part of Thomas Jefferson's dream for a system of public education in Virginia, from the elementary level through college." The principle of free public education, however, did not take place in Virginia until the 1860s, with technical and community colleges coming 100 years later. "Until the community colleges welcomed all with their open-door admissions, higher education in Virginia was considered elitist. There was an apparent tension and ambivalence regarding public education. This conservative approach to public higher education finally resulted in thousands more young Virginians leaving the state to attend college than those coming from other states for higher education in Virginia (Chamberlain, 1986).

Virginia tradition ran counter to the development of a populist educational idea (the public community college). And yet, Virginia finally adopted a community college system with exemplary features. From an opposite perspective, Jefferson's call for public education
through college leads one to expect an earlier start for public community colleges in Virginia. But this did not happen.

On the one hand, it is remarkable that the community college was adopted in Virginia; on the other hand, it is hard to believe that it took so long. Because of Virginia's political and educational history of elitism and conservatism, it should be interesting to identify the events and reasons leading to the development of an extensive community college system in Virginia. This study proposes to inquire into the origins and seek some explanations as to how this history of apparent tension between conservatism and educational programs was resolved in Virginia. It will also seek to discover how the community colleges came to be and whether or not the Virginia traditions of conservatism and elitism were preserved or modified.

**Theoretical Framework**

Nationwide the public community college focus began in the early 1900s. Historians cite several reasons for the initiation of community colleges. Among them always is democratization.

In Virginia, a state noted for its elitism in education, and a state that produced Thomas Jefferson, the public community college was late in coming compared to other states. Yet, in view of its tradition of elitism, it is remarkable that it developed at all. How did the system evolve? And for what reasons?

According to Clark Kerr (Deegan and Tillery, 1985, p. vii), of the two greatest innovations in higher education in the United States, the community college movement of the twentieth century is one (the other being the land-grant movement of the nineteenth century). A
uniquely American enterprise, the community college developed in response to the perceived need to extend the first twelve years of public education to grades thirteen and fourteen, and to suggestions by university spokesmen to separate the first years of postsecondary education from the later, rigorous years in an effort to emulate the German university system (Monroe, 1972, p. 7). The roots of the community college are therefore found in both the upward extension of secondary education and the downward extension of the university, adopting philosophy from one and curriculum from the latter.

According to Karabel (1972, p. 522), "...the magnitude and shape of the community college owe much to American ideology about equal opportunity, and the capstone of its open opportunity structure is its system of public education." And, according to Blocker (1965, p. 32), "The public two-year college is the outgrowth of a philosophy of education which believes that: The American way of life holds that all human beings are supreme, hence of equal moral worth and are, therefore, entitled to equal opportunity by teaching whatever needs to be learned to whoever needs to learn it, whenever he needs to learn it." According to Vaughan (1985, p. 1), "Like Jefferson, the community college philosophy calls for education to serve the good of both the individual and society. Egalitarianism is a hallmark of the community college philosophy. Indeed, the community college's open door has often provided the only access to higher education for millions of Americans."

Access, opportunity, broadening the base of higher education, open-door admissions, people's colleges, and democratization, in
particular, are descriptors found in the existing literature on the community college. Democratization, which exemplifies our American heritage, is identified most often as the philosophical basis for the community college. And that theme developed in the 1940s.

From a nationwide perspective, the "community college" (versus the "junior college") movement began at the end of World War II. From the time of the Truman Commission Report (1947) until the early sixties, the idea of a community college (a people's college) was woven into the fabric of public higher education. By this measure, too, Virginia was late in joining the movement when it finally passed legislation for a comprehensive system in 1966. "This movement was late in coming to a state that could point to the College of William and Mary as the second-oldest institution of higher learning in America, and could claim Thomas Jefferson as its native son--one of the most important leaders in the fight for public education in America" (Vaughan, 1971, p. 1). Virginia not only was late from the Jeffersonian perspective, but also from the Truman Commission perspective.

There were fifteen state-controlled postsecondary institutions operating at the two-year level prior to 1966. Of these, twelve were branches of three of the state's senior institutions. The other three two-year institutions were technical institutions operated by three other institutions. Apparently, none of the fifteen was initiated prior to the 1950s. Armistead reported, "At the time the community college development was under consideration, the state's senior institutions of higher education, as a general rule, had selective
admission standards, and a large number of individuals were unable to
meet their entrance requirements" (p. 66-67).

In Vaughan's monograph (1971, p. 1), Raymond Schultz stated in
his prefacing remarks, "The Commonwealth of Virginia, a state
generally steeped in the tradition of elitism in higher education,
presents a particularly significant case study in the community
college movement."

Research Question

What explains the development of an extensive community college
system in Virginia in light of its history of conservatism and elitism
in higher education?

As noted in the introduction to this study, community colleges
were in operation in some states over fifty years before they were
adopted in Virginia. Even with the impetus of great growth after
World War II, almost twenty years passed before Virginia took the
initiative to create a community college system. Why did Virginia not
act sooner? Why was it one of the last states to provide public two-
year colleges for its citizens?

Other Questions

Other questions this study proposes to ask include the
following: What was the rationale for the development of the community
colleges in the United States before 1966? How did the first colleges
develop? What national developmental trends and patterns of community
colleges were apparent before 1966? What was the higher education
philosophy in Virginia prior to 1966? And what factors inhibited the
establishment of public community colleges before 1966?
Additionally, what were the political/social forces which accounted for the Virginia Community College System? Possibilities projected are a change in political philosophy, political expediency, the Civil Rights Movement's impact, economic pressures for technological advancement and training, and the introduction of federal dollars to supplement state systems of public higher education. Did democratization and egalitarianism indeed play major roles? Are the changes that resulted in the community college consistent with past educational tradition in Virginia?

Definition of Terms

**Junior Colleges** - two-year colleges (either private or public) offering work equivalent to the first two years of a traditional (four-year) senior institution of higher learning.

**Community Colleges** - two-year public institutions offering traditional freshman and sophomore curricula, augmented by service to the community (may be independent or attached to a senior institution).

**Technical Colleges** - two-year public institutions offering vocational/technical and occupational training primarily of a culminal or terminal nature.

**Branch Colleges** - two-year units of senior institutions or universities, also called "community colleges" because of their extension into the community.

**Virginia Community College System** - the network of 23 public two-year colleges in Virginia, begun in 1966.

**Methodology of Study**

This study will utilize various documents in an attempt to
answer the aforementioned research questions. These documents will include records and minutes of the State Council of Higher Education and General Assembly journals, as well as various reports. Newspaper accounts, Community College archives, available correspondence and speeches will also be explored. Through investigation of these documents, seemingly key individuals will be identified and perhaps interviewed. These could include former governors, the first chancellor of the Virginia Community College System, and others who played a part in the development of the Community College System in Virginia.

The primary source of this research will be content analysis of a variety of documents (supplemented with a review of existing literature).

**Limits of the Study**

The study, for the most part, will be limited to the 1950s and early 1960s, the time period preceding the establishment of the community college system in Virginia. Although the first public junior colleges began at the turn of the century, the notion of a comprehensive community college took hold only after World War II and the Truman Commission (1947).

Highly dependent on document analysis and interpretation of events after-the-fact, the study will be limited to the writer's own perspective.

**Hypothesis**

Reasons other than democratization or broadening the base of higher education are expected to be found for the establishment of the
Virginia Community College System as a result of this study.

Chapter Order

Chapter II will focus on the development of the two-year college nationwide and in Virginia prior to 1950.

Chapter III will feature an overview of public higher education in Virginia during the 1950s through documents of that period.

Chapter IV will be devoted to the era of Massive Resistance in Virginia (1954-1959) to demonstrate a facet of Virginia's history of elitism: racial prejudice.

Chapter V will deal with the early 1960s and factors leading directly to the 1966 Virginia Community College legislation.

Chapter VI will summarize findings and make conclusions regarding the factors identified which account for the development of the Virginia Community College System.
EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

A review of the literature reveals that prior to the time of the 1947 Truman Commission, the development of the public two-year college nationwide was a gradual process. The first public two-year college which was established in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901 evolved from concepts dating back to the 1850s. Thornton (1972, p. 47), in fact, outlines four developmental stages for the community junior college, the first of which dates from 1850. During that first period (which he extends to 1920), "the idea and the acceptable practice of the 'junior college,' a separate institution offering the first two years of baccalaureate curriculum, were achieved" (Thornton, p. 47).

Private Heritage

Although the "junior college" terminology was not created until the 1890s, an array of two-year units was in place during the five prior decades. According to Palinchak (1973, p. 26) there existed an "amorphous conglomeration of two-year institutional forms which included the academy, the normal school, and a variety of institutes, seminaries, six-year high schools, junior college departments in high schools, and lower divisions of universities, among others."

Palinchak notes the period 1835-1900 to be one of diversity and unstructured growth. He also points out the prevalence of private academies which offered elementary, secondary, and collegiate courses in varying amounts. From this movement of two-year units (1835-1900),
the private junior college emerged (Palinchak, p. 22).

**Morrill Act**

While groundwork for private junior colleges was laid, federal legislation enacted during this time did much to affect the future development of the "community" college. The Morrill Act of 1872, a collaboration between the federal government and the states in the land-grant movement, greatly expanded higher education and what was to be taught. Community-college historian, Dr. George B. Vaughan (1985, p. 3), comments, "Today's community college has borrowed heavily from the precedent of the land-grant institutions and continued and expanded the democratization theme developed largely as a result of the Morrill Act of 1862."

**Public School Influence**

Also affecting the development of the community college were the public schools. Monroe (1972, p. 1) asserts, "The principles and traditions upon which the public schools were built are also the principles and traditions which guide the community college." The principles to which he refers are: "(1) universal opportunity for all persons without distinction based on social class, family income, and ethnic, racial, or religious backgrounds; (2) local control and support of free, nontuition educational systems; and (3) a relevant curriculum designed to meet both the needs of the individual and those of the nation."

Another significant contribution from the public-school influence was the Kalamazoo Decision of 1872. This landmark decision for American high schools mandated that Michigan public high schools
were to be supported by public tax dollars (Monroe, pp. 5-6). By 1900 the principle of free tax-supported high schools was accepted throughout the nation. "Since the community colleges were destined to grow out of the local high schools, the principle of tax-supported secondary education was a vital step in the development of local community colleges" (Monroe, p. 6).

Of equal importance to the development of community colleges was the increase in completion rates for secondary schools. As early as the late 1880s, new demands for higher education were made as a result of increasing high-school attendance and graduation rates; and these needs could not and would not be met by existing colleges and universities (Deegan and Tillery, 1985, pp. 5-6). The number of public high schools throughout the nation increased from sixty in 1870 to more than six thousand by the end of the nineteenth century (Blum et al., 1985, p. 487).

University Influence

As the spiraling demands for access to higher education began, several influential university leaders surfaced to voice their opinions concerning the bifurcation of the university and the upward extension of high school. They advocated the separation of the first two years of higher education from the university. As far back as 1859 the recommendation for combining secondary education with the first two years of collegiate study was put forth at the University of Georgia. This recommendation was prompted by a concern that many young boys were not adequately prepared for the rigor of university work (Diener, 1986, p. 26).
Similar recommendations by university leaders toward the end of the nineteenth century stemmed not only from a concern for efficiency, but also from an affinity for the German university system. According to Monroe (p. 7), "Advocates of the German model thought that the university should restrict its students to the intellectual elite, who would be able to profit most from an education which would train the intellect and prepare persons for careers as researchers and scholars." They were influenced also by Darwinism, industrialism, urbanism, science and technology, and progressivism (Gallagher, 1968).

"Prominent among those advocates were Henry P. Tappan, president of the University of Michigan; William Watts Folwell, president of the University of Minnesota; David Starr Jordan, president of Stanford University; Alexis Lange, Dean at the University of California at Berkeley; and William Rainey Harper, president of the University of Chicago" (Vaughan, 1985, pp. 3-4). "Tappan is credited with being the first American educator to recommend transferral of the first two years of college to the secondary schools" (Monroe, p. 7). Harper is widely recognized as the "father of the junior college," for it was he who separated the first and last two years of the University of Chicago in 1892. The lower division, initially referred to as the "academic college," in 1896 was dubbed "junior college," which was perhaps the first use of the terms (Thornton, 1972, p. 48).

Nevertheless, it must be noted that William Rainey Harper, in concert with the other statesmen of this period, conceived of the junior college primarily as a continuation of high school (Thornton, p. 48). Henry Joseph Aigner, quoted by Bogue (1950, p. 332) in referring to
the early history of the junior-college movement, underscored the significant impact of the writing and educational activities of Harper, Jordan, and Lange.

Elitism/Social Efficiency

Harper, Jordan, and Lange wrote as though they were disciples of democracy, opening the gate of educational opportunity ever wider according to Goodwin (1971, p. 31). However, their conception of democracy was not one which advocated that all men were equals. Goodwin (p. 20) maintains that closer scrutiny of their ideas reveals that their endorsement of the junior college concept was an integral part of an over-arching plan to alter the nature of society and to regulate the vicissitudes they feared in the nature of man. Goodwin reports (pp. 23-24):

The lives of Harper, Jordan, and Lange did not revolve around the junior college, and neither did their ideas. Their conception of the junior college existed as only a minor component in a larger framework of educational structures and philosophy. This larger framework, in turn, was only a part of their overall conception of man and society.

No theme is more pervasive in the writings of Harper, Jordan, and Lange than their general preoccupation for order, systematization, efficiency, and the elimination of waste. The single theme that was employed the most often to encompass all of the many virtuous ends sought by these writers was 'efficiency.'

The meanings that Harper, Jordan, and Lange attached to 'efficiency' were generally in keeping with Haber's analysis.

Samuel Haber's study of scientific management during the Progressive Era disclosed that 'efficiency' was a widely used term with several meanings: a character attribute of hard work, self-discipline, and masculinity; a productive machine; a profitable business operation; and, of particular importance during this era, it signified a harmonious relationship among men under competent leadership.
Goodwin (p. 25) further elaborates, "They made consistent use of the term ('efficiency') as a mark, often the most important mark, of individual worth, and they also applied the term, sometimes labeled 'social efficiency,' as the function of an ideal society."

Necessarily, the goal of social efficiency included the identification and extension of public education. This was a major factor which stimulated interest in the junior college, especially for Lange (Goodwin, p. 29).

The elitist attitudes of Harper, Jordan, and Lange sprang from their beliefs on the nature of man, and these attitudes toward society were integral parts of their educational philosophies and practices. Their acceptance of elitism was supported, intellectually, by their acceptance of social Darwinism concepts of evolution which they applied to society (Goodwin, p. 31).

Diener (1986, p. 201), commenting on Goodwin's findings, notes:

In a lengthy study and report on the junior college movement and the fundamental ideas which underlay its development, Gregory Goodwin detects what he feels is a strong tilt toward social efficiency, vocational training, and conservatism. Stability has been its aim, not social change. Further, the main thrust of the community and junior college ideology has been to idealize a technological society, control the 'meaner aspects of human nature,' and sort out and protect the elite from the masses. Although sprinkling their writings with terms such as 'democratic citizenship,' and 'the people's college,' the concepts behind these terms reflect a greater interest in social control than in helping individuals to promote their own development.

First Description of the Junior College Movement

Other factors leading to the development of the two-year or junior colleges were outlined in Floyd McDowell's dissertation in 1918
(the first dissertation to describe the junior college movement). Among factors cited was the University of Michigan's recognition of the idea of a junior college in 1883 (Diener, p. 76). McDowell also noted rapidly increasing university enrollment (making it harder to accommodate the needs of the freshman and sophomore students); the need for early preparation for professional courses; the move for normal schools to enter collegiate study (encouraged by a drive for standardization); and the extension of course work in public high schools for two years in response to demand for higher education opportunities within the reach of all. McDowell additionally noted that the junior college would assure a place in the educational system for a number of women's colleges in the South (Diener, pp. 76-77). He concluded that the idea of a junior college as an extension of secondary education probably originated in Europe, but that its form in 1918 was purely an American product.

McDowell found that 60 percent of the private junior colleges reporting offered courses in education, compared to sixteen percent for the public junior colleges (Diener, p. 78).

One of McDowell's conclusions was that the junior colleges, particularly the private ones, were not meeting the needs of the comparatively large proportion of their students who did not intend to go on to the university after graduation. He recommended that those institutions offer more and a greater variety of vocational or finishing courses of college grade. He also recommended that the public junior colleges encourage the movement which would make them a definite part of the state system of public education (Diener, pp. 80-
A Different View

At a national meeting of junior college leaders in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1920, Philander Priestly Claxton, U.S. Commissioner of Education, strongly endorsed the junior college as a vehicle for making higher education more efficient. He noted that too many weak four-year colleges were in existence. Suggesting that they seek a desirable level of economics, he believed that many of these institutions should refocus their efforts on doing a better job with fewer programs. Claxton also said they did not have the financial resources necessary for success. The alternative he suggested, in the name of economy, was to build strong two-year programs (Diener, p. 83).

Claxton had a different view from that of Lange et al. Seeing the junior college as a cure for the ailments of American colleges, he urged it to be a part of higher education, not the public school system (Diener, p. 48).

At this same gathering of junior college leaders where Claxton expressed his views, the American Association of Junior Colleges was initiated (Diener, p. 83). This event, too, had an impact on the development of the community college. (The Association later became known as the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.) Through its professional and lobbying services, particularly in the period between 1900 and 1950, the Association helped shape the national movement of community junior colleges (Deegan and Tillery, p. 9). In 1922 it adopted the following definition for the junior
The junior college is an institution offering two years of instruction of strictly college grade" (Thornton, p. 52).

Accrediting Agency Influence

During the 1920-30 period of time, the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools of the Southern States (now the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) played an important part in defining the junior college and its value (Diener, p. 89). According to Diener (p. 48), the difficulty encountered by the Association in sorting out the purposes and programs of the junior college, as well as the standards chosen by which to evaluate it, clearly promoted the notion of the junior college as a part of higher, not secondary education.

Koos and Eells

Also during this same era (1920-30), two junior college scholars, Leonard V. Koos and W.C. Eells, made significant contributions to the junior college direction. From his assessment, Koos found the junior college to be admirably suited for increasing the effectiveness of American education. And Eells, upon careful analysis of the junior college, recommended that it be a separate and autonomous unit in higher education.

The Concept of Terminal Education

During the period of 1920 to 1945 (Thornton, p. 54), the concept of terminal education evolved. "Leadership of state agencies for vocational education, set up under the Smith-Hughes Act and related federal legislation, was especially effective in states that considered the public junior colleges to be part of secondary
education" (Thornton, p. 54). Thornton notes, "The widespread unemployment during the depression of 1929-1937 encouraged the spread of occupational education; it was realized that specific training beyond the high-school level would give an applicant a competitive advancement in the job market" (p. 54). Here we see the idea of Lange's emerging: "The junior college cannot make preparation for the University its reason for being. Its courses of instruction and training are to be culminal rather than basal" (Thornton, p. 53).

**Generation 2: The Junior College (1930-1950)**

The years 1930 through 1950 were dubbed "Generation 2: The Junior College" by Deegan et al. (p. 4). It was during this time, according to them, that the "junior college" developed. (They identified 1900 to 1930 as Generation 1: Extension of High School.)

Deegan et al. note one particular factor which had a major impact on junior colleges during Generation 2—the Great Depression. It not only resulted in the reduction of state funding, but also on a near moratorium on college founding. At the same time increasing demands were being placed on junior colleges (and the rest of higher education) for education beyond high school by graduates and mature adults, especially the many returning veterans (Deegan and Tillery, pp. 8-9).

According to Diener (p. 117):

The 1930s and 1940s saw increasing numbers and variations of the junior college. Circumstances were right. The junior college grew with increasing strength and vigor in the educational and social climate of this country. The dire economic conditions of the 1930s in the United States prompted the erection of 'emergency' junior colleges in a number of states. A unique quality of the developing junior college was its focus on meeting individual community needs.
Diener also notes (p. 119) that the junior colleges were used during the Depression to help alleviate severe unemployment problems. Several states (primarily Michigan, Ohio, New Jersey, Connecticut, Kansas, and Texas) were given federal dollars to develop local colleges. These institutions were some of the first to attempt to be what later would be called community colleges. They were primarily for unemployed high school graduates and unemployed high school teachers (Diener, p. 119). It was also during this time, according to Diener (p. 125), that Doak Campbell, a leader in the junior college movement, warned that the traditional approach was too narrow. He recommended that junior colleges look toward expansion of programs and services.

"The resulting expansion and competition in postsecondary education led, among other things, to state higher education commissions, which influenced the development of junior colleges in relation to other segments of education" (Deegan and Tillery, p. 9). Consequently, goals and objectives for junior colleges were given much attention, and "Perhaps, for the first time, the goal of equal opportunity for postsecondary education for mature adults as well as for younger students was affirmed" (Deegan and Tillery, p. 9). Additionally, the mission for public two-year colleges was defined to include terminal education, general education, lower-division preparation for university transfer, adult education, and the removal of matriculation deficiencies" (Deegan and Tillery, p. 9). This period also ushered in the linkage with business and labor. "One of
the most important developments of this period was the establishment
of labor-management advisory committees for many occupational and
technical programs. These groups remained a lasting bridge to the
private sector over the years" (Deegan and Tillery, p. 12).

Increasing Public Enrollment

During Generation 2 the public junior colleges continued to
outnumber the private ones in enrollment. In 1941 (Eells, 1941, p.
4), there were 261 public junior colleges and 349 private colleges.
Yet the private enrollment represented only 29 percent (57,934) of the
total enrollment, while the public enrollment swelled to 71 percent
(168,228).

The big growth for public community colleges came during the
Depression when they increased from 403 in 1929 to 584 in 1945. In
1948, the public community colleges outnumbered the private junior
colleges for the first time (Monroe, p. 13). The great surge of
transformation, however, occurred after World War II when the GI Bill
ergvanized an educational boom, which according to Diener (p. 12) was
cataclysmic.

Community College Concept

As the 1940s came to an end and the 50s emerged, the "community
college" versus "junior college" concept began to crystallize. "It
was during the decades of the 1950s and 1960s that adult education,
terminal education, and community service found a welcome in the two-
year college. And with curricular democratization came academic
democratization, evident in the 'open admissions' policy increasingly
introduced after World War II" (Neufelt, 1982, p. 174).
Virginia Before the 1950s

While the roots of the community college were being nurtured in the 1850s nationwide, Virginia was lagging behind. In his 1957 dissertation on the development of the junior colleges in Virginia, Donald Pearce noted that great changes took place in American education between 1850 and 1900, but they were not reflected in the Virginia schools (p. 84). The period before 1900 in Virginia produced a predominance of schools for women which represented a direct outgrowth of economic factors as well as an indirect attribution to the agitation during this time for the emancipation of women (Pearce, 1957, p. 81). Pearce also referred to the "aristocratic Virginia traditions of separate schools for the sexes" (p. 81).

Apparently the junior colleges in Virginia prior to 1900 were a collection of so-called colleges, seminaries, and institutes without uniform standards. "The organization in 1895 of the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Southern States was to have a tremendous impact on schools of all types, but not until the middle of the next decade did it directly affect the Virginia schools" (Pearce, p. 92).

Pearce noted also the prophetic speech provided by William Rainey Harper at a National Education Association meeting in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1900 (p. 151). Harper, elaborating on the crisis being forced on small colleges by the growth of public schools, stated that from 20 to 25 percent were doing work no better than that of an academy, meaning that the term 'college' had been misused (Pearce, p. 151). According to Harper, those having libraries
of fewer than a thousand volumes, scientific apparatus of less than
one thousand dollars in value, and an income of less than six to eight
thousand dollars could not truly call themselves colleges. He
predicted that 25 percent would become academies, and another group
would constitute a new category of schools doing two years of college
work and known as junior colleges. Although he was referring to at
least 200 colleges across the nation, his remarks were on target for
Virginia's situation as well (Pearce, pp. 151-152). "Twelve years
were to pass before the junior college would become a reality in the
state, but the speech marked the beginning of a transition era during
which every effort was bent toward bringing the so-called colleges,
the seminaries, and institutes into line with current standards"
(Pearce, p. 152).

Also according to the findings of Pearce (p. 172), the term
"junior college" was finally used by the State Board of Education in
Virginia in 1912 to designate a certain category of institutions.
These institutions had existed previously as neither grammar schools,
high schools, nor colleges, but as sub-standard combinations of all
three. The State Board, in fact, classified all institutions of
higher education in 1912. The use of the junior college designation
was tentative, including schools doing more than two but less than
four years of college work. By 1914 the classification became more
definite, being defined then as an institution doing the equivalent of
the freshman and sophomore years of college work (Pearce, p. 172).

"Not until 1917 was a complete set of specific, clearly
delineated standards for junior colleges published. After that date,
the standardization of the schools was accelerated, and by 1924 a new type of institution, the 'standard junior college' took its place in the educational system" (Pearce, p. 172).

In summarizing the period of 1912 to 1924 in Virginia, Pearce noted that the cumulative effect of the great changes in education was at least to bring about a complete revision of practices and re-direction of purposes for the so-called colleges in Virginia. These changes, covering over a decade, were to become known as the junior college movement (Pearce, p. 244).

Pearce also cited a study by Massengale on the Methodist College. Massengale identified the growing public high school as the major force attributable to decline in the number of private schools as well as the gradual change of policy by educational agents toward them (Pearce, p. 244). According to Massengale, quoted by Pearce:

Increased high school enrollments and the beginning of mass education resulted in the creation of standards. The acceptance of those standards by both high schools and colleges in turn resulted in the creation of 'non-standardized' schools which were 'unclassified;' that is, they were neither clearly high schools nor colleges. For a time these anomalous institutions survived on the margin of the educational world, chiefly by training teachers for the public schools. When, at last, a junior college classification was evolved by the state it was eagerly accepted as an opportune haven by these unclassified, and until then, 'unclassifiable' schools (pp. 244-245).

**The Virginia Tradition**

In trying to explain why Virginia did not come forth in the early junior college years with public two-year offerings, one must understand the prevailing Virginia tradition. Heatwole, in his history of education in Virginia (1916, p. 19), noted that, "Whatever the fact, it must be conceded that the Virginia planters, though few
in number, were the ruling class for nearly two centuries, and were responsible for the aristocratic type of society in Virginia."

Virginia has indeed been a paradox. Paul Monroe, in his introduction to Heatwole's history (pp. x-xi), stated: "For the first three quarters of a century of our national existence, Virginia's educational problem was more complicated than that of her sister states. In politics she had accepted a democratic government, while her society was organized on an aristocratic basis." The upper class (planters) were interested only in a system of education that affected their children, and thus introduced the tutorial system to which they were accustomed in England (Heatwole, p. 26). The people of Virginia, although genuinely interested in education, did not always provide for the training of all her people. The idea of universal public education was slow to develop in Virginia (Heatwole, p. 100).

**Thomas Jefferson**

Thomas Jefferson is often quoted in connection with the development of the community college system in Virginia. He is reported to have advocated free public education through the thirteenth and fourteenth years within commuting distance of every citizen. Although Jefferson's ideas, indeed, had an impact on education, his proposal for free education through college was quite different from the way it is often reported today. He actually proposed a rigid selection of pupils. According to Dabney Lancaster (1943, p. 296), "'One only of the most promising genius and virtue' to be sent annually from each of the lower schools to a grammar school. Again one only each year from each of the grammar schools to receive
further training there and then to be sent to the College of William and Mary for three years at public expense. Jefferson believed in a simple, practical course of study, careful selection of those to be trained at public expense, and thorough supervision of instruction by well educated school officials."

Lancaster further reported (p. 296):

Jefferson's plan for a system of public education did not materialize during his lifetime. The social system in the South did not lend itself to his plan. Large plantations where the owners employed private tutors for their own children could not well be divided into 'hundreds' for school purposes and the large land owners were not enthusiastic about supporting schools for the less fortunate members of society.

The Byrd Organization

Another factor which cannot be omitted in any assessment of the Virginia tradition is the "Byrd Organization." According to Benjamin Muse (1965, pp. 25-26):

The 'organization,' dignified, respectable, deriving much of its strength from its long record of conservative, frugal and notably honest management of the state's business, was an institution unique in American politics. Byrd's fame stems in the first instance from a remarkable and never-to-be-forgotten performance as governor (1926-1930). He enjoyed in Virginia an almost mystical prestige; and his hold over the organization itself was such that eager politicians took their cue from the Senator's slightest hint, or sought to fathom his wishes when express directions were lacking.

In a report on higher education institutions given to the General Assembly of Virginia on January 16, 1928, Byrd's remarks underscored his conservative stance (Byrd, 1928, pp. 5-6). He noted that he endorsed suggestions to eliminate, as far as possible, duplications in specialized courses in the colleges. He also noted
his support for a reasonable increase in tuition fees for institutions of higher learning, with the establishment of loan funds..."so that no deserving boy or girl will be deprived of a higher education because of lack of funds" (Byrd, p. 5). He went on, however, to note that he specifically favored the establishment of a more rigid system of selecting students for admission to the higher institutions, citing results from his survey staff report, indicating that a large number of part-time students were failing and dropping out. He deemed this an expensive process, and elaborated, "The burden of paying the cost of education from kindergarten to college is more than the State can bear. The plant and buildings should be provided by the State for the colleges, and a part of the tuition cost paid, yet an increase in present tuition is necessary if our standards of education are to be maintained" (Byrd, p. 5). It was also noted in the report that 429,161 students were daily attending public schools in Virginia and that 8,000 were receiving the benefits of a college education.

The open-door philosophy was not one which began early in Virginia. Although Vaughan (1985, p. 12) asserts, "Perhaps the most important concept to influence the development of the community college was the belief that all Americans should have access to higher education," all Virginians did not feel this way. When it came to endorsing this concept with financial support, the educational leadership in Virginia fell short.

**Toward the 1950s**

As the nation's two-year public colleges were increasing during the 1940s, Virginia was not in the mainstream. As noted earlier in
Chapter I, the 1947 *Junior College Directory* listed 312 publicly supported junior colleges nationwide. Seven states had none, and nineteen states had more than three. Virginia had three, but they were two-year branches or extensions of four-year institutions with the same entrance requirements as their parent schools. By 1949, according to Blocker (1965, pp. 28-30), twenty-seven states had initiated legislative activity for the establishment and expansion of two-year colleges. Virginia was not among them.

In a report on the public schools in Virginia in 1948 from the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to the Governor and General Assembly (House Document No. 17, p. 15), the Committee responded to a request to consider the advisability and desirability of extending courses of study afforded by the public free schools of the State for two additional years, to afford further free education to high school graduates:

Here we are asked to consider the advisability of extending the courses of study now afforded in public free schools when it is the almost universal complaint that the State is not adequately financing the courses now offered. It will be remembered that in dealing with this problem we are not dealing with theory, but with hard, cold, realistic facts of dollars and cents. We have available in the State of Virginia, from either present tax sources or suggested tax sources a certain sum of money. To demand more than this sum of money would be damaging to the economy of the people of the State and to embark on a theoretical program that has no consideration of the financial ability of the State to pay, would, in our opinion, be disastrous.

In the same report the development of vocational training also was addressed. The report noted that the college preparatory goal had been injected into the educational process of thinking to an unbelievable degree. Only 2.2 percent of the entire school enrollment
then attended college. The report indicated the need to overcome the attitude of regarding the use of one's hands for learning a trade for a life's calling to be belittling. It also called for a greater emphasis on the advantages of a vocational career, noting that Virginia had overlooked planning for practical training and preparation for the 97.8 percent of the pupils who never completed a college career. The report warned, "Too many young people leave school in every community in the Commonwealth equipped only to do work of the 'white collar' type. This leads them to believe that they should follow some academic or professional career although they may be unfit for it. The resulting complexes are contributing factors in juvenile delinquency and adult crime in our State." A call also was made for Virginia's vocational program to be drastically changed, asking that children from the age of nine and up be given comprehensive aptitude tests to determine their fitness for a particular calling as well as the allocation of money for the creation and equipping of a State regional school (utilizing existing facilities where possible) in either Norfolk or Richmond for Blacks, in order that their employment opportunities be greatly broadened.

The findings outlined in this chapter leave no doubt about Virginia's tradition of elitism and conservatism. Virginia, in fact, was very much in line with the elitism and social efficiency called for by the university leaders--Harper, Jordan, and Lange. From its very inception, Virginia had consistently demonstrated an elitist attitude toward public education. While two-year extensions of public high schools and other forms of public two-year institutions were
developing across the country, Virginia's two-year counterparts during this era (before the 1950s) were a conglomeration of primarily private institutions existing on the fringes of higher education. The junior college movement in Virginia (1912-1924) was, however, assisted by the Southern Association's adoption of standards, which clearly placed these institutions in the higher education arena. The standards also helped to elevate the academic status of these (private) institutions.

As Virginia approached 1950, there was a lot yet to be done before the public two-year college would become a reality. The statistics relating to the number of Virginians in higher education speak for themselves, as does the call for public endorsement of practical and vocational training for the 97.8 percent who did not go on to college. And finally, there was no apparent cry for democratization of higher education, in spite of the recommendations of the Truman Commission after World War II.
CHAPTER III
PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA: 1950s

As noted in Chapter II, before the 1950s, Virginia was lagging behind in the development of public two-year colleges. While great changes were taking place nationwide (between 1850 and 1900), they were not reflected in Virginia (Pearce, 1957, p. 84). With reference to public education, Virginia from its earliest days employed a very conservative and elitist approach. Education was considered to be something for the elite, not the masses. And the endorsement of a policy to provide financial assistance for public education was contrary to the Byrd tradition. Even after the call for community colleges from the Truman Commission, there were no cries for democratization on Virginia soil.

As Virginia entered the 1950s, she carried with her the baggage of two prevailing traditions: conservatism and elitism. Each one of these, in turn, had an effect on her direction in offering public higher education to the citizens of the Commonwealth.

Conservatism

A review of the studies called for by the General Assembly in the early fifties reveals a recurring theme. In each case the study was prompted by a concern for efficiency. There appears to have been a never-ending quest and concern for minimizing waste, avoiding duplication, and getting the most out of state dollars spent.

In 1951 a report on higher education in Virginia was completed
and presented to the General Assembly and the Governor (Higher Education in Virginia). Since it was headed by Fred J. Kelly, Specialist in Higher Education with the U.S. Office of Education, it is often referred to as the "Kelly Report." The preface of the report noted that the 1948 General Assembly had asked for a special commission to study state-supported institutions of higher education, but the commission had not been appointed. Governor Tuck referred this assignment to another commission which was already overloaded with other charges. Not having time to properly address the higher education issues, this commission asked the 1950 General Assembly to call for a "complete and thorough study" (p. 3). The General Assembly complied and appointed the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to undertake this task.

House Joint Resolution No. 47, calling for the study, stated in part, that particular attention should be given to "possible consolidation of overlapping functions, and any other matters which in its opinion result in inefficiency or duplication of expenses or effort" (p. 3). With this charge, the necessity of reviewing previous studies that had been completed prior to 1951 (p. 14) was affirmed. The General Assembly and Governor had authorized five prior studies, the first of which dated back to 1918. Kelly noted that more than manifesting a deep interest in higher education, "...they have manifested a troubled sense of uncertainty about whether the State was getting one hundred cents worth of higher education for each dollar it was appropriating for these colleges and universities" (p. 13).
In the consultant portion of the report (pp. 14-16), five previous studies were outlined. Each one had considered the problem of coordination of higher education in Virginia. And each one reflected, again, a concern for efficiency, cost-cutting, and duplication of services.

The first one (Education Commission's Report to the Assembly of Virginia, 1919), which focused primarily on public schools, made the recommendation for doing away with the Normal School Board and having the normal schools placed under the State Board of Education. The rationale not only was to provide a closer connection with the public schools, but also to help solve Virginia's problem of too many boards.

The second study, Public Education in Virginia (1928), addressed "...all the important aspects of higher education" (p. 14). And although it made various recommendations (ranging from research to the education of women), its first eight recommendations dwelt on the elimination of duplications at the several institutions. This 1928 study also called for the creation of the office of Chancellor of Higher Education as a vehicle for program coordination for state-controlled colleges and universities.

The third cited study relating to the financing of higher education in Virginia was completed in 1936. Dr. William H. Stauffer, who coordinated the report, highlighted income, expenditures, and costs per student at the various institutions studied. His remedial recommendations dealt with cost reduction and a concern for duplication. He called for "...an allocation of instructional functions" to "...best serve the citizens of the State with greater
economy" (p. 15).

In 1945 a fourth "...thorough and complete study of the system of public free schools in Virginia" (and "...a like study of the present methods of educating, instructing, and training teachers in said schools") was accomplished at the direction of the 1944 General Assembly. This study resulted in two reports: one addressing the public schools system, and another addressing teacher training—a dominant function of most of the state-controlled institutions at the time. As in the three studies before it, this study expressed concern for coordination not only of public, but private institutions as well (pp. 15-16).

The fifth study completed before 1951 involved the many aspects of state government. Among its recommendations was the call for the creation of a single State Board of Higher Education to replace the existing governing boards of the various institutions, along with a chancellor who would be its chief executive officer.

In summarizing the five studies and how they related to the one he had just completed, Kelly stated that the main problem then was the same one of the past three decades—that of how Virginia could have "...the most effective and economical system of State-controlled colleges and universities" (p. 16).

As far as Kelly was concerned, his report in 1951 was one that should concentrate on solving the problem of coordination. In the report he emphasized two tasks to be carried out: (1) to identify not only Virginia's program of higher education as it was then, but also to identify what it purported for the future; and (2) to outline steps
needed to carry out a program with "maximum efficiency and economy" (p. 17). He also emphasized that planning for the future was the most important task of the day.

Kelly suggested six areas of service required for the future in Virginia. Among them he called for short technical and semiprofessional courses and more effective education for meeting social and civic responsibilities (pp. 18-20). He explained that there was a need in almost every professional pursuit for persons with less than professional training, and there were demands for skilled workers needed to keep the wheels of the modern machine age running (p. 19). He also expressed concern for preparing for the difficult problems being faced. He urged that general education be vitalized and extended at least two years beyond high school for increasing numbers of young people, noting that the social, economic, political situations at home and abroad were complex, and that formal education for young people of high school age needed to be extended (p. 20). In the same vein, he also called for expanding opportunities for the education of adults. Kelly reasoned, "If we are to make our democratic institutions strong enough to meet the exigencies of the decade ahead, we must have positive action to that end" (p. 20).

In examining the programs that were in existence at the time of his report, Kelly stated that for Virginia to meet the well recognized needs of tomorrow and to measure up to the vision of the greatest educational statesman this country ever produced (Jefferson), she would need to take a more leading position among the states in the quality of the higher education provided (p. 21).
Further outlined were four areas of needed adjustments for Virginia to become an outstanding provider of higher education. The first and foremost adjustment he mentioned was related to the comprehensive university and the need to expand its services related to the land-grant mission. He noted that the adult education program provided by Virginia's land-grant institutions (VPI and Virginia State College) needed to be expanded to other fields of higher education in the State besides those reaching out to farmers. He also noted that Virginia State College was the only institution maintained for Blacks by the State and that Blacks needed essentially the same quality and type of higher education as did the whites (p. 22).

Kelly also warned (p. 23) that unless the State decided to establish community colleges under public school auspices, the comprehensive university would have to establish either day or evening technical and semi-professional courses in communities within reach of the people who wanted them. He believed that the comprehensive university had an obligation to consider the State as its campus and the problems of the people as its material of instruction.

In underscoring areas of needed adjustment and expansion of services, the groundwork was set for the development of a more comprehensive system of higher education. And hope was expressed that the explanation of the services he recommended would perhaps allay any fears that a central coordinating board, if established, would curb the initiative or destroy the individuality of any of the existing institutions (p. 26).

The Report went on to pinpoint the advantages and benefits of
multiple boards as were in place in Virginia. Some disadvantages were also identified. The main concern focused on the need for coordination as a system, rather than as individual entities. The reason: "Their programs must be administered with a view to serving the State's interest. Unnecessary and costly duplication of offerings must be avoided" (p. 27). (Again, the recurring theme of concern for cost and duplication of services is evident.)

It was noted in this report that Virginia's statewide program of extension, via the University of Virginia, was carried out with a minimum of duplication and a simple but effective administrative organization--unlike other states where classes were being provided by more than one college in the same communities (p. 33).

In weighing the concerns outlined in The Kelly Report, it is easy to come to the conclusion that the higher education concerns of Virginia were centered chiefly on efficiency and cost-cutting, and that perhaps this was a stance particularly peculiar to Virginia. However, this is not true. In reviewing the handling of coordination involving a single governing board with no executive officer in other states, the Report stated (p. 34), "From the arrangements made in these States, the focus of interest in coordination would seem to be financial rather than educational." And with reference to states (seven) with a single board and an executive officer, advantages reported included the reduction of unjustifiable duplication and the substitution of cooperation for competition among institutions, as well as the economies of operating some functions on a State-wide basis versus an institutional basis (pp. 35-36).
The Kelly Report included the recommendations of recent studies that had been done by Arkansas and Texas (pp. 37-38), citing the similarity between situations in these two states to the situation in Virginia. One of the primary findings of the Texas review was the lack of a statewide coordinated "system" of higher education which resulted in uneconomical operation and the probability that the people of Texas were not receiving full value for funds expended.

The Arkansas Report (p. 42) showed concern that students were having to bear a large financial share of operational costs. Both state reports called for a coordinating body (a coordinating agency for Texas; a board of control for Arkansas).

In summarizing, Kelly affirmed that:

...for decades Virginia has been troubled about the problem of incoordination of the programs of her State colleges and universities. In spite of five previous State-wide studies which recommended some method of coordination, the situation remains essentially as it has been for decades except that as appropriations increase, the problem seems to be more serious (p. 48).

Kelly also emphasized that the problem facing Virginia was not unlike that of many states, noting that fourteen states had a mechanism in place at that time to increase coordination among institutions, while three other states had prepared reports to present to their legislatures recommending a coordination vehicle for their institutions of higher learning (p. 45).

It should be noted here that Virginia, in her usual tradition, did not act to create a coordinating board in 1951. It would take another five years for the State Council of Higher Education to be created. The Report's call for expanded educational opportunities for
adults and for technical/semi-professional courses was likewise tabled. One can speculate that Virginia's hesitancy in these two matters related directly to economical concerns.

**Crisis in Higher Education in Virginia**

In House Joint Resolution No. 46 (*Journal of the Senate*, 1954), the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council was directed to report on educational opportunity available through extension services of the state universities and colleges. The Resolution noted that previous studies had indicated that a large number of high school graduates could not afford to attend the state's colleges and universities, and that the number of high school graduates was expected to increase significantly in the decade to follow--beyond the capacity of the existing institutions to serve them (p. 931). The study was to be made with the idea in mind of finding out whether or not extension services could be developed to meet the higher education needs of those who could not afford to attend state universities and colleges. Here we have, perhaps for the first time, a resolution calling for a study bolstered by concern for educational opportunity in the State, albeit coupled with a concern for the most efficient way to accommodate an expanding pool of high school graduates.

The study that followed was entitled *The Crisis in Higher Education and a Solution* (1955). In addressing its major concern for making provisions for the projected increase in those seeking admission to its institutions of higher education, the Report recommended that the most economical way of accommodation, while maintaining present standards, would be the organization (in densely
populated communities) of branches of existing institutions offering the first two years of college education. This recommendation was also meant to include expanded offerings of such branches to meet the needs of demands in fast growing industrial areas for technical training beyond the high school level (p. 6).

The "crisis" in Virginia, according to the 1955 report, was not unlike that in other states. Nationwide during the first years of the fifties, two million students were reported to be enrolled in colleges and universities. The projection for 1969 was an enrollment number swelling to three and one-half million (p. 7).

Citing estimates provided by Dr. Lorin Thompson, Director of the Bureau of Population and Economic Research, the Report noted that the 18 to 21-year-old population in Virginia at that time was 199,640, and would increase to 307,521 by 1970 (p. 7). Using conservative figures, Dr. Thompson compared the probable minimum college enrollment for 1970 (48,624) to 1955's enrollment (approximately 32,000). The Report also stated that enrollment projections for Virginia in a similar study produced by Dr. John K. Folger, staff associate for the Southern Regional Education Board, indicated Virginia's college enrollment would almost double (to 63,155) for the year 1969-70 (p. 7).

The Report of 1955 also mentioned other projections of increasing enrollment, exacerbating the potential problem of more students seeking admission than could be accommodated. The two facts to be faced were (1) that many thousand young Virginians would seek college admission in the next fifteen years; and (2) that existing
facilities were inadequate to deal with such a situation (p. 8).
Possible solutions considered by the Report included greater
utilization of present facilities, enlargement of present facilities,
increasing the percentage of Virginians at state-supported
institutions, extension courses, community colleges, and branch
institutions in populous areas (pp. 9-11).

Among the disadvantages of greater utilization of existing
facilities, outlined by the Report, was the requirement of additional
supplies, equipment, and administrative/operational personnel for such
an undertaking. Enlarging present facilities would only work with
thoughtful, long-range planning, in advance of the need to ensure the
most adequate application of the State's tax revenues (p. 10).
Capital outlay requests that were on the drawing board then totaled
$70,000,000. If approved, there still would not be facilities enough
for demands expected in the next fifteen years (p. 9).

Increasing the percentage of Virginians in state-supported
institutions was not the answer either. The Report stated that the
balance in interstate exchange of college students was then in
Virginia's favor, and if changed, would throw a greater burden upon
her institutions (p. 10). And extension courses, the Report
concluded, could not alone meet the general demand for academic
training for college-age youth.

In the matter of considering the development of independent
"community colleges," offering two years of college training in small
institutions located in smaller centers of population, the Report
noted the experience of other states. While there had been successes,
the disadvantages outweighed their incorporation in Virginia. The disadvantages were the difficulty of maintaining uniform standards of quality and the inability of those colleges, in some cases, to receive accreditation. Also concern was expressed that residents of areas where those colleges were placed tended to be more demanding and that those colleges had often sought expansion to four-year institutions (p. 11).

The establishment of branches of existing accredited institutions of higher education was by far the preferred solution to the "crisis" in Virginia. They were reported to have many advantages over independent community colleges (p. 11). The reputation of the parent institution would be a stake in the branch's operation; being under the control of the parent institution would guarantee the same standards for the branch as for its sponsoring college; the problem of accreditation would be alleviated; those students wishing to transfer to the four-year parent institution could transfer with full credit; and most importantly, the branch would be less expensive both to the State and to the student in comparison to four-year college costs. It was also noted in this report that a measure of local support could be expected for an institution serving primarily the needs of a locality (p. 12).

There also would be two considerable advantages for the four-year institutions in reducing costs and strengthening programs. First, the possibility of developing terminal courses for the branches could serve a number of students who would not apply to go to the four-year institutions. And secondly, the four-year institutions
would be free to focus on their primary function--degree offerings (p. 12). Additionally, the drop-outs and turnover that usually occur in the first two years of college could be more efficiently handled at the branch institutions, eliminating the partial waste of expensive plants. Needless to say, the arguments (both pro and con) for branch institutions related to those same old concerns: efficiency, cost reduction, getting the most for the State's dollars, and even elitism (noting the primary function of the "four-year" institutions to be that of degree offerings, with the development of terminal courses for the branches).

The Report also emphasized other educational contributions the branches could make: facilities for education in nursing (a shortage was in existence in Virginia at the time); and post-high school education below the professional level demanded by industrial development.

Urging the creation of such branches, the Report recommended that a commission also be established to consider the mechanics of putting them in place (p. 13). It noted that should the General Assembly decide to create a Board of Higher Education to exercise certain supervisory functions in connection with existing institutions, the establishment of branches could also be among its duties--eliminating the need for a commission.

In conclusion, the 1955 Crisis in Higher Education Report recommended the immediate development of a branch of the University of Virginia in Northern Virginia (where a pressing need existed) and for long-range planning for branch institutions in densely populated areas.
to meet anticipated enrollment pressures, affirming the development of branches in appropriate places to be the most economical way to solve the crisis problem within the financial resources of the Commonwealth (p. 14). (It should be noted here that another theme keeps raising its head among the recommendations of educational studies in Virginia—that of the need for planning.) The Crisis Report, as the others preceding it, was prompted by issues related to cost effectiveness. Its recommendations were likewise.

The Cost of Education in the State-Supported Colleges

1955 also produced another study directed by the General Assembly of 1954—The Cost of Education in State-Supported Colleges. This report was called for from a concern with the cost of education at state-supported institutions. The General Assembly also wanted to know to what extent the state institutions were providing adequate education for the people of Virginia (p. 5). Although this was yet another study focused on costs, the House Joint Resolution No. 30 which called for it also asked for a study and report on methods by which high school graduates in the State could be encouraged to attend institutions of higher learning in Virginia. It further directed that the Study include a report on the advisability of establishing a system of annual State scholarships at State-supported institutions for worthy and capable high school graduates who, due to financial restrictions, would be unable to attend college (p. 6). It examined such factors as the cost of education in state-supported institutions; the extent to which education at state-supported institutions should be subsidized by out-of-state appropriations; tuition fees for both
in- and out-of-state students; methods by which the State could encourage high school graduates to enter institutions of higher learning in Virginia; and the advisability of establishing a system of annual State scholarships at State-supported institutions for needy and capable high school graduates (pp. 10-18).

In summary (p. 18), the Report affirmed that the State was at a critical stage where vital decisions would soon have to be made. Among the questions to be answered were, "Should the parent institutions be expanded, or should extension divisions be created? Should the entrance requirements be increased greatly, or should the institutions keep the present requirements and seek to educate all Virginians who apply? Should the present method of over-all control of the institutions continue, or should a central board be created?"

Responding to Industrial Needs

In 1957, one year after the establishment of the State Council of Higher Education, the Report of the Commission to Study Industrial Development in Virginia, among other areas, addressed education and its relationship to successful industrial development (p. 15). It reported that on the whole public schools were doing an adequate job, however, there was need for improvement in the provision of more technical training in the secondary schools as well as night and extension courses and the need to provide college engineering training in the central eastern areas of the states. It also stated that the newly formed State Council could perform a real service by encouraging the filling of certain gaps in what for the most part was a good system of state-supported higher education (p. 60). It reported too
that at the undergraduate level Virginia colleges were well known for their excellent liberal arts training and that scientific courses at three institutions in the western part of the state were adequate, and perhaps exceptional (p. 61). However, the lack of engineering and scientific training of any kind in larger areas of the population was a concern. A solution cited was the development of junior colleges (in the larger centers) which were being considered at the time.

The Report also called for a close cooperation between industry and education at all levels, noting that industry would in the future increasingly help and finance education if the educators were reasonably responsive to its needs (p. 61).

Another Higher Education Costs Study

In 1959, another study relating to costs to the taxpayer and the student was completed. According to Vaughan (1971, p. 11), "...the study pointed out that the state's cost to the student was increasing, while the cost to the student was decreasing." Vaughan made reference to this statement taken directly from the report (pp. 5-7), "This trend toward increasing the percentage of the State's share of the cost of higher education should be halted and, if possible, reversed." This study, too, as the 1955 Crisis in Higher Education Report, favored branch colleges. Vaughan (p. 12) noted that this preference had nothing to do with making higher education more available; it was prompted by a concern for cutting costs. In the 1959 report (p. 9), the message was clear that Virginia had sought to afford public education for all children through the high school level, but she had yet to endorse universal college education, and,
Indeed, should not.

Another study completed in 1959 (December) was what is known as Needs, Policies and Plans for 2-Year Colleges in Virginia, commonly referred to as "The Martorana Study." This study was done for the Virginia State Council of Higher Education and was directed by S.V. Martorana, Chief of Staff and Regional Organization, Division of Higher Education, with the Office of Education (Department of Health, Education, and Welfare). And like the 1955 "Crisis" Report, this study was authorized with the same theme. According to the June 7, 1959 issue of the Washington Star, Virginia was facing a "crisis" in state-supported higher education. Two developments noted to be at the root of the problem were rapidly expanding enrollments with increasing costs and the spread of specialized knowledge, especially in high-cost technological fields. The article quoted Dr. William H. McFarlane, Executive Director of the Virginia Council of Higher Education: "Unless this crisis can be resolved by the State, public education in Virginia will not only fail to meet the minimum quantitative demands and needs of the people, but will also suffer a serious decline in quality." The article also quoted the president of Randolph-Macon Woman's College: "There is no more critical problem facing the State...than that of assuring the quality of our institutions of higher education--both public and private."

According to this same account, an enrollment pressure was being heightened by the increasing birth rate and a growing number who wanted to go to college, and that the avalanche was yet to come. It noted that enrollment in the 13 public colleges alone would be 27,100
by the end of the year, 33,000 by 1965, and 39,100 by 1970.

Additional factors contributing to the Virginia crisis in higher education were noted to be the rising cost of college education and the number of specialized courses needed as a result of the space age.

Noting that the Council of Higher Education was embarking on a program geared to solve these problems, the article reported that a short-term study was in the making, to be funded with a $20,000 grant from the Old Dominion Foundation. This study was to examine such complex matters as creating policy for the establishment of community colleges and development of standardized fiscal reporting procedures for the state institutions of higher education in Virginia.

**State Council's Role**

Minutes of an organizational meeting for the State Council of Higher Education, dated August 21, 1956, noted a list of problems outlined by Governor Stanley for consideration. They included standards for admission to colleges, consideration of expansion needed at various institutions of higher learning to meet the impact of increasing enrollment, the consideration of establishing junior colleges to provide two years of college training to "relieve the impact on the four-year institutions during the first and second years," consideration of the type of training between high school and college which could serve the similar purpose of technical institutes, and the call for a study to anticipate as accurately as possible future trends for college enrollment.

Subsequent minutes of the State Council revealed concern for
the "crisis" situation with reference to extension courses (April 30, 1957, p. 12) being offered by the senior institutions (with conflict particularly between the College of William and Mary and the University of Virginia). Dr. Dabney Lancaster, Chairman of the Council, noted also (April 30, p. 12) that the Council would probably have to submit recommendations on the establishment of a technical institution in Roanoke under the guidance of VPI and the location of a northern Virginia branch of the University of Virginia.

At the May 20 (1957) Council meeting (p. 15), Dr. Lancaster pointed to the need for action toward coordinating the extension work being offered by the University and William and Mary.

August 2 minutes (1957, p. 22) noted a meeting that had been held with Dr. Paschall (President of VPI), Governor Stanley, and Mr. Bishop, the President of Averett College, regarding possible junior college expansion in Virginia. Mr. Bishop was in favor of such colleges being under the Board of Education, rather than under the supervision of four-year institutions. He believed that the latter plan would result in the community college being "too academically straight-laced and would tend to curtail the practical training which junior colleges emphasize."

At the November 18 (1957) meeting, Dr. Lancaster noted a conversation he had just had with the Governor (pp. 32-33). The Governor had asked that the State Council consider who should take responsibility for two-year (branch) colleges. "Should they be an extension of secondary education and controlled by local school boards, or should there be a special state board composed of both
four-year and two-year college members to check on proper academic standards, and local representatives who would be interested in and aware of local needs, or should the control be vested in existing boards of parent institutions" (November 18, 1957, pp. 32-33).

By the December 14 meeting (1957, p. 36), concern was expressed by the Council with the urgency of getting under way a major study with reference to junior (branch, community) colleges. State Council minutes (December 14, 1957, p. 36), noted "Essential decisions will have to be made concerning location, control, cost, and curricular offerings. Of paramount importance is the immediate announcement from Council of some statement of policy and plans to forestall a possible flurry of bills in this area in the coming session of the General Assembly." At this meeting it was suggested that a committee be instituted (composed of qualified and respected people) to study the whole question and report its findings and recommendations within a period of perhaps eight months. It was also noted that funds would be needed for associated expenses and the employment of consultants.

Interestingly, at this same meeting (December 14, 1957, p. 36), it was recorded that the whole matter of discussion was related to a section of the act which created the Council, stipulating that a report on branch institutions, location, cost, control, be made to the Governor and General Assembly by October 1, 1957. The minutes also stated that no report of this nature had been completed. Lack of time to permit no more than a perfunctory report was the reason identified for noncompletion of such a report. The Council agreed that a letter to the Governor was in order, explaining the Council's position and
its plans.

Discussion of the following topics was sprinkled throughout State Council minutes from January 27 to November 24, 1958: requests for establishing technical institutes; a possible conference on education beyond the high school; the desirability of junior colleges in several locations throughout the state; the approval of standards for junior and senior colleges; the State Chamber of Commerce's request for assistance in its projects involving higher education; the means of control and financing of two-year colleges used by other states; the encouragement of SREB (Southern Regional Education Board) for local control of junior colleges; whether or not the junior college was the answer to expected growth in college enrollment; whether or not a state institution should be allowed to exclude students; and the probability of sponsorship of community colleges, beginning as branches of parent institutions and working their way toward eventual independent status (pp. 41-47).

Finally, according to the minutes of the February 16, 1959 meeting (p. 83), "The Council agreed to request SREB to appoint a panel of experts for a statewide study of needs in higher education in Virginia." At this particular meeting, Dr. Lancaster requested that serious consideration be given to the following: (1) Should teacher colleges continue to be under the State Board of Education; and (2) Shall two-year colleges be branches of existing colleges or controlled by local boards.

Accordingly, on February 17, 1959, a letter went out to Dr. Robert Anderson, Executive Director of the Southern Regional Education
Board, requesting assistance in a general survey of higher education in Virginia, with particular reference to the coordinating role of the State Council of Higher Education. In the letter, Dr. McFarlane, State Council Director, provided a brief historical sketch of events leading up to this request. He made special reference to the Kelly Report of 1951, noting that almost ten years had passed since the publication of the Report in 1952. And although he agreed with Kelly's belief that a coordinated system was the answer to some of Virginia's educational problems, he did not necessarily endorse Kelly's definition of the State's responsibilities in higher education and his evaluation of institutional functions for application in 1959.

Referring to Virginia tradition, McFarlane noted in his letter to Anderson, "State action in coordinating higher education, both prior and subsequent to the creation of the Council, is a classic illustration of the characteristic deliberateness and caution with which Virginians approach a new problem. This approach is not without its advantages, of course, but one suspects that a more immediate and positive response to the problem would have been better in this case." He further noted, "The net result appears to be that Virginia stands almost defenseless on the threshold of an era to which everyone refers as the 'coming crisis in higher education.'"

In making a plea for SREB's assistance in conducting a survey, McFarlane stated that the impetus for the study was not coming from the Council alone, but also from others interested in higher education and its importance to the well-being of Virginia. He affirmed that it was their feeling primarily that the proposed study would have the
greatest impact if it were undertaken by a group (referring to SREB) with "impeccable judgment and unquestioned prestige."

With reference to financial arrangements, McFarlane informed Dr. Anderson that if costs could be kept under $20,000, the Council would be drawing up a proposal for a foundation grant to underwrite expenses.

On February 26, 1959, a letter went out to the Old Dominion Foundation from the State Council, outlining background information regarding an upcoming proposal for funds from the Foundation to assist in conducting an objective survey. McFarlane frankly acknowledged that many people had expressed doubts of the Council's ability to streamline higher education facilities and programs. In defense he lamented, "While there are contributing factors of varying importance to the Council's present ineffectiveness, the overriding cause is simply this: Virginia is attempting to supervise a multi-million dollar enterprise in terms of an wholly inadequate administrative set-up and a minuscule budget." He went on to compare the administrative set-ups in other states (Texas and North Carolina) to that of Virginia--underscoring the fact that the Council's ineffectiveness was related to a lack of adequate staff and sufficient budget, unlike Texas and North Carolina.

He also noted that Virginia had been able to accomplish a number of surveys in spite of financial constraints, but that the expectations of the legislature were staggering. To emphasize this point McFarlane included the following passage from a 1958 General Assembly request, directing the Council to report by September, 1959
...curricular offerings in the individual state institutions... the demands which Virginia's economy and total society will make on higher education in the next ten to twenty years... the extent, deficiencies, funds, and long range aims of community colleges, the location, support, control, type of work and basic purposes of such colleges, tuition charges at each institution in relation to the cost of educational services rendered and the ability of the student to pay... use of scholarship and loan funds and the need for increase in these funds.

McFarlane then quipped, "All this, mind you, in addition to the regular duties of coordination with which the Council is charged, which includes biennial visits to all institutions and a detailed review of all capital and operating budgets, as well as detailed recommendations on them."

In April (1959) the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) reported on its visit to Virginia to discuss the proposed study of higher education in the State and the desirability and feasibility of SREB's participation (SREB Report to the State Council of Higher Education). SREB's conclusions were based on interviews with the chairman and three other members of the Council on Higher Education, eight legislators, six college presidents, the governor, the attorney general, and the budget director. The Report recommended the development of a higher education long-range plan for coordination to be effective and for Virginia to have an adequate system of higher education to meet the difficult problems of the future. And SREB stated that the development of such a plan should be the primary task of the Council, working closely with state institutions. SREB called for the plan to contain general plans for a system to meet the needs
of all Virginians, stating that such a plan could be used as a general basis for coordination. SREB suggested three ways to develop the plan, preferring, however, that the best way would be for the State Council to conduct a statewide study of higher education (versus a study done by an outside organization or a series of more limited studies over a longer period of time, resulting in a general plan). The most important reason for this choice was that it would emphasize the Council's responsibilities as set forth in the act creating it. SREB believed that outside assistance would be desirable if the Council wanted to move forward rapidly on this study and suggested that a foundation grant be sought. SREB stated that extensive use of outside consultants would enable the Council to retain direction of the study while also benefiting from outside experienced judgment. SREB further estimated that a thorough study of higher education would cost from $50,000 to $100,000 and would probably involve from a year up to eighteen months to complete. It mentioned three areas that should be included in the study: Council coordination at several levels (with other government agencies and commissions); program coordination and present patterns of expenditures.

In conclusion, SREB emphasized that Virginia's problems were not unique, but fairly typical with the kind encountered in coordinating agencies of other states. In response to the recommendations of the SREB Report, Dr. McFarlane prepared a proposal to the State Council for undertaking a technical study of higher education in Virginia (April 10, 1959). His proposal introduction asked that State Council members keep three considerations in mind:
(1) that although the Council had been in place for almost three years, it was not closer to a genuine program of coordination than when it began; (2) the reasons for the lack of programs were related to inadequate means and the nature of the problem itself; and (3) that the proposal being presented represented the best professional advice available for getting on with the job within a time that was growing critically short.

McFarlane then presented to Council members his response to the recommendations of SREB. He noted the limitation of inadequate financing to undertake a study of the magnitude recommended as well as the dilemma of the need to demonstrate to the 1960 General Assembly through such a study that coordinated planning is needed for effectiveness (making a case to finance such planning on a long-term basis). He also noted that a favorable response was expected from the request for a foundation grant, but that the particular foundation with which the Council was negotiating had a policy of avoiding commitment of support beyond the original grant. Yet it had been known to be responsive to a continuation of grants when positive results had been demonstrated and a continuing need prevailed.

In considering these elements, McFarlane emphasized the desirability and necessity of producing (no later than December 1, 1959) a completed study of some critical phase of higher education in Virginia. He felt that such an effort would produce tangible results for the $20,000 expended and that it would enhance the chances of satisfying the expectations of both the Legislature and the Foundation. He then outlined procedures for studies to begin that
would contribute to a long-range plan of coordination, accompanied by cost factors and recommendations for personnel to be involved. He also included in his proposal to State Council members a list of suggested studies leading to coordination. Among eleven cited were a study of needs for additional educational facilities, including community colleges, and a study of extension programs. These were to be a part of a long-range program. For short-term studies he recommended two: one of the fiscal reporting systems for the colleges, with a view to coordinating information, standardizing report forms, and eliminating unnecessary duplication; and another of the technical and technological needs of Virginia business and industry as compared with the technical and technological training provided by institutions of higher learning in Virginia.

At the April 13 (1959) meeting of the Council, members agreed to seek the $20,000 grant to finance the first phase of the long-range survey of higher education proposed by McFarlane with recommendations from SREB. In the records of State Council a document almost identical to the one sent to members prior to the April 13 meeting was sent to members after the April 13 meeting. Modification of the document included the deletion of McFarlane's reminder of the three considerations to be noted (as noted on page 59 of this chapter), a change from a study of needs for additional facilities, including communities, to a study on the "needs for community colleges," plus the addition of a third short-term study on the creation of policy on establishing community colleges. These changes seem to emphasize the urgent concern for the establishment of community colleges.
Following these modifications, a proposal was drawn up on April 17, requesting $20,000 from the Old Dominion Foundation to underwrite a technical study of higher education in the Commonwealth. The request for funding included SREB's Report as well as the State Council proposal. In this document the third proposed short-term study on the creation of policy on establishing community colleges was moved up to a number-two priority, and the short-term study on fiscal reporting was assigned number three in priority.

On May 18, 1959, the Old Dominion Foundation informed Dr. McFarlane by letter that the Trustees for the Foundation had authorized the grant in the amount of $20,000 to underwrite the costs of the projected first phase of the study that the Council planned to undertake. In a May 20 newspaper account (Richmond Times-Dispatch), the $20,000 was to be used for a six-month study of the state's most pressing educational problems, according to State Council announcements. The study would begin July 1, to be concluded before the January convening of the General Assembly. The newspaper article stated that, according to Dr. McFarlane, the study would look into Virginia's need for technical training facilities, a definition of policy for community college facilities, and a survey of the cost of instruction in all fields of Virginia's public institutions of higher education. It reported that the study would be conducted by a full-time director (nationally recognized) and an advisory committee of four or five educators of recognized repute, with the assistance of the State Council.

The Director who would be chosen for this study was S.V.
Martorana. He had directed an earlier study in 1959 for the Norfolk Junior Chamber of Commerce, in conjunction with the State Council (Vaughan, 1971, pp. 22-24). That study which was initiated by the Chamber, concluded that a comprehensive two-year college should be established to offer general studies and occupational programs to meet the needs of area business and industry. A significant factor related to the Chamber's study was the demonstration of local interest in post-high school education. The study revealed an interest in adult education, to include night and extension courses, and the need for technical training to meet current employment demands. Business respondents to the Study's survey indicated the advantage to be had for their businesses should a college be provided within commuting distance (no more than thirty miles). The Report called for the establishment of two-year institutions (including technical institutes) wherever they were needed.

Martorana demonstrated his continuing interest in Virginia's problems in higher education beyond the completion of his Chamber of Commerce Study. He kept abreast of what was occurring. On June 8, 1959, after seeing the Washington Star article regarding the $20,000 foundation grant, he wrote a letter to McFarlane. Martorana, making reference to the article wrote, "Needless to say, I read every word with a great deal of interest. The comprehensive study program is a challenging and promising proposition for Virginia. I want to wish you well and the highest of success in getting this done. If there is anything this office (Office of Education) can do to help in accomplishing your objectives, please let me know."
And indeed, his assistance was sought, resulting in his proposal for a study of two-year colleges in Virginia's system of higher education. On July 13, 1959, the State Council approved his proposal. By December of 1959, the Council received a presentation on his findings (12-18-59 State Council Meeting).

Findings of the Martorana Study

According to Vaughan (1971, p. 12), Martorana's Study was the first major one which was dedicated to the desirability and feasibility of a network of two-year colleges in the State. The Study (Needs, Policies, and Plans For 2-Year Colleges in Virginia, 1959) resulted in several conclusions. Among them was the fact that increasing demands for educational opportunity were being accelerated by population growth and progress in economic and industrial development. Consequently, gaps existed in educational opportunity for Virginians. Another conclusion was that decentralization through the establishment of two-year colleges would be economical for students and the state alike (p. 203). A call for the State Council of Higher Education to recommend the development of a number of two-year colleges for expansion and decentralization of higher education was suggested in response to these particular conclusions, as was the suggestion that the two-year colleges offer comprehensive programs and a commitment to serve the area within commuting distance of their campuses (pp. 4-5).

Another conclusion of the Martorana Study was that the greatest progress in developing two-year colleges could be made by supporting, utilizing, and strengthening the existing pattern of higher education
organization and administration in the State, noting that an evolutionary change versus a serious modification would be preferred in Virginia (p. 5). The Study recommended that the State Council be the agency for the overall planning and establishment of two-year colleges and that the Council should receive adequate support to coordinate this effort (p. 6).

The Study noted three reasons for the State Council to proceed with haste in establishing a sound statewide plan for the development and operation of two-year colleges: (1) the mounting demand for higher education; (2) the danger of haphazard and wasteful development that would likely occur without guidance for localities; and (3) the opportunity to make the most of State resources and capitalize on the direction in motion to move higher education forward in an orderly and efficient manner (p. 34).

The Martorana Study also noted the tradition in Virginia of separating elementary and secondary education from higher education and the practice of providing no local tax support for higher education on a continuing basis (p. 35). Excluding the Medical College of Virginia and Virginia Military Institute, it noted too the four systems of higher education in place, each with its own board. Three (the University of Virginia, the College of William and Mary, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute) maintained branches under their purview. The fourth system placed two teacher colleges and a Black college under the purview of the State Board of Education (pp. 37-38). One wonders about this last statement, in particular. Apparently, the placing of teacher colleges (primarily women's colleges) and a Black
college under the State Board of Education (secondary education) versus the State Council of Higher Education, is yet another expression of Virginia elitism. This policy appeared to classify teacher's and Black colleges as below-college level.

With reference to types of junior or two-year colleges in existence generally, the Report made mention of some of the most common models: the unified school district (as found in Iowa and Minnesota); the autonomous two-year college district (found in Texas, Mississippi, and New York); the state junior college (as in Georgia); and the two-year college branch of a university or college (as in Virginia), outlining strengths and weaknesses of each (pp. 44-51). It concluded that the best model for two-year colleges in Virginia would be for them to be created as institutional units under the boards of existing state institutions of higher education (p. 54). It did note, however, the importance of forming citizen committees to ensure sensitivity to community needs (p. 57).

In making decisions about possible locations for these two-year units, several criteria were chosen. The best measure, according to the Report, was the high school enrollment. A second criterion was the closeness of an existing institution of higher education, and the third criterion was evidence of local interest (p. 59). In a quite thorough investigation, using these criteria, the Report identified twelve areas that could be served by new two-year colleges. The establishment of colleges (in addition to existing institutions) in these locations would provide public education in commuting distance for all Virginians (p. 93). The Report concluded with a plan for
financing the two-year colleges, which called for the localities to provide the funds for the sites and for the development of those sites for the new colleges. The primary funding for facilities would come from the State (p. 100).

The Other Side of the 1950s

The State Council of Higher Education endorsed the recommendations of the Martorana Study. However, the 1950s ended just as they had begun—with no system of two-year public colleges in place and more studies on the horizon. The General Assembly had not been poised to take the step. In deciphering the direction of public higher education in Virginia in the 1950s, the issue of desegregation must not be ignored. Although it was not mentioned in any of the aforementioned studies of the fifties, the issue was boiling beneath the surface.

As Vaughan asked (1971, p. 21), "Why, one must ask, would a state that had just taken its stand for 'massive resistance' be willing to put millions of dollars into the system recommended by Martorana, whose programs could not legally be limited to the white race?" Although, when questioned by Vaughan, Martorana maintained that the race issue did not discourage the expansion of higher education recommended in his study, the possibility cannot be ruled out. The tradition of elitism, as well as conservatism, in Virginia is well documented. While the case for conservatism is well documented (as recorded by the documents examined in this chapter), the case for elitism is not always so overt. The tradition of elitism in Virginia, however, can also be documented—particularly with
reference to racial elitism.
CHAPTER IV
MASSIVE RESISTANCE ERA: ANOTHER VIEW

The 1950s produced many studies with reference to public higher education. The recommendations of these studies, however, failed to receive endorsement from the General Assembly. That the recommendations of the 1959 Martorana Study were not endorsed is especially hard to understand, particularly when they received full support of the State Council of Higher Education which called for the Study.

It should be pointed out, however, that while these studies were taking place, the racial attitude of the 1950s was being fully expressed in Virginia's Massive Resistance to the Brown Decision. And while Vaughan and others dance lightly over this topic while speculating on its impact, this author chooses to demonstrate just how strong this attitude was during the 1950s. And surely such a deeply-felt attitude had a bearing on any decision to fund public education, whether it was elementary, secondary, or higher.

The issue of race was one that was neither punctuated throughout the literature on public higher education in Virginia, nor overtly discussed. Nonetheless, it was boiling beneath the surface during the decade of the 1950s. The traditional elitism of Virginia had always included the separation of the races, and the educational
arena was no exception. Although there were frequent references to democracy and equality, they apparently were intended primarily for the white population. Well before and beyond the 1954 Brown Decision and Massive Resistance, this racial stance prevailed.

There were, however, intermittent, if not-heard, cries on behalf of the education of Blacks and their rights during the early 1940s and the decade of the 1950s. But the existing racial attitude was so pervasive that it would take a long time for real change to occur.

In 1943, for example, when Dr. Dabney S. Lancaster, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, addressed the Delegate Assembly of the Virginia Education Association, he began with the following words attributed to Thomas Jefferson:

I think by far the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness. Preach my dear Sir, a crusade against ignorance: establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the tax which will be paid for this purpose is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests and nobles, who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance (pp. 131-134; 138).

Lancaster notes that these words of Jefferson were written to George Wythe with reference to his plans for a system of public education for Virginia (1943, p. 132). And he went on to say that Virginia was standing at a crossroads. Advancements had been made in public education, but there was a far way to go. Lancaster added (p. 131), "Jefferson's words, written one hundred and fifty years ago, are as pertinent today as they were then."
Further into his address he mentioned the many outstanding leaders who had been educated in Virginia's public schools and state-supported colleges, boasting that "These individuals have been equal to or superior to many men and women educated in school systems rated well ahead of Virginia" (Lancaster, p. 132). He explained:

This has been due to a good inheritance, a background of culture, a tradition of public service, and the labors of many teachers who have considered their work of first importance and their compensation as secondary. The large majority of Virginia people, however, are not being offered the educational opportunities that they must have if they are to hold their own in our present complex society. Far too many are receiving little training, or training of poor quality, and concerted action is needed now if we believe with Jefferson that democracy can survive only if founded upon an educated citizenship (Lancaster, p. 132).

Elaborating more, Lancaster (p. 133) made recommendations for emphases in elementary school, consolidation of high schools to afford broader program offerings, and the possible addition of two years to the high school program not only for broadening purposes, but also for work-study and better preparation for college (allowing colleges and universities to concentrate on more advanced studies). He also called for rigid scrutiny of facilities and future needs of higher education "with a view to enabling every young man and young woman, regardless of economic stature, to secure the education that his needs require" (Lancaster, p. 133). Lancaster also called for improvement of Virginia's college facilities and planning "to meet the needs of the state as a whole rather than of each individual institution."

Finally, Lancaster did devote a portion of his address specifically to the Black population in Virginia. In a section toward the end of his speech, captioned "Equalization of Opportunities in
Higher Education for Blacks," he made reference to an annual amount of $40,000 that was being appropriated to provide opportunities in higher education for Negroes who could not receive such opportunities at the Virginia State College for Blacks (Lancaster, p. 134). Apparently the fund had been administered through Virginia State College up until that point in time. Lancaster stated that since the dollars were not an actual part of the College's budget, they should not be expended there. The State Board, he announced, was recommending that those funds be given to the State Board of Education while allowing the President of Virginia State College to administer them, under the direction of the State Board of Education.

Lancaster went on to suggest that the entire matter of Negro education be given the utmost careful attention. He further noted (p. 134), "Not only because of the Supreme Court ruling but because of our belief in democracy and American principles, we must provide equal compensation for all when there is equal training and successful experience."

Dr. Lancaster's reference to Thomas Jefferson and his apparent concern for equality for all, however, were incongruent with the actual practices that were then being allowed as far as the Black was concerned. Virginia State College was under the State Board of Education (Secondary and Elementary Education), versus a governing board of its own. And tuition assistance provided for the higher education of Blacks was limited. Apparently those Blacks who sought higher education beyond the Master's level at Virginia State College could receive financial support, however, it had to be used outside
the State. In a telephone interview with a well-known Black educator, Dr. Freddie W. Nicholas, Jr., President of John Tyler Community College, he explained the practice and policy of providing dollars for Blacks to receive their doctorates at any institution of higher education "outside Virginia". Since Virginia State College for Negroes and Hampton Institute (the private Black College) only provided graduate work at the Master's level, those Blacks desiring a doctorate had to go elsewhere. However, according to Nicholas, it was standard operating procedure in the 1940s and even past the time of the Brown Decision that Blacks could not go to Virginia Polytechnic Institute or the University of Virginia. He noted that many of his friends received their doctorates at such places as Cornell, New York University, Ohio State, and Penn State prior to integration, paid for by Virginia dollars. Blacks were not allowed to attend traditional white institutions of higher education in Virginia for their doctorates, even when the same programs they sought could be obtained at a cheaper rate and regardless of the fact that Virginia might be their first choice.

Surely Dr. Lancaster's reference to the large majority of Virginians not receiving educational opportunities included the Black, yet the development of higher educational leadership for Blacks had to be accomplished beyond Virginia's boundaries. To progress in higher education, Blacks had to leave the state.

A Call to Overhaul Virginia Civil Rights Laws

Although the plight of the Blacks was not a concern of many white Virginians, there were some voices rising from the multitude who
viewed things differently. One such voice belonged to Delegate Armistead L. Boothe. In a front-page story of the Richmond Times Dispatch (January 8, 1950), Boothe made a plea for a thorough overhaul of Virginia civil rights laws. A proposal was being considered at that time to abolish transportation segregation and to establish a Virginia Civil Rights Commission to study economic, educational, and other phases of racial relations and problems, and to recommend measures for correction of abuse.

This proposal, according to Boothe, would have three effects:

1) It would demonstrate to Congress and the Supreme Court that Virginia was moving to do something on her own.
2) The establishment of a civil rights commission would condition the people of the state for staggering social problems that they will inevitably face in the future.
3) The commission could go to work on improving Negro school facilities and the lot of Negroes generally.

Boothe said, "Then we might come a little closer to living up to what the Constitution promises--1) safety and security of persons, 2) freedom and conscience expression, 3) privileges of citizenship, and 4) equality of opportunity." Boothe noted that it was under equality of opportunity (#4) where Virginia was lacking in fair treatment of the Black. Using the general thesis that racial integrity should be preserved, Boothe outlined a plan to overcome unjust conditions. According to his plan, he would first abolish transportation segregation. His second move would be in education. And it is here, he noted, in the field of education (particularly primary and high schools) that civil rights issues of the most highly explosive content existed.

Boothe urged Virginians to keep the races separate for the
time-being, but to expedite the job of making them equal. He made reference to a case under advisement in Arlington at the time which was arguing that segregation in itself was a form of discrimination and that separate schools for Blacks meant unequal schools for Blacks. He also cited a similar case being tried under the Supreme Court, warning of the revolutionary repercussion on the life of the people of Virginia that would take place should these cases be sustained. To avoid such consequences, Boothe pleaded for work to begin in the State to improve the lot of the Black. Prophetically, he warned that the greatest thing to be feared was a federal attempt to right all the wrongs at one fell swoop. This, Boothe was certain, would demonstrate an utter disregard for certain facts of life, including health, moral and social differences, which rightly or wrongly existed in many places as racial, rather than individual, differences. He called for Virginia to face the problem squarely and to recognize the State's duty to foster equality of improvement in employment, education, housing, and health among all her citizens, regardless of their race or color.

Denouncement of Segregation

Five days later, following the Richmond Times Dispatch article on Boothe's call for an overhaul of civil rights laws, a story on page five denounced segregation (January 13, 1950). Making reference to a current issue of Presbyterian Outlook, the Richmond Times Dispatch quoted the Director of Christian Relations for the Presbyterian Assembly Board of Church Extension (Dr. Marion): "I have no hesitation in saying that I think segregation, as such, is utterly wrong in
principle and utterly pernicious in practice. We white Southerners have lived with segregation so long that we tend to accept it as something handed from Sinai." Dr. Marion was also reported as declaring that segregation decreed for all Blacks amounted to a second-class citizenship.

Galloping Socialism

Virginia's general attitude toward equal opportunity was not limited to the Black. Anything that smacked of subsidy went against the grain of most Virginians.

On January 10, 1950, a portion of Truman's budget request was featured (pp. 10-11) under the caption, "Education, Research." The newspaper account reported the following words of Truman (taken from highlights of the budget message included in Aid to Education):

The nation cannot afford to waste human potentialities, as we are now doing by failing to provide adequate elementary and secondary education for millions of children and by failing to help hundreds of thousands of young people who could benefit from higher education. The importance of this need requires that we provide substantial federal assistance to states for general education purposes and for certain other important programs in the field. I have asked the Federal Security Administrator to make a comprehensive study in order to determine whether the Federal government might appropriately take any actions to encourage the states and localities to establish and expand "community colleges." I shall transmit to the Congress legislative proposal to authorize a limited Federal program to assist capable youth who could not otherwise do so to pursue their desired fields of study at the institutions of their choice. The welfare of the nation as a whole demands that the present educational inequalities be reduced. I urge the Congress to complete legislative action to permit the Federal government to aid the States.

The January 13 issue of the Richmond Times Dispatch (1950) provided the following headline with reference to Truman: "BYRD URGES CURB ON TRUMAN BEFORE NATION IS PLUNGED INTO STATE OF 'GALLOPING
SOCIALISM". Regarding welfare (and defense) spending plans, Byrd was reported to have said in a prepared speech that "creeping socialism" had been under way in the United States for several years and that it would become "galloping socialism," if the program of President Truman were adopted.

In that same issue, this headline appeared: "ANOTHER GOOD TRUMAN PLAN TO BUST THE GOVERNMENT." This feature attacked a suggestion by a Federal official that $300 million be annually appropriated for federally-financed scholarships for college students. It reported also that Truman was apparently sympathetic to the proposal and that while he had not formally endorsed the particular estimate of $300 million, he had stated in his recent budget message that he would initiate a federally-funded scholarship program. Truman, in fact, was expected to present this proposal to Congress shortly. The newspaper account also stated that Ed McGrath, United States Commissioner of Education, seemed to think that American colleges needed millions more students, rather than fewer and better ones. McGrath had reported that the proposed dollars would take care of 400,000 undergraduates a year and about 37,000 more on the graduate and professional levels. Each student would receive $600 per year outright. A loan program was reported also to be under consideration whereby up to $1,200 might be borrowed. Rebutting this proposal, the Richmond Times Dispatch editorial retorts:

All this is a wonderful idea, except that it would carry the Federal government that much nearer bankruptcy, flood the colleges and universities with vast hordes of students, many of them unqualified, strengthen 'the welfare state' concept, and teach another group of Americans to look regularly to Uncle Sam for help. No wonder Dr. Guy E. Snavely,
executive director of the Association of American Colleges, warned that body at its meeting in Cincinnati against any such insidious scheme. He pointed out that an ambitious and needy student can still find ways and means of getting through college, without this Federal program. He expressed fear that its enactment would give the young people of America the impression that the Government is ready not only to guarantee a college education, 'but to furnish suitable and good-paying positions thereafter.' His solemn warning should be heeded before it's too late.

Higher Education in Virginia: 1950-1960

According to McNeer (1981, p. 3) there were many changes that took place in Virginia during the years following World War II. Reporting on the establishment of Richard Bland College in 1960, however, McNeer noted that at that time (1960) higher education in Virginia remained racially segregated (1981, p. 2). "Thus," he said, "when local citizens began to seek the creation of a new institution under the control of a four-year college or university, they assumed that this type of racially separated enrollment pattern would continue" (McNeer, 1981, p. 2). Apparently among the changes referred to by McNeer was not a change in Virginia's racial stance. He did note the projected lack of classroom space for increasing numbers of high school graduates who would be enrolling in higher education from 1960 to 1975. He also noted the need for the establishment of some type of coordinating agency to address ways of solving the emerging problems of higher education (McNeer, p. 3). According to McNeer, the General Assembly of Virginia directed the Virginia Advisory Legislative Council to develop a comprehensive report on the status of higher education in Virginia, in an effort to meet the needs confronting the higher education community of the post World War II era.
The 1954 Supreme Court Decision

"The struggle to assure Blacks their full rights as American citizens had gathered momentum during and after the Second World War. Though most of Truman's civil-rights program was rejected by Congress, his fight for that program established civil rights as a national issue" (Blum et al., 1985, p. 793). On May 17, 1954, in the case of Brown versus Board of Education of Topeka, the Court, speaking through the new Chief Justice, Earl Warren, concluded that in the field of public education, the doctrine of 'separate but equal' had no place and that separate facilities were inherently unequal (Blum, p. 793).

"In Washington, Virginia's Senator Harry F. Byrd issued a sharply critical statement. Byrd called the decision 'the most serious blow that has been struck against the rights of the states,' and said Virginia faced a 'crisis of the first magnitude' (Muse, 1961, p. 5). And according to Tucker (1975, p. 36), "As soon as the 1954 decision was announced, evasion and resistance became the political watchwords of Virginia."

Harry Byrd and Massive Resistance

In his book on Virginia's Massive Resistance (1961, pp. 25-26), Benjamin Muse provided the following description of Harry Byrd:

Harry Byrd, the heavy-set, well-dressed, gentlemanly 'Senator's Senator,' with ruddy cheeks and vigorous step—reflecting outdoor life at his apple orchards—and almost cherubic features, bore little resemblance to the usual conception of the political boss; but few political bosses in the United States had held such power or wielded it as long as he. The 'organization,' dignified, respectable, deriving much of its strength from its long record of conservative, frugal, and notably honest management of the state's business, was an institution unique in American politics. Byrd's fame stems in the first instance from a remarkable and never-to-be-forgotten performance as governor (1926-1930). He enjoyed in Virginia an
almost mystical prestige; and his hold over the organization was such that eager politicians took their cue from the Senator's slightest hint, or sought to fathom his wishes when express directions were lacking.

Making reference to Byrd's initial statement in May, 1954, Muse noted that "Byrd was almost silent on the subject of the Supreme Court ruling for over a year. But his feeling was well known to the political confraternity; he resented it from the depths of his soul" (p. 26).

According to Muse (1961, p. 26), "It was not primarily a matter of race prejudice with Byrd." In spite of the fact that his organization had been strongest in the Southside area of Virginia (considered to be the "Black Belt"), he actually resided in the northwest part of the State where Blacks were rare (Muse, p. 26). Muse also noted that Byrd had never been regarded as anti-Black and that white supremacy had never been a feature of his philosophy. Byrd, in fact, prided himself in the fact that as governor he had obtained the strongest anti-lynching law that had ever been enacted (1926), and boasted that since that time not one single lynching had occurred in Virginia.

However, according to Muse:

...Byrd gloried in the story of Virginia's post-Civil-War 'redemption' from carpetbagger rule, and a passionate and lifelong attachment to the principle of state rights permeated his very being. One may suspect, too, a certain feeling that, in ordering an end to a time-honored practice in Virginia, the Supreme Court had intruded, not merely upon the rights of states, but upon the personal domain of Harry Byrd (p. 26).

Mills E. Godwin: The Enigma

One of the most intriguing facets of the racial saga in
Virginia is the story of Mills E. Godwin, Jr. Godwin was one of the main leaders of Massive Resistance, and yet he went on to be championed by many as the "father of the community college system in Virginia," when he later became Governor. With reference to Byrd's "organization," Senator Mills Godwin emerged as the most powerful leader for the organization program and the personification of Southern gradualist philosophy, and he believed that integration would seriously impede educational progress in the state (Elliott, 1968, p. 17).

"Leading the extremist majority, and riding on top of the emotional wave, were some of the most potent figures in the Byrd organization" (Muse, 1961, p. 33). And Godwin was the one who became the chairman of the massive resistance team. Godwin, in fact, proclaimed that any integration would be the key which opened the door to the inevitable destruction of the free public schools in Virginia. He believed that integration, "however slight, anywhere in Virginia would be a cancer eating at the very life blood of our public school system" (Orville, 1969, p. 214).

Godwin was a signer of the Gray Commission Report which called for a system of tuition grants from public funds to aid children who might attend private schools to escape public integration. The Report, or "Gray Plan," also called for a "locally administered pupil assignment plan, which, though based on criteria other than race, was calculated to keep to a minimum the enrollment of Blacks in white schools" (Muse, p. 16). The Gray Plan also called for amendment of the compulsory attendance law to provide that no child could be
required to attend an integrated school. According to Elliott (p. 17), "Though he served on the Gray Commission, he signed the report with the reservation that he could later work toward a stronger policy." And indeed, he did champion something much stronger.

Also according to Elliott (p. 16), "The state entered the phase of 'massive resistance' as state policy when it bypassed the Gray Commission's proposal for a pupil placement plan, leaving the choice of integrating schools to each locality. In January 1956, the General Assembly adopted a resolution of 'interposition' calling for resistance by all honorable, legal and constitutional means." There was one lone dissent to the resolution, provided by Senator E. E. Haddock (Elliott, pp. 16-17). "He was one of a gradually increasing number of legislators who would raise their voices and their votes against suggested evasive programs of the organization. The unequivocable stand of such men, coupled with the courageous open battle of men like Armistead Boothe against the massive resistance legislation, was a heartbreaking story. These men placed their political fortunes on the line in an attempt to moderate the organization's position and give reasonable direction to the state" (Elliott, p. 17).

Senator Godwin was one of the signers of the Doctrine of Interposition. With reference to politics where he was concerned, Godwin noted later (Andrews, 1970, p. 37) that "No man could have survived in public office, especially in Southside, if he was 'soft' on integration." Andrews noted that upon looking back to that time of desperate maneuvering when Virginia used every possible legal avenue
of subterfuge and defiance, Godwin made no apology. He was quoted by Andrews (p. 42) as stating, "There was every reason to believe that enormous problems would continue in many areas and I cannot say even now a decade later that public education has not been adversely affected because of racial integration."

"The Doctrine of Interposition

The Doctrine of Interposition (1956), endorsed by Godwin, was indeed a scathing report. Its underlying racial implications certainly ran contrary to a system of public two-year colleges which would come later. In discussing the various Southern states' reactions to the Brown Decision, Blum, et al. reported that "Extreme segregationists revised the pre-Civil War doctrine of nullification under the more mellifluous name of 'interposition'." This was no doubt a reference to Virginia (p. 793).

In February, 1956, the General Assembly adopted a resolution interposing the sovereignty of Virginia against encroachment upon the reserved powers of the State, and appealing to sister states to resolve a question of contested power (1957, p. 3). The Resolution was passed by a 36-2 Senate vote and a 90-5 vote in the House of Delegates.

The following excerpt from the Report on the Doctrine of Interposition (p. 23) conveys the racial flavor in the politics of Virginia at that time:

It is with no wish to offend Virginia's Negro people, who include among their number many valuable citizens, that the committee submit data to support their profound conviction that the two races ought not to be mingled in the intimacy of the public schools of this Commonwealth. The schools offer an experience that is not educative alone, but social
also; they bring together young people in the formative years of their adolescence, before they have had an opportunity to fashion a bridle of maturity by which the passions and impulses of inexperience may be governed. The palpable differences between white and Negro children in intellectual aptitudes have been demonstrated repeatedly by careful examinations conducted by responsible educational authorities. A summary of recent findings in this regard appears in the Appendix. To bring together such disparate groups in a massive integration of classrooms (and in the smaller, rural counties, having only two or three high schools, massive integration could not be avoided by any devices of gerrymandering) would be to create an educational chaos, impossible of satisfactory administration, which would lower the educational level for white children and inevitably create race consciousness and racial tensions. A more cruel imposition upon the children of both races, and upon the tranquillity of their communities, could not be imagined.

The Report cited other problems beyond those of teaching and curriculum which stemmed from generations of custom, tradition, and perhaps anthropological considerations for decreeing continued segregation in the schools. It quoted 1955 data including the 21.7 percent illegitimate Negro birth rate (the white rate was 2.3), the disproportionate percentage of crime committed by the Black people (especially crimes of violence), and the high incidence of venereal disease among the Negro race (84 percent of all venereal disease) when they comprised but 25 percent of the total population (p. 23).

It then pointed out that the committee was not suggesting that all Negroes were more promiscuous or less educable than whites, stating that the attainments of many individual Negro citizens in business, law, education, sports, and humbler occupations of the economy were well known to the committee and warmly commended. It also acknowledged shortcomings among segments of the white population. It submitted, however, that the committee simply stated (regretfully
but necessarily) that the conditions they alluded to existed; that they demonstrably existed as racial phenomena; and that they contributed (along with tradition of generations, recognition of economic competition, and other factors) "to an intense and resolute desire on the part of the overwhelming majority of our people to maintain their public schools on a basis of continued separation as to race" (p. 24). Affirming that this feeling was so deeply held in many counties that public officials had promised to abandon all public schools before submitting to compulsory school integration, the committee stated that no locality could be compelled against the will of the people to operate a school system abhorrent to local taxpayers and patrons. It suggested, too, that the awful tragedy of "no schools" should not be imposed for either race.

To buttress its recommendations, the committee cited precedence for its convictions:

They existed in 1868, when the Fourteenth Amendment was pending, and were implicitly recognized in the actions of States both North and South which simultaneously ratified the amendment and established racially separate schools. They were in the consciousness of the distinguished men who framed Virginia's Constitution of 1901; it is significant that the sole provision in that Constitution relating to racial separation in public institutions is the prohibition against teaching white and Negro pupils in the same classrooms. These are the very considerations which historically have figured in the exercise by the States of their reserved police power over essentially domestic institutions. This power, it is earnestly submitted, may be prohibited by the States only by the clearest constitutional process. This is the position taken by Virginia in her Resolution of 1956 (p. 24).

And to add more fuel to their arguments, the committee asserted (p. 25), "When the time comes that a sovereign State cannot take measures
it deems to be appropriate, honorable, legal and constitutional, calculated to resist encroachments it believes to be illegal, arbitrary, and oppressive, then indeed the States will have been reduced to impotence and the structure of Union destroyed."

And the signers of this Report, Mills E. Godwin, Jr. and Albertis S. Harrison among them, held that the South's system of racially separate schools, predicated on substantial equality of facilities for both races, was indeed in accord with "equal protection of the laws" to all citizens (pp. 25-26). Its signers believed "that disruption of this system can result only in strife, bitterness, and inter-racial hostility tragic to contemplate" (p. 26).

Other Virginia Responses to the Brown Decision

The sentiments of the framers of the Doctrine of Interposition were echoed throughout the State during the months and years following the Brown Decision. In the Report of the Commission to Study Industrial Development in Virginia the following statement appeared: "The largest cloud on the educational horizon for Virginia, as well as other southern states today, lies in the current uncertainty over the question of segregation and integration in the public schools" (p. 59). This statement is part of a discussion on secondary trade schools and their relationship to attracting industry to the State. The racial issue is addressed from two perspectives. "To the extent that these political and constitutional crises lead here to hindering or closing of the schools or to civil unrest and violence, our opportunity to bring sound, substantial enterprises to our communities is lessened" (pp. 59-60). "On the other hand, many business men from
other sections admire Virginia's firm stand in support of the proper rights of the states, and perhaps support of our determination to retain control over our school system and to resist unconstitutional encroachments by the federal governments may arise as a result" (p. 60).

**Virginia's Segregated Anniversary**

Elliott (1968, p. 18) reported the context of an article that appeared in *Time Magazine*, entitled "Virginia's Segregated Anniversary" on April 29, 1957. Apparently the fear of race mixing was rampant, and personal prejudice versus rationality ruled. One extreme, of note, was the occasion of Virginia's 350th Anniversary for which Governor Stanley had commissioned the State Chamber of Commerce to coordinate a reception. Six hundred invitations were issued to distinguished ex-Virginians, and some among them were Blacks. When this was discovered, the Chamber announced that no invitation would be honored that slipped through the racial barrier. This brought scathing criticism by other invited guests such as Lambert Davis of the University of North Carolina Press. He wrote to Governor Stanley, "You have succeeded in making the leadership of the Commonwealth both a stench and laughing stock in the nation. I believe that I can best show my loyalty to the great traditions of Virginia by declining your invitation" (Elliott, 1968, p. 18).

**Where We Are On Integration**

The May 1957 issue of the *Virginia Journal of Education* featured an article on "Where We Are On Integration (Dabney, 1957, pp. 14-17). In it Dabney noted, "Aside from the educational problems
involved, consider the enormous rise in juvenile delinquency which would inevitably accompany such a development" (p. 14). He also submitted that "The question of how to avoid handicapping white children by throwing them into classes with Negro children who are incapable of doing the work must be giving many of you concern" (Dabney, p. 14).

He also reported on two opposing sentiments—that of the South and that of the rest of the nation. The latest Gallup poll, according to Dabney (which included views of both white and Black citizens in the Southern States), revealed that two-thirds of those canvassed disapproved of the Supreme Court's ruling against segregation. Conversely, the poll found that nearly two-thirds of those in the rest of the country applauded the same ruling (p. 15).

Dabney went on to identify the one anti-integrationist argument that he believed influenced most of the Southern whites against the mixing of schools. That one argument was that it could lead to mongrelization. He also admitted that other sections of the United States would sneer and jeer at this argument. He then tried to defend his position by denial of obvious feelings: "There is nothing in my thesis of bigotry or prejudice, and nothing having to do with supposed racial superiority or inferiority" (Dabney, p. 15). And then he followed this blatant statement with what he felt the Black should feel: "My point is that the Negro should wish, no less than the white, to retain his racial identity and his cultural heritage, to the end that his race's indisputably great achievements can be properly recognized and handed down to his posterity" (p. 15).
And like the committee members who endorsed the Doctrine of Interposition, he cited various negative statistics with reference to the Negro race which he cleverly prefaced with his non-support of violence against Blacks (p. 15):

Perhaps the most alarming phenomenon in the South at this time is to be found in the repeated acts of violence against Negroes which are not only criminal and utterly wrong, but which are bringing the entire region into disrepute in the eyes of civilized people everywhere. The bombings, beatings, and shootings which are occurring in some areas, with whites as the guilty parties, are in glaring contrast to the passive and law-abiding attitude of Negro leaders in the Montgomery bus boycott, for example.

On the other hand, the criminality and immorality of many Negroes is one of the chief reasons why white Southerners object so strongly to mixed schools. Granted that other races might have similar records if they had been enslaved for centuries and then had to live in slums and to fight against all manner of handicaps. Yet the fact remains that the Negro crime and illegitimacy rates are everywhere so vastly greater than those of the whites that these statistics have an alarming impact on the minds of parents, especially those of adolescent white boys and girls who would be thrown into rather intimate contact with colored boys and girls in integrated schools.

**Virginia Versus Other States on Higher Education**

Comparing Virginia with Arkansas, Tennessee, Louisiana, North Carolina, and the upper South, Brickman (1960, p. 68) reports, "Virginia, it appears, has made less progress toward desegregating its institutions of higher education than any state which had begun the process before 1958." According to Brickman, Blacks had been attending the St. Phillips School of Nursing (of the Medical College of Virginia) on a segregated basis since 1920, and real desegregation had not actually begun until 1950 when the University of Virginia, the College of William and Mary, Richmond Professional Institute, the
Medical College of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute (public institutions) started to allow Black students to enter who could not get their desired programs at Virginia State College. For the year 1958-1959 the estimated Black enrollment in predominantly white higher-education institutions in Virginia was 48. Brickman, commenting on the restriction of campus facilities and the policy of antidesegregation which prevailed in the Old Dominion, provided the following apt summary, "In general, state-supported institutions have adopted a 'containment' policy regarding desegregation. Negro students must either want courses not offered at Virginia State College or be qualified in other respects" (p. 68).

Strange and Dark Era

An editorial featured in the March, 1959 issue of the Virginia Journal of Education was captioned "Public Education--Dark and Strange Era" (Williams, 1959, p. 11). It began with the following words: "When, under Federal Court order, the first Negro entered a white school in Virginia, a dark and strange era in public education began, the ultimate consequences of which are frustratingly uncertain. One result, however, can be predicted with absolute certainty. There will be an increase in the per cent of children attending private schools" (p. 11).

And like Dabney in his 1957 article on the status of integration (pp 14-17), Williams also reported how he felt the Negro should respond. He affirmed:

Certainly if the Negro is sincerely interested in preserving and improving mass education, he will be slow to seek that which inevitably will result in a weakening of the public school system and the withdrawal of much
public support. Certainly he should be aware that there would be no public schools at all in many communities in Virginia if integration is attempted. Now that the Negro has apparently earned the 'right' to attend a white school in Virginia, we would hope that, as a matter of policy, he will practice massive voluntary segregation. This we devoutly believe will be in the best interest of both races (p. 11).

State Council Reference

In July, 1959, just five months before Dr. Martorana and his colleague, Dr. Hollis, presented their report to the State Council of Higher Education on the 1959 study on two-year colleges, a special meeting was conducted at the State Council to consider the request for the establishment of a two-year college from residents of Petersburg, Hopewell, and Dinwiddie. In the minutes of that meeting, State Council member, Sol W. Rawls, Jr., asked of the group presenting the request, "What effect will segregation have on your proposed new project (SCHEV Minutes, July, 1959, p. 98)?" The answer from the entire committee was recorded, "In view of the closeness of Virginia State College, it is not felt that there would be any segregation problem." To which, Dr. McFarlane stated, "I note that pre-engineering is one of the special things you suggest will be offered by the new junior college. I call your attention to the fact that engineering is one course that Virginia State does not offer. Would not the very curricula of the new facility cause segregation problems?" And the reply to that question from the delegation appearing before the Council was, "The matter of curricula would, of course, require careful study."
Going back to Martorana's response to the question concerning race with reference to why his study was not endorsed by the General Assembly, he reported (Vaughan, 1971, p. 21) that in the surveys and probes he had received no overt or open indication that the racial issue would influence his recommendations. He also responded that no significant people or groups he had interviewed suggested separate but equal two-year colleges. But, as Vaughan suggested, "While the race issue in the 1950s is too complicated to investigate here, it seems it would surely have entered any plan that intended to truly democratize post-high school education. Vaughan also wrote:

One should also note that, although Dabney S. Lancaster, Chairman of the State Council of Higher Education, believed in abiding by the law, including the 1954 Supreme Court decision on school desegregation, he was also a Southerner who believed "in a simple justice that meant, for him, doing absolutely everything for the Negro that you did for the white but keeping the races separate (p. 21).

It is ironic that in the spring of 1959 when Virginia's massive resistance collapsed (Muse, 1961, p. 171), simultaneously funds were being sought and plans being made to go forward with the Martorana Study. It is hard, therefore, to divorce the racial issue from those that might have averted any action on the recommendations of the Martorana Study by the General Assembly. As noted in the aforementioned State Council minutes, references to segregation still existed in 1959. Vaughan affirmed (1971, pp. 21-22), "The race issue would probably have entered the picture if the movement toward a comprehensive program of post-high school education had ever reached the point where legislators were faced with supporting it with tax dollars or rejecting it. However, since the Martorana plan was not
voted on in the General Assembly, the question is academic and needs no further investigation at this point."
Although there is no direct evidence, perhaps the race issue kept the Martorana Study from receiving consideration by the General Assembly.

At any rate, one cannot discount the period of Massive Resistance when considering Virginia's educational history, especially in the 1950s.

After-the-Fact Accounts

In recounting the story of Massive Resistance in Virginia, Muse (p. 175) concluded:

In the foregoing story of the massive resistance era in Virginia, I have dwelt extensively on the political manifestations. The South's problem, of course, is broader and deeper than politics. Ancient custom and prejudice, sedulous racist propaganda, widespread dissemination of misinformation and the strange, irrational contagion of race hatred are basic ingredients.

Muse further noted (p. 176) that a constructive attitude on the part of Virginia's leaders during the "relatively propitious atmosphere of 1954-1955 might have changed the course of Southern history." In Muse's opinion the politicians of the South, in general, had failed dismally to meet their responsibilities of leadership in this crisis. Their activities on the whole had tended to unprepare, rather than prepare, the public for the inevitable social change. He also believed that no small part of the blame for the confusion and hysteria and the public disorder must be laid at their door.

Ely (1976, p. 206), commenting on Virginia's racial attitude, said, "Although less susceptible to analysis than political behavior, the racial attitudes of most Virginians have been characterized by a
persistent, if less vocal, attachment to white supremacy. And with reference to the Massive Resistance, Ely provided this observation (p. 207):

The resisters halted all steps to racial integration for almost five years. Moreover, until the mid-1960s Virginia held integration to the smallest possible level. Massive Resistance was instrumental in upsetting the optimistic predictions that the South would readily adjust to the Brown ruling. Given their inability to rally national sympathy or regional unity, the resisters accomplished more than might have been reasonably expected. The massive resistance record attests to the persistent power of the southern elite in the past and suggested a continued vitality in the future.

**Godwin: The Flip Side**

Senator Mills E. Godwin, Jr., chairman of the massive resistance team (Muse, p. 171), went on to become Governor of Virginia and proponent of the two-year public college. His emergence as "father of the community college" is an interesting political metamorphosis--from an elitist-based to a populist-based philosophy. And he is to be saluted because few have changed with the times (successfully) as did Godwin. He not only became Governor once (1966-1970), but he also campaigned successfully for re-election four years after leaving office, on a different ballot (switching from Democrat to Republican).

Andrews (1970, p. 43) noted that, "As for quality education he was to move forward from the Massive Resistance days to do more for public education, especially on the higher levels, than any predecessor. It may be said that the times changed, which they did, but the man changed, too. He possessed that rare quality of being able to grow with the needs of his State and its people."
Regarding the 1965 gubernatorial campaign, Elliott (1968, pp. 36-37) reported the following observations:

Here was the former leader of the massive resistance movement actively wooing and gaining fifty thousand of the seventy thousand Negro votes, a number which closely paralleled his margin of victory.

Governor Harrison predicted that those who dared hope for a liberal administration under Godwin were in for a rude awakening. Yet, here was a member of the conservative hierarchy who was leading the organization into a progressive stance that even liberal opponents of the past would not have dared propose.

He even gained the active support of old-time foe Armistead Boothe, who said he supported Godwin 'heart and soul,' and even dared to predict that, once in the governor's mansion, Godwin would shuck his Southside past and make a modern chief executive for all Virginia.

Yet Godwin's "change" was not welcomed by all. According to Elliott (p. 33):

Although not enthusiastic, Godwin supported Johnson within the state by riding the 'Lady-Bird Special' through Southside Virginia, an act which was anathema to Byrd and his 'Black Belt' supporters. Godwin says this both helped him and hurt him politically. He attributed this to his uncontested Democratic nomination for governor and at the same time credited it with almost costing him the election.

And, of course, his gubernatorial opponent, Holton, took full advantage of Godwin's "change" during the 1965 campaign. Godwin was plagued with the image of "Godwin, the school-closer" during that campaign (Elliott, p. 100). According to Elliott (p. 34), "Holton consistently attacked Godwin's change in philosophy from a program that threatened to make a 'wasteland' of the public school system, to championing public education." Reported as responding (Congressional Quarterly Report Weekly Review, October, 1965) that the times had changed and so had he, Godwin told Elliott in a December 1967
interview that though he had not said he had changed, "integration had simply not proven as detrimental to the public school system as he had believed it would be" (Elliott, p. 34). Elliott (p. 34), surmised, "More than the fact that he, personally, had changed, the whole face of Virginia had changed and now demanded a major thrust forward in education."

Andrews (pp. 42-43) quoted Godwin:

I think it is worth noting that in this era (1954-60) some of us were designated 'school closers' wanting to destroy public education. There has never been any evidence of this because even at the height of the debate more and more money was appropriated to schools. We realized that Virginia could not go forward without public education. It was necessary for her well-being. At the same time we didn't want to destroy the best quality education we could provide and that is what we were afraid might happen in many areas.

Obviously Godwin's former association with Massive Resistance did not deter his future success in State government. His post-massive resistance career was exemplified by a theme of political continuity (Ely, p. 205). Commenting on his 1973 gubernatorial race, Ely (p. 205) noted that "His campaign impressively linked the massive resistance era of the 1950s with the Nixon years of the 1970s. As this indicates, there is no evidence that the resisters either repented of their stand or suffered politically."

And from Godwin's point of view, "No man could have survived in public office (during the Massive Resistance Era), especially in Southside, if he was 'soft' on integration," and he never made apologies for his part (as noted on pages 81-82).

In January, 1959, the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals and a special three-judge federal court sitting at Norfolk held that both
the school closing and fund cutoff provisions were unconstitutional by both federal and state standards (Andrews, p. 40). "Like the rest of the Byrd 'Massive Resisters,' Senator Godwin went down to grudging defeat and with no apologies then or since" (Andrews, p. 41).

From Massive Resistance to Supporter of Public Community Colleges

Governor Godwin and other powerful leaders in Virginia's political system left no doubt where they stood on the racial issue of the 1950s. They took a very strong stand on how they felt through their adoption of the Doctrine of Interposition. And while this document was supposedly dedicated to state rights (a sacred subject in Virginia), it also reflected racial attitudes. That the call for public community colleges (or postsecondary training) in the 1950s was ignored leads one to think that the racial issue could have been a contributing factor. It is hard to believe that politicians would be ready to endorse a public system of education beyond high school that would include Blacks as well as whites, when they were in the midst of affirming all the ill that could come if the races were mixed in educational settings (albeit elementary/secondary). It is also hard to believe that they would finance such a possibility when they still endorsed the policy of "separate but equal," not only in schools but also in other areas such as transportation, public restrooms, and eating facilities. It is impossible for this author to discount the racial attitude when accounting for the factors which influenced the nonsupport of publicly-financed postsecondary education in the 1950s.

The irony is that the public community college did become a reality in the next decade, and this was made possible by a number of
changes—not the least of which was a change in Godwin himself. For he emerged from being a supporter of elitist attitudes toward Blacks and public education to becoming a supporter of a public system of community colleges which would be open to all citizens regardless of race. And without his metamorphosis, the community college concept probably would never have reached fruition. From Massive Resistance to championing a populist notion, Godwin also represented a changing Virginia.
The decade of the 1960s is the one that finally produced a public community college system in Virginia. The changes that brought this about included the acceptance of integration, a strong call for vocational/technical training, a rude awakening to Virginia's ranking in the nation regarding college-going youth, and the influence of regional and national commentaries. These changes led to a study which provided the impetus for the adoption of the Virginia Community College System -- the Report of the Higher Education Study Commission.

Acceptance of Integration

The 1960s ushered in the changes that led to the creation of a comprehensive community college system in Virginia. One of these changes was the acceptance (at least on the surface) of integration. Many of those people representing significant leadership in the state at that time began to put the past behind them, quietly laying groundwork in a new direction for Virginia's future. One man, in particular, helped smooth the transition from massive resistance to racial calm. That man was Albertis S. Harrison, Jr.

According to Vaughan (1971, p. 37), Harrison took a middle-of-the-road stance during the period of massive resistance, alienating only the most extreme segregationists. (Harrison served as Attorney
General from 1958 to 1962.) Vaughan also noted (p. 37) that "Most of the wounds of the period were healed during his subsequent administration." When Harrison became Governor (1962 to 1966) Vaughan surmised that he obviously realized that his key project--industrial development--could not occur without racial tranquility. Vaughan quoted Harrison:

My failure to mention the racial issue (in his first major address to the General Assembly) which has consumed so much of our time in years past is a deliberate omission. The progress that is so necessary to Virginia, and the programs that I ask you to consider, are designed for the welfare and happiness of all Virginians, irrespective of their race, color, or creed.

Harrison not only set the tone for racial harmony, but he launched a focus on industrial development which ultimately led to the establishment of the public two-year college for Virginia.

The Call for Vocational Training

A major part of enhancement of industrial development in Virginia was the need for vocational training throughout the state. To attract new business and industry to Virginia the availability of training was a key for success.

Although a real commitment to vocational training did not occur until the 1960s, there had been calls for it dating back to the 1940s. According to newspaper accounts, Virginia was not meeting the needs. State Superintendent of Public Instruction, G. Tyler Miller, said Virginia needed to have a greatly expanded program of vocational education in the fields of trade and industrial business education to aid in replacing workers reaching retirement age (Richmond Times-Dispatch, 11-17-46). In another article (Richmond News Leader, 12-3-
Virginia was reported as not coming close to filling needs in skilled trades, commerce, and agriculture. And in a State Chamber of Commerce Study, directed by H. Sanders of Virginia Polytechnic Institute (Richmond News Leader, 1-13-47), it was reported that Virginia was not meeting the needs of her citizens with respect to any of the recognized types of vocational training. The Study also noted that while the past twenty years had witnessed progressive growth in vocational education, this growth was far short of preparing trained personnel in the numbers commensurate with the occupational demand. Another newspaper account in 1957 (Richmond Times-Dispatch, 10-7-57), indicated that the State Government was concerned that a shortage of industrial training schools would hinder Virginia's efforts to attract new manufacturing concerns.

According to Armistead (1977, pp. 7-8), a study authorized by the General Assembly, entitled Public Education in Virginia: Report to the Educational Commission of Virginia of a Survey of the Public Educational System of the State (O'Shea Report), pointed to the need for diversified educational opportunities. The Report suggested that some students needed (or desired) a nontraditional path of study, recommending a form of vocational education (however, not at the collegiate level.)

In 1945 a legislatively appointed commission called for vocational education, at least partially at the post-high school level, for students who might benefit from it. The Commission went on record as favoring broader post-high school education, but no legislation was passed to ensure it. Instead, another study was
called for by the 1948 General Assembly. The conclusions for this report included the need for short technical and semi-professional courses in preparation for the varied types of callings requiring post-high school training, but not requiring a four-year program of study. The remedy identified for this conclusion was the establishment of more branch campuses and an increase in extension work, but not comprehensive community colleges. The 1951 General assembly was obviously not ready to take the initiative to establish expanded opportunities in higher education; there was no state-wide action in response to this report (Armistead, pp. 8-9).

As noted in Chapter III of this dissertation, both the 1957 Report of the Commission to Study Industrial Development in Virginia and the 1959 Martorana Study highlighted the need for improvement and expansion of technical education in Virginia.

Biennial Reports of State Council

In January 1960, the State Council presented its 1958-60 Biennial Report to the Governor and the General Assembly. The Report was developed from the findings provided by the 1959 Martorana Study. In the cover letter for the Report, it was noted that there were two items that had dominated the Council's time during that biennium: fiscal reporting and the development of a plan for regional two-year colleges. And in the opening sentence of the Report, the State Council stated that Virginia's phenomenal growth in population and its accelerating transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy were the two main reasons for the increasing pressure on the State's system of higher education. Also noted on the first page of this
The desirability of community colleges results from economies to be achieved both for the State and the student, from their effectiveness in providing specialized training of local manpower, and from their positive impact upon the educational level of Virginia's citizenry (p. 4).

The Report also noted the primary aims of the community college program being recommended (p. 5): effecting economies and meeting needs for trained manpower. (It should be noted that the community college model being recommended was the "branch" model.) The call for this expansion, via the branch model route, was underscored by the shortages in occupational skills required by Virginia's expanding economy. These shortages, according to the Report, were neither being met by the secondary system nor the system of higher education in Virginia. They were being partially met by regional trade and vocational schools. The Report proposed to "intensify training in these skills" and to promote economical development through a unified administrative plan (pp. 5-6). Community college curricula called for included "a comprehensive program of education beyond the high school level to ensure the ready availability, not only of college-transfer programs, but also, where appropriate, of training programs leading to
direct employment in business and industry" (p. 5).

In 1961, the State Council produced its Biennial Report in two parts: Part I was presented in September, and Part II in November. The 1961 (Part I) Report called for greater emphasis on terminal and vocational programs to guide many students into more rewarding fields of post-high school training. It, therefore, recommended an expansion of existing community colleges and the development of new ones. The Report expressed concern for "qualified" students, as well as the proverbial concern for efficient spending. On the Report's first page, the following statements exemplified Virginia's never-ending focus on effective spending:

In order to maintain a ranking position in mid-twentieth century society, Virginia cannot afford to ignore or stem the growth of higher education. No less important, however, is the need to allocate increasing expenditures more effectively. Not only must costly and wasteful duplication be eliminated, but unbalanced growth—in programs, services and facilities—must be controlled.

According to the Report (p. 1), "An adequate program of higher education, promoting high standards of quality and maximum economy, must therefore be based on orderly growth, effective cost control and sound financing."

Contrasting two types of students to be served, the Report also reported:

The economic advantages of the community college, together with the limitations on residential enrollments, will attract many able students. In addition, students whose abilities and interests can best be developed in work of less than college grade should be encouraged to seek post-high school education in terminal and vocational programs. Virginia should expand its community college program consistent with these needs and the State's financial resources (p. 10).
In the State Council's Biennial Report, Part II presented in November, 1961, one of the three needs identified to be answered by the community two-year college was the provision of occupational training, not otherwise available (p. 4). It also noted, (p. 16), "Growing student enrollments and increasing pressures from industry, business and other groups in the State have presented demands for the expansion and development of curricular programs and services in the state-supported institutions of higher learning." However, as with past tradition, recommendations from these Reports failed to receive endorsement.

**Within Our Reach**

Another significant report that was also introduced in November, 1961, was *Within Our Reach: Report of the Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South*, published by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB). The commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South had been created to set forth goals for the southern states and their institutions of higher learning for the next ten to twenty years. The states represented by SREB included Virginia and the following: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and West Virginia (16 in all).

*Within Our Reach* identified five goals for the South: to provide every individual with opportunity for maximum development of his abilities; to produce citizens responsive to the social, economical, and political needs of their time; to achieve excellence in teaching, scholarship, and research; to accelerate the economic progress of the
Southern region through education and research; and to guide the region in solving social problems created by population changes, racial differences, urbanization and technical growth.

In this report a concern for opportunity of the individual in a democracy was voiced as the number-one goal—a chance to achieve.

According to the Report:

In a democracy, the individual comes first. We are irrevocably committed to the principle that every individual should have the opportunity to progress as far as his interests and abilities permit. This means that everyone who can profit from a college education should have a chance to acquire it, but it does not mean that everyone should have the same education. On the contrary, diversified, well-planned education, research and training programs suited to the differing capacities of individuals, and designed to meet the needs of society, constitute the ideal system of higher education in a democracy. Above all, full opportunity does not require lowered standards. But it does require that a person's access to education be limited only by his ability and character. Other barriers to advanced education and training must be eliminated (p. 10).

The Commission's recommendation for accomplishing this goal was that each state make available a complete program of higher education, either in its own system or in cooperation with other states. It also recommended that each state develop a strong system of two-year community colleges. The commission noted the variety of functions such non-residential institutions could perform: traditional freshman/sophomore courses; vocational/technical programs; guidance/counseling services; and special programs to meet the needs of the community and adult education. It also emphasized the economical benefits of these institutions for both student and taxpayer. And whatever their configuration (part of a local system,
separate two-year institution, affiliate of a state university system), three things were essential to their organization. Those three things were:

1) They must be integral parts of the state system of higher education, and fully coordinated with the other parts of the system.

2) They must resist pressure to expand into four-year institutions, concentrating rather on achieving excellence in their two-year programs.

3) Their distinctive function must be recognized and respected. They are neither mere extensions of the high school or decapitated versions of the four-year college.

These three conditions, in fact, turned out to be prophetic for the development of the Virginia Community College System.

Commenting on racial discrimination, the Report noted that while it had affected college attendance in the past, it was then being eliminated as a barrier. It also reminded that as the change continued, it must take place in a sensible, orderly and constructive fashion so as not to interrupt educational progress. In the interim, it was also suggested that the region's predominantly Black institutions be given generous support because full opportunity for all the youth of the South required maximum utilization of existing institutions of higher education. All of the South's colleges would be needed to accommodate the needs of the people as enrollments continued to increase (p. 17).

Another prophecy for Virginia was the recommendation for accomplishing the Commission's fourth goal for the South--that of accelerating economic progress. The Report stated that the South stood to gain more than any other region from the technological revolution then sweeping the American industry. It affirmed that the
South had the natural resources to make it one of the richest areas on earth, and that it was less burdened than other regions by inefficient plants and obsolescent equipment. It also noted, however, that technological industrialization would not come easily; it would require long-range planning and a high level of education. Thus, planning was the recommendation for accomplishing educational and economic progress (something well-known to Virginians). With reference to greater efficiency, the Report also recommended that every Southern state have a central agency for long-range planning and coordination of higher education. On this account, Virginia was ahead of the game. The State Council of Higher Education for Virginia had been created in 1956.

**Virginia's Commission on Vocational Education**

As the early years of the 1960s progressed, the call for vocational education reached a crescendo. In 1962 (March 8), House Joint Resolution No. 81 called for the creation of a Commission on Vocational Education to address the need for vocational education in both public high schools and terminal vocational education at the post-high school level. The Commission was charged "to make a thorough study and offer recommendations for improving the program of vocational and technical education in the publicly supported schools of Virginia and at the post high school level" (p. 759). The Resolution calling for this Commission cited the following reasons for doing so:

Whereas, the quality and scope of vocational education have significant implications for business and industrial development in Virginia; and Whereas, the need for skilled and semiskilled workers is increasing; and Whereas, the majority of
high school graduates and those who drop out of school before graduation seek employment immediately or pursue some type of post high school technical training; and Whereas the report of the Commission on Public Education which was made to the Governor and the General Assembly, emphasized the need for: vocational education to be established and existing ones to be expanded in order to better prepare students now in school as well as to upgrade adults already in the labor force; now, therefore, be it resolved...(p. 759).

The development of this important Commission was an integral part of the changes that came into place to make the establishment of the comprehensive community college system in Virginia a reality.

In a newspaper article five months later (Richmond Times-Dispatch, 8-13-62), Warren Strother said that the new director of industrial development had suggested that the Commonwealth would have to vastly expand its system of technical training for Virginia workers. Strothers reported that Joseph G. Hamrick, the industrial development chief who had been hired away from a South Carolina firm by Governor Harrison, had stated in a speech at Franklin that he felt strongly about the need for every Virginian to be given the opportunity to reach his maximum potential as a citizen. He said also that this would not be possible without a statewide system of technical education for all its citizens, and that Virginia was lagging behind North Carolina and South Carolina.

Strother, a reporter for the Richmond Times Dispatch, also wrote an article (May 1962) for the Rural Virginian which was reprinted in the September 1962 edition of the Virginia Journal of Education (Strother, 1962, pp. 22-23). The article began in typical Virginia fashion: outlining concerns for possible increasing costs for an increasing number of two-year colleges. Strother noted:
Virginia educators are taking a long second look at the two-year junior colleges popping up like toadstools across the broad map of the Old Dominion. Already there are half a dozen. Three others will open their doors in little more than a year. The odds are the General Assembly will authorize at least one more when it meets here two years from now. Barring an absolute shutoff of State funds, it's hard to say where the junior college revolution in Virginia's educational program will stop. The State Council of Higher Education which helped start the swing to two-year colleges--both to meet the educational needs and to help hold down rising State college costs--is now busy discouraging the immediate formation of new schools. Too many seem to be coming too fast (p. 22).

Strother, however, went on to recount the arguments for the two-year schools for commuting students. He cited that according to the State Council, it was cheaper to send the schools to the pupils than to bring the pupils to the schools. Money that would otherwise be spent for dormitories could be spent for such things as classrooms, laboratories, libraries, teachers' salaries, and perhaps even campus centers. This, according to Strother, was the rationale behind Virginia's explosive growth of junior colleges and the two-year schools in many other states. He also noted that for many young (and not so young) students, these institutions could make the difference between going and not going to college, adding that the current labor market demanded college training to land a decent job.

The apparent "revolution" to which he was referring included the existing junior colleges located in southwest Virginia (Clinch Valley), Fairfax (George Mason), Newport News (Christopher Newport), and Petersburg (Richard Bland) where enrollments were steadily climbing. Added to these four in the near future would be branch colleges in Martinsville, Clifton Forge, and Wytheville, sponsored by the University of Virginia and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Each
of the two-year colleges noted offered college transfer credit and also two-year terminal courses (primarily vocational training courses) for the students who could not (or would not) go on to four-year institutions. Strother reported, "This revolution in Virginia higher education is just getting started" (p. 22). This notion of a revolution is certainly contrary to Vaughan's thesis that the development of the two-year college in Virginia was an evolutionary versus a revolutionary process (1971).

State Council's Perspective

In the same issue of the Virginia Journal of Education (September, 1962) which featured the Strother article was another one written by W.H. McFarlane, the current Director of the State Council of Higher Education. His article was apparently written to explain the purpose and background of the junior colleges which were receiving so much public attention. McFarlane stated that as early as 1900 there had been no more than eight two-year colleges nationwide. By 1930 there were 207, and at that time (1962) the total was 700 (one third of all the institutions of higher learning in the country). He noted that these institutions had been intended originally to provide the first two years of education in liberal arts and sciences, but that they had also become valuable assets for community needs such as meeting requirements for business and industry, agriculture, education, health and other types of services. He also noted that the educators of the day were generally accepting a comprehensive role and function for these two-year or "junior" colleges. McFarlane affirmed:

With the requirement for more and varied types of post-high school training in Virginia, at the lowest possible cost to
McFarlane also believed that every high school student (graduate) could benefit by additional training, but that individuals differed in ability, personality and interests. Through appropriate guidance, he continued (and provision of educational opportunity), it was desirable that at least fifty percent of the youths graduating from high school should be encouraged to continue formal education beyond high school. McFarlane concluded:

If this happens, the enrollment in the public and private colleges of Virginia will double in the next ten years. The comprehensive community two-year colleges, developed and operated as branches of the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and the College of William and Mary, will greatly assist the Commonwealth of Virginia in meeting this challenge in higher education (p. 23).

Other Perspectives

In 1962 (Richmond Times-Dispatch, 9-12-62), Joseph G. Hamrick, Director of Industrial Development and Planning for Virginia, was quoted in the newspaper:

Industry needs and can employ at least five times as many technical institute graduates as it can four-year engineer college graduates. At present this potential demand is only one-fiftieth supplied.

The article reported the need to establish technical training centers in Virginia until such training is in reach of students in every locality of Virginia. Hamrick also added that the economic program of Virginia would be in direct proportion to the opportunities the
citizens of Virginia had to obtain technical education.

In the October 1962 issue of the *Journal of Higher Education*, Bernard H. Stern reported (p. 370), "The increase in the number of community colleges in the past twenty years reflects the growing national need for an institution that is a supplement to the four-year college in which young persons can be trained as technicians." Stern offered community colleges as alternates for rejected college applicants.

James J. Kilpatrick, editor of the *Richmond News Leader*, in the March 23, 1963 edition of his newspaper, was quoted as saying that the State Department of Education and perhaps others had been asleep at the switch in providing vocational training in Virginia. He said that Virginia had only eight post-high school technical institutes and that it was a scandalous situation.

In the May 30, 1963, edition of the *Richmond Times-Dispatch*, George B. Leonard (author of a *Look* article) was reported as saying, "Everyone agrees that some change must be made in the way we educate those millions who are not going to finish college. Today's complex society has been entirely unforgiving of the untrained. Young people who once could have worked as unskilled factory or farm laborers have no place to go but street corners. Today we are cheating millions of students by failing to give them job training." Apparently, the problem of providing vocational training was not in the sixties unique to Virginia. It was shared by the nation.

According to Vaughan (1971, pp. 25-26), Edwin Holm, economist for the Virginia Division of Industrial Development, reported in an
article appearing in a 1963 edition of the Virginia Economic Review that the changing economy was having more impact on educational needs than at any other time in Virginia's history. Holm further noted that unless the State developed a broad program of post-high school education, she would lose the opportunity not only to be of service to the people of Virginia, but also of the nation.

The Slaughter Commission Reports

On November 7, 1963, the Commission on Vocational Education, known also as The Slaughter Commission (D. French Slaughter, Jr., served as Chair), reported its findings on vocational and technical education in Virginia to the Governor and the General Assembly. It had been charged by the 1962 General Assembly to make a study and offer recommendations to improve vocational and technical education in the publicly supported schools and at the post-high school level. The Commission's Report, entitled: Vocational and Technical Education in Virginia: Present and Future Needs, identified a changing economy, rapid growth of technological knowledge, increasing urbanization of the population, and the nature of jobs available in Virginia business and industry as reasons for the necessity of a higher level of skills from more people than was then afforded by the available vocational and technical training. Additionally, the Report noted that if Virginia were to continue to attract new industry, the need for workers with new and advanced skills would become even greater.

In its future-oriented and forward-looking recommendations, the Slaughter Commission reported the most formidable task at hand to be the development of occupational training programs to keep pace with
the complexity and rapidity of technological growth and economic changes. It noted that the academic curriculum was relatively stable, but the vocational and technical curriculum demanded constant revision to keep abreast of changing skill requirements created by technical advances. With reference to these complex problems, the Report affirmed its belief that the greatest need for expanding vocational/technical educational training was at the post-high school level. And while its major focus was to create a State Board of Technical Education to address the need, the Commission did not leave it at that. It went on record as supporting a broader approach, with the State Board of Technical Education as a mere springboard. What it foresaw was a transcending need for a comprehensive system of community colleges which would evolve from the initiative for post-high school technical training. The Commission, therefore, recommended that the parent institutions (Virginia Polytechnic Institute, the University of Virginia, and the College of William and Mary), the Council of Higher Education, and the State Board of Technical Education make a joint study of the feasibility of such a system, with particular emphasis on such areas of concern as accreditation, transfer (or credits), and financial savings.

Thus the Slaughter Commission takes on even more significance in the history of the development of the comprehensive community college system in Virginia. It chose not to use a "band-aid" approach; rather, it sought to go beyond that. Vaughan (1971, p. 48) felt that the Slaughter Report kept the development of a satisfactory college system in the political arena, because the Commission had been
politically appointed and had been headed by a politician. This stance helped the General Assembly of 1964 recommend yet another study (a comprehensive one) to review higher education. According to Vaughan (p. 4), "If the Slaughter Commission had considered the two-year college issue closed, it is possible that the General Assembly would have gone along with its recommendation and excluded the two-year college from any subsequent study of higher education." Perhaps two concluding remarks of the Commission's Report say it best: "In a study of this complexity, conducted against a background of rapid growth and change, the Commission's major problem has been to chart a steady course towards the ultimate objective to provide a better way of life for more and more Virginians through better and higher-paying jobs" (p. 18). "In the long run, the State should consider the feasibility of establishing all post-high school education of less-than-degree length under a system of comprehensive community colleges operated by a single State-wide board" (p. 19).

An interesting aside is the caveat provided at the end of this report by one of its signers, Curry Carter:

I agree in the main with the Report, but feel that it would be more desirable to have all branches of public education under the State Board of Education with an appropriate division, than to establish a separate and independent agency. It is common knowledge that once an additional and separate agency is established in our State government it grows and grows with greater and greater cost to the taxpayer. The State Board of Education seems inclined to prefer not to take on this additional work, but I believe there is where it belongs. If it needs more members and more personnel, they should be provided. It is not clear to me that the Constitution of Virginia contemplates such a separate and independent agency and it is not beyond the realm of possibility that a clash of responsibilities, duties and jurisdiction may ultimately arise (p. 19).
Apparently, the Virginia "tradition" was alive and well with at least one of the Commission signers. The historical concern for too much government and cost efficiency was never kept beneath the surface long. Mr. Carter's preference for branches to be under the State Board of Education, fortuitously, was not one reflecting the majority of the Commission. If it had been, we would not have in place today an arrangement whereby the two-year institutions were considered a part of higher education. They would, indeed, have been mere extensions of high school, belonging to the secondary area. Vaughan is obviously on-target in his assessment, for the Slaughter Commission provided a pivotal direction for higher education in Virginia.

James Brunot (Richmond Times-Dispatch, March 9, 1964), commenting on the General Assembly's approval of the study commission recommended by the Slaughter Report stated, "Viewed from a statewide perspective, one of the Assembly's major accomplishments was the approval of a resolution calling for a comprehensive study of Virginia's college objectives, needs, and resources." Dr. W.H. McFarlane, Director of the State Council of Higher Education which would help carry out the study, according to this same newspaper account, said that the $50,000 appropriation for the study "reflected the long-range thinking of the Assembly." The article also mentioned that the 20-member commission would study among other problems the possible combination of community colleges with post-high school community colleges. It noted that to operate on the state level there would also be a new State Department and Board of Technical Education.
with three million dollars appropriated to initiate new technical educational facilities and schools, as well as improvements of existing ones. It concluded that the nine-member board would probably supervise the community college/technical school system.

**1964-A Year of Technical Education Awareness**

From the time of the 1964 General Assembly approval of the act creating the State Board of Technical Education and the Department of Technical Education (Vaughan, 1971, p. 39) in March, 1964 and before, public awareness of technical education needs in Virginia was highlighted throughout the newspaper media. Sprinkled throughout also was a focus on the comprehensive direction to which the two-year offerings were headed. The resolution calling for a comprehensive study of Virginia's institutions of higher education was reported in the February 7, 1964 edition of the Richmond Times-Dispatch. On February 27, the Richmond Times Dispatch reported the 37-0 approval in the Virginia Senate on that date for the creation of a new department of technical education which would some day perhaps govern all state junior or community colleges. It elaborated that the legislation, supported by the State Council of Higher Education, called for a board parallel to the State Board of Education to oversee post-high school educational programs. In time, it noted, some educators believed that such a board would govern technical schools and junior colleges with the aim of building a statewide system of comprehensive community colleges. These comprehensive community colleges would offer terminal skills courses, technical courses to meet the local needs, and academic courses applicable for transfer to a full four-year college.
The article also stated that community colleges (branch institutions) eventually should be pulled away from their mother colleges and placed under the board of technical education.

In a Richmond News Leader article (March 18, 1964), McFarlane (State Council of Higher Education Director) made reference to the new college system which would be a comprehensive community college to include the liberal arts college transfer in preprofessional courses and the post-high school vocational and technical program, adding that this college would be several years away. In July (Richmond News Leader, 1964), McFarlane noted at the first meeting of the State Board of Technical Education that studies were under way to explore the possible consolidation of adult education, vocational-technical education, and community colleges into one statewide system.

On September 1, 1964 (Vaughan, 1971, p. 39), the State Department of Technical Education began operation, and Dr. Dana B. Hamel, former Roanoke Technical Institute Director, became its first head. Hamel was quoted in a September 19, 1964 article of the Richmond Times-Dispatch, captioned "Need for Technical Schools:"

The board of technical education was created by the 1964 General Assembly to operate schools at the post high school level. The General Assembly also appropriated 2 million dollars to inaugurate the program. The schools would provide educational opportunities for young persons unable to pursue higher education either because of the cost or because of poor scholastic records. The schools would be 'virtually tuition free.' Such schools would also be satisfying the needs of new industries for trained personnel and would meet the long range needs of existing businesses for skilled workers.

In a November 1, 1964 editorial (Richmond Times-Dispatch) labeled "Our Vocational-Technical Future," the need for a clear
understanding of vocational/technical education was called for. The article noted that "There is a certain amount of confusion in the public mind as to what types of training are offered by the various vocational and technical schools in Virginia and other states." It alluded to a pyramid of three layers: the first and foremost being the two-year courses in engineering technology at Roanoke Technical Institute, Richmond Professional Institute, and Old Dominion College in Norfolk; the second layer being the vocational-technical schools of less than college grade at Danville, Fisherville, Wise, Radford, Abingdon, and Virginia College in Petersburg and Norfolk; and the third and bottom layer as being the trade and skilled craft programs in high schools, embracing both industry and agriculture, scattered throughout the State. It went on to say that a clear understanding of the proper role of each was badly needed, noting that substantially larger appropriations also would be required if Virginia's technical and vocational centers of instruction were to be adequate to the great task ahead.

An article appearing the next day (Richmond Times-Dispatch, November 1, 1964) affirmed Virginia's need for two-year technical courses, stating that Virginia lagged behind in this area in comparison to her neighboring Southern states. The Carolinas and Georgia, it warned, were well ahead of Virginia in the establishment of technical institutions.

Another article (Richmond Times-Dispatch, November 3, 1964) reported on the Federal Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the substantial appropriations that were available through it, noting that
amount to be slightly more than 3 million federal dollars for Virginia to develop vocational instruction. It stated that this money was to be matched with state and local funds and that nine area vocational-technical schools would be among the beneficiaries: Richmond Professional Institute, Old Dominion College, Virginia State (Norfolk and Petersburg), Danville, Fisherville, Wise, Radford, and Abingdon. Certainly the availability of federal dollars had a great and significant impact on the ability of Virginia to develop vocational training.

On November 6, 1964, an article on "Education and Economic Growth" in the Richmond Times-Dispatch reported that Virginia was on the verge of a great and much-needed expansion in the facilities offered for vocational-technical education, not only in high schools and on the post-secondary level, but also on the college level in two-year institutes or colleges. The November 7 (Richmond Times-Dispatch, 1964) newspaper followed up with an account of "Virginia's Great Opportunity." That opportunity was the two-year institutions in engineering technology that were hoped to be developed into comprehensive community colleges. The account additionally noted that the community colleges then in operation, and others in the planning stage (with a liberal arts emphasis) were expected to offer technical courses. It stated that the objective thus was to establish a series of two-year junior colleges around the state which would provide the citizens with a well-rounded offering of courses in liberal arts and the humanities, as well as scientific and technical disciplines. The article then outlined three pressing problems that should be aided
substantially by the development of a program of vocational/technical instruction: 1) The program should offer a type of schooling to citizens both young and old who could profit greatly from this kind of education, but who would not fit into curricula requiring a great degree of academic emphasis. It would also prepare others to go higher and take full-fledged degrees in engineering; 2) It should upgrade the state markedly as a lodestone to new industries which more and more frequently were requiring technical competence; and 3) Bringing in new industries should greatly enhance the state's prosperity and increase its tax revenues, thereby reducing the necessity for higher education taxation. This article underscored the impetus that later was identified by the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (The Virginia Plan for Higher Education, 1986, p. 76). "The impetus for the establishment of the statewide system of community colleges in Virginia was a desire on the part of the Commonwealth to expand the educational opportunities available for citizens beyond high school. In the early 1960s, educational opportunities within the state were limited, because higher education programs were not available in some regions. In addition, the State was unable to meet the demand of new industries for skilled workers."

Regional and National Commentaries

In 1964 there were also regional and national commentaries that no doubt had an effect on Virginia's direction in higher education and the development of the comprehensive community college system. In the February issue of the Virginia Journal of Education (1964, p. 9) an article entitled "The Missing 25 Per Cent" outlined disturbing
statistics for Virginia as a result of a recent study that had been completed by the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) of which Governor Albertis S. Harrison Jr., was chair. The Study revealed that Virginia ranked very low in the percentage of the State's college-age population enrolled in college. Only 23 per cent of college-age youth were attending colleges in 1962-63, ranking Virginia 16 points below the national average, higher only than South Carolina in the South. The article stated that the following points be considered: "1) Perhaps our admission policies are more selective than those which generally obtain and 2) The number of youngsters who can profit substantially from college experience (Williams, 1964, p. 9)."

The article further identified even more unsettling figures culled from a recent Virginia Education Association survey:

1. Only 85 percent of Virginia's 1953 white high school graduates who graduated among the top 10 per cent of their class went to college, and
2. Only 75 per cent of those who graduated in the top 25 per cent of their class went to college. The fact that as many as one-fourth of our brightest high school graduates do not go to college is indeed appalling (p. 9).

In asking why 1,697 smart 1963 Virginia high school graduates failed to go to college that year, the article gave the following possible answers: lack of individual initiative, apathetic parents, or poor school guidance. It went on to say that the reason certainly was not financial, noting that the Federal Student Loan and Grant program and the Virginia Educational Assistance Program, plus available work to be found on- and off-campus, precluded lack of money as being at fault. In a uniquely Virginia way, the article concluded (p. 9), "All
other things being equal, a college education results in greater individual development and vastly increased earning power; nevertheless, we are much more interested in raising the percentage of our brightest youngsters who attend college than we are in the mere matter of increasing overall college enrollment." The literature regarding college education in Virginia had yet to reveal a real concern for anyone other than "gifted," "smart," or "qualified" high school students, or efficiency and cost effectiveness.

On the national level, however, Lyndon Johnson's "White House Policy Paper on Education" (November 1, 1964) revealed a concern for every child (Virginia Journal of Education, January, 1965). It began with the following statements: "I believe that every child has the right to as much education as he has the ability to receive. I believe that this does not end in the lower schools, but goes on through technical and higher education—if the child wants and can use it" (Johnson, 1965, p. 22). It additionally noted that America badly needed educated men and women, quoting Thomas Jefferson as once having said, "If we expect a nation to be ignorant and free, we expect what never was and never will be" (Johnson, p. 22). The White House Paper called for broadening and improving of the quality of the school base, concentrating on teaching resources in urban slums and poor rural areas, expansion and enrichment of colleges, recognition that learning is a lifelong process. It also stated that "In today's world, we cannot neglect the adult's need for schooling to keep up with technology" (p. 22). And finally, it called for a strengthening of the State and community educational systems.
It is interesting that at this time (after the end of the Massive Resistance), Mills Godwin moved from the traditional conservatism of Virginia to a more moderate stance. Apparently, "Godwin seemed to tune into the changing winds early" (Elliott, 1968, p. 32). During the 1964 presidential election, Byrd had met the prospect of Lyndon Johnson's nomination with his "golden silence."

And at the state Democratic convention, Harrison bowed to Byrd's silence. "But Byrd's whim would no longer be law to the organization. The convention rebelled and for the first time since Wilson's nomination, the Democratic Party of Virginia went on record as supporting the likely choice of the national party. As noted in Chapter IV, when Godwin supported Johnson by riding the 'Lady-Bird Special' through Southside Virginia, an act unacceptable to Byrd and his 'Black Belt' supporters (Elliott, pp. 32-33), he took a real chance by opposing prevailing (white) Virginia tradition. Perhaps the philosophy of equal opportunity subscribed to by Lyndon Johnson also had an effect on the newly emerging Godwin.

The Higher Education Study Commission

Certainly, "the creation of the Department of Technical Education was a noteworthy accomplishment of Harrison's administration, going hand-in-hand with his other major accomplishment--bringing industry to the state" (Vaughan, 1971, p. 41). However, the recommendation and completion of the Higher Education Study Commission (Russell, 1965) during his term of office also deserve commendation (along with the Slaughter Commission which recommended it). In December of 1965, this comprehensive study was
finally completed and presented to the General Assembly. Probably the most thorough study of higher education in the history of the Commonwealth, the extensive document included eleven staff reports (which were published as a part of the Study). These reports covered an array of topics and included the following: Prospective College-age Population in Virginia; State-wide Patterns of Higher Education in Virginia; Geographical Origins of Students Attending College in Virginia; The Two-year College in Virginia; Instructional Programs in Virginia's Institutions of Higher Education; Educational Programs in Virginia for Fields Related to Health; Extension Services, Television Instruction, and Research in Virginia's Institutions of Higher Education; The Faculties of Virginia's Colleges and Universities; Library Services in Virginia's institutions of Higher Education; Instructional Plants in Virginia's Institutions of Higher Education; and Control and Coordination of Higher Education in Virginia. The topics themselves gave testimony to the Virginia tradition—concern for efficiency, cost effectiveness, unnecessary duplication, and coordination and control.

The conclusion of the Higher Education Study Commission (Vaughan, 1971, p. 46) was that the most urgent need in Virginia's higher education program was the development of a system of comprehensive community colleges. The Commission recommended that the highest priority be given to this development (Vaughan, p. 46). And again, thanks to the Slaughter Commission, the planting of the idea of comprehensive community colleges in the minds of key educators in the state helped the presidents of parent institutions come to grips with
severing their branches when the establishment of the comprehensive community college system finally got under way. Members of the Slaughter Commission had asked the presidents of the College of William and Mary, the University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute how they felt about the possibility of their branches joining a comprehensive system of community colleges (Vaughan, 1971, p. 49).

**Highlights of the 1965 Higher Education Study Commission**

Several significant conclusions were drawn from the 1965 Higher Education Study Commission, prepared by John Dale Russell (Director of the Study) and Lloyd C. Bird, Chairman of the Commission. Four trends had been identified in House Joint Resolution No. 30, calling for the Commission (Russell, pp. v-vi). They were 1) that unprecedented numbers of Virginians were seeking admission to institutions of higher learning; 2) that the employment opportunities in Virginia's changing and expanding economy were creating needs for more graduates at the post-high school, college and graduate levels; and 3) that Virginia's program of industrial development was causing greater demands for advanced training and research in business, commercial, scientific and technological fields; and 4) that urbanization, higher standards of living and related social changes were increasing the requirements for medical, dental and other professional and social services. Citing the accompanying increase in financial requirements for adjustment and expansion of programs, services and facilities to meet the rapid changes, the Resolution addressed the need to study, review and make evaluations of higher education objectives, needs and resources to
develop a program of long-range planning.

Statistically the Report of the Higher Education Commission found that Virginia's population was slightly more than 2 per cent of the total national population and that it was growing slightly faster than that of the entire country. Additionally, Virginia was estimated in 1964 to have had 2.35 per cent of the college-age (18-21 years old) population in the entire country (proportionately more than would have been expected from Virginia's population). Added to these figures was another 2--Virginia, in general, was slightly below 2 per cent of the economic strength of the nation. Noting that if the two factors of population (above 2 per cent) and economic resources (below 2 per cent) were combined, it would seem a rough measure of performance in higher education and that Virginia should expect to carry about 2 per cent of the total national load. According to the Report, Virginia approximately was meeting the 2 per cent maintenance of her public schools; however she fell quite short on most measures in her service to higher education (Russell, pp. 2-3).

The Report noted that college enrollments of the college-age population had been on the rise for some time nationally, yet Virginia at the time was considerably below the national average. Anticipating an increase in Virginia's population of college-age college enrollments, the Commission affirmed the State's need "to catch up or correct its present below-par status" (p. 5).

At the time of the Commission Report, the institutional configuration of higher education in Virginia included 13 institutions under state control (having programs of four years or more leading to
the bachelor's or higher degree); 21 private four-year institutions; 12 private institutions under private control, offering programs of less than the bachelor's degree (and for convenience, called two-year colleges); and 11 public (2-year) institutions operating as branches of one of three parent institutions: the University of Virginia, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and the College of William and Mary. UVA had five, VPI four, and W&M two.

The Report also made reference to Virginia State College at Petersburg, a land-grant college (like Virginia Polytechnic Institute) which had a branch in Norfolk which offered a four-year program of instruction and also provided a vocational/technical curriculum of less than baccalaureate degree in length. This college's organization, the Report noted, dated from the time when separate facilities were maintained for students of each race (Virginia State College is a traditionally Black institution.)

The Report also made mention of the fact that Virginia, to a greater extent than any other state, had followed the pattern of maintaining separate schools for each sex in its state-controlled institutions of higher education. According to the Report:

This was formerly a common pattern in the South, but the Southern States in general have converted their institutions to a coeducational pattern, though in some states one institution for women is maintained. In Virginia, Virginia Military Institute, as would be expected, is exclusively for men students. The University of Virginia admits only men to its undergraduate College of Arts and Sciences, although women are admitted to some of the other undergraduate colleges and to graduate and advanced professional schools. Women students, however, constitute only a minority of the total enrollment at the University of Virginia. At the College of William and Mary, the attempt is made to preserve a ratio of about 60 men to 40 women in the student body (Russell, pp. 10-12).
All of the branch (two-year) colleges in Virginia's state system at the time, however, were coeducational with the exception of Roanoke Technical Institute (which by the nature of its curriculum had been chiefly an attraction to men).

And with reference to technical education, the Report noted the establishment of the Board of Technical Education which had authority to develop a system of two-year college programs for technical education throughout the State. At the time of the Report the Board was at work, promoting the development of technical colleges in Virginia, with the assistance of available federal dollars. The Report indicated that one such institution had opened in the Fall of 1965, and that others were in the final planning stages. Although this new direction in the development of technical colleges was under way, the Report stated that the most significant gap in the higher education system in Virginia at that time was the lack of that institution commonly known in other states as the comprehensive community college. The Report noted that "The term 'community college' is sometimes applied in Virginia to the two-year branches of certain parent institutions. But this is not the usual meaning of the term in other States. In general, throughout the country the comprehensive community college is understood to be an institution with a program carrying a student two years beyond high school graduation in diversified curriculums which offer considerable opportunity for gaining vocational competence as well as credits that may be transferred toward a bachelor's degree in a four-year university" (Russell, p. 22). The comprehensive community college,
according to the Report, offered tremendous opportunities for adult education (noncredit) to meet the cultural/vocational needs of citizens not intending to study for a bachelor's degree.

Reiterating the charge given the Commission by the Senate Joint Resolution, (No. 30, 1964)--calling for it to recommend procedures for the development of a statewide system of comprehensive community colleges--the Report affirmed this to be the most pressing need. It listed four related needs and issues: 1) that opportunities for post-high school education in Virginia needed to be expanded greatly in the subsequent two decades; 2) that diversified educational programs must be provided to accommodate the State's manpower needs and to make available appropriate opportunities for students of widely varying interests and abilities; 3) that future developments in post-high school education must be planned systematically to provide quality education most economically; and that there must be a plan for the coordinated development and control of two-year post-high school programs of all types (Russell, pp. 24-25).

The Report also stressed a concern that opportunity be available for every high school graduate wanting a college education, stating that to do less would be both an injustice to individual citizens and deprivation to the state of the improved quality of service that college-trained personnel can provide during a lifetime. One of the greatest advantages of the comprehensive community college, it noted, was the opportunity rendered high school students of all levels of ability to continue their education. Looking at both ends of the spectrum it stated that students of low academic ability could be
served by a curriculum of general education of two years or less in length in the community college, and that the four-year colleges and universities could quite properly follow a selective admission policy at the freshman level with a system of comprehensive community colleges in place.

The broad range of extension activities taking place in the State at that time was also noted in the Higher Education Commission Study Report. It identified lack of inter-institutional coordination with reference to extension being offered by the state-controlled colleges as an area of concern, and obviously the development of the comprehensive community college system could be an excellent vehicle for coordinating the extension services going on throughout the State; and cooperative planning for extension and related services additionally could help prevent a potential chaotic situation that the Commission members seemed to think would occur if uncoordinated extension was allowed to continue.

In reviewing the concerns and recommendations of the Higher Education Study Commission, the same traditional Virginia concerns were in the forefront—economy, planning, coordination, efficiency—albeit a concern for opportunity was among the usual list.

The Higher Education Study Commission Report included various staff reports from consultants involved in the Study. Staff Report #4, The Two-Year College in Virginia, was developed by A.J. Brumbaugh, a consultant from the Southern Regional Education Board. That the two-year college had been singled out for a separate staff report was significant to the importance of the problem in Virginia.
Echoing the concerns about the increasing college-age population in Virginia, The Two-Year College Report asked how Virginia would provide opportunities and facilities for these students. Its resounding answer was the expansion of existing two-year colleges and the establishment of new two-year colleges in strategic centers. The Staff Report also identified factors that would affect the future development of higher education in the Commonwealth. They included the growth and population shifts of the State, the size and geographical location of the college-age sector, economic developments and changes, the number, type, and capacity of existing institutions and the need for new types of institutions to augment them. This Study (The Two-Year College in Virginia) was directed to two concerns: the need for two-year colleges, and how they could be established and effectively operated. The recommended plan was for the existing two-year branches, the two-year technical colleges, and the post-high school area vocational school programs to be transferred to the Community College and Technical Education Board, as well as any new two-year institutions to be established.

This Study also noted that 7,798 students were attending two-year colleges in Virginia, comprising only 10.22 percent of the total number (78,041) attending all higher education institutions in Virginia, and that nationally 14.3 per cent of all college students were enrolled in two-year colleges. The Study reported, "The development of the two-year college in Virginia has obviously lagged behind that in the nation as a whole" (Brumbaugh, pp. 50-51).

Reflecting Virginia tradition, the Study noted that societal
pressures in the past had been toward higher education for recognized
degrees, and that this seemed especially true for Virginia. Until
recent years, it was noted, there had been little recognition of
college-level programs of less than four years which prepared persons
to move directly to job opportunities. It also noted that the present
efforts to establish technical colleges indicated an awakening to the
pressures for trained personnel at levels below the four-year degree.

The Study likewise reflected the need for a comprehensive
institution, one that combined the features of both college transfer
and occupational/technical education. It also compared the advantages
and disadvantages of the branch institution. The primary disadvantage
of the two-year branch was that more than 80 per cent of its offerings
appeared to be in conventional academic departments, with more than 50
per cent concentrated in science, mathematics, and engineering. Seven
of the 12 privately controlled junior colleges, in fact, offered more
extensive terminal occupational courses than the two-year public
institutions.* The branch was also more selective. On the positive
side, the branch offered a way to reduce student congestion on the
main campus, as well as a vehicle for identifying those who should
pursue further education (beyond the sophomore level) and those who
should not. A major assumption of the Report on Two Year Colleges was
that it would be more economical for the junior college to offer
freshman and sophomore programs than it would be for the other
institutions of higher education in Virginia.

The completion of the Report of the Higher Education Study
Commission, following the Slaughter Report, marked the final piece to
come together to make the conditions ripe for General Assembly approval (at long last) of the development of a comprehensive community college system in Virginia. According to Vaughan (1971, p. 47), "In 1966, the recommendations of the Slaughter Commission (1963) and the Higher Education Study Commission (1964) reached fruition with the passage of legislation calling for the establishment of a statewide system of publicly supported community colleges." And how did this finally come about?

**Godwin Responds**

With the election of Mills E. Godwin as Virginia's new governor in 1965 came also the right setup to give birth to the community college system. In Godwin's January 17, 1966 address to the General Assembly, he made reference to the Higher Education Study Commission and its recommendations. Armed with these recommendations, Godwin gave his sales pitch for the community college:

> It is a bold new concept, but not one untried or untested. As conceived by the Commission and developed in other states, the comprehensive community college is more than an extension of high school. It is more than a decapitated four-year college. It is more than a merger of technical and two-year branch colleges in the interest of economy, although it embraces all these concepts. It is a varied and flexible institution, tailored to community needs and designed to serve every citizen within commuting distance. It offers universal admission to high school graduates, weighs their potential through extensive guidance and testing, and directs them to their proper field of study. It relieves the pressure on our four-year resident institutions at a fraction of their cost per student. It substitutes informed choice for the guesswork that so often selects a college for the high school graduate. It minimizes the heartache and provides new opportunity for the amazing number of four-year college freshmen who are unable to complete their first year, despite the best admission machinery. It offers a second chance to high school graduates who have been refused admittance to the college of their choice, as well as to those who would have little chance of enrolling in any four-
year college (Godwin, Senate Document No. 3, pp. 7-8).

Godwin went on to say that he would support legislation to create a new State Board of Community Colleges to assume purview over appropriate branch colleges, technical colleges, and certain vocational training centers.

His sales pitch was impressive, yet it did not guarantee an easy passage of the bill he would propose to endorse the development of the community college system in Virginia. Indeed, the path to General Assembly approval was rocky. On February 3, 1966, Godwin introduced his bill to the General Assembly. He prefaced it by stating that he considered it to be the one of the most important legislative proposals he would make to that body. He stated:

The need is obvious. Last year, our four-year colleges and universities turned away many, many qualified applicants for lack of space. Some of them, with no alternative, left Virginia to continue their education. Among all Virginia high school graduates, more than 55 per cent now continue their education somewhere, in some fashion, but only one in five is able to attend a two or four-year State-supported college in Virginia. If we look at the numbers of potential students, and if we also look at the relative costs involved, the implication is clear that a community college system is the quickest, the most efficient, the most economical, in fact, virtually the only way the future demands of our young people can be met (Godwin, February 3, 1966, p. 165).

He ended his prefacing remarks by saying that the task was critically important and urgent and that he was confident the members of that body would decide in favor of what was best for all Virginia.

The following day Allan Jones (Richmond Times-Dispatch, 2-4-66) rendered a newspaper account. He reported that subsurface resentment
against some of the provisions of the program—a recommendation of a special state study commission—burst into the open and threatened to engulf the bills in a bitter legislative fight. The principal point of concern was that it exempted three existing community colleges from the jurisdiction of the contemplated board (Clinch Valley branch of UVA; Danville Community College, a branch of VPI, and Richard Bland, a branch of W&M). Six other institutions were to be separated from their parent institutions and placed under the new board (The Eastern Shore and Lynchburg branches of the school of general studies of the University of Virginia; Patrick Henry College of the University of Virginia; the Clifton Forge/Covington branch of VPI; Roanoke Technical Institute of VPI; and the Wytheville branch of VPI). George Mason College in Northern Virginia and Christopher Newport in Newport News were not included in the legislation. This was in accord with the findings of the Higher Education Study Commission (both were well toward becoming four-year degree-granting institutions). The Commission, however, recommended that Richard Bland, the Danville branch of VPI, and Clinch Valley be placed under the authority of the community college board. Jones further reported: "Governor Godwin in a special message to the Legislature said he considered the bills—identical measures were offered in both chambers—to be one of the most important legislative questions I shall propose to this body." Jones also noted that in making the community college recommendation, the Study Commission had sought to end a chaotic situation by developing a program of systematically planned higher education—providing quality education most economically for the maximum number
of high school graduates.

In providing his viewpoint, after-the-fact, Godwin recounted the events leading up to the introduction of the community college legislation (June 5, 1986). He gave credit to former Governor Allmond (who preceded Albertis S. Harrison) for supporting the sales tax, noting that without the sales tax there would have been no funding to inaugurate this new level of education. He also gave credit to Lloyd D. Byrd, the Chair of the Higher Education Study Commission, and to Governor Harrison and his role in industrial and economic development. Godwin stated that industrial/economic development really did not get started in an organized way until Harrison's term (beginning in 1962). He also noted that there had been no established state agency for economic development until 1962 when a division was placed in the Governor's office.

According to Godwin the progress of economic development that was commencing at the outset of Governor Harrison's term created the need for vocational/technical training. That was why vocational training was set up and passed. And since the funding was still not available for any large development of that program, Harrison realized something had to be done. He, therefore, authorized a study commission and recommended that we get legislation in 1966.

Remembering the bill's introduction, Godwin said that it passed easily in the House of Delegates. It was sent to the Senate where it languished and almost expired in the Senate Education Committee because of opposition from certain quarters, particularly from then Senator William F. Stone of Martinsville who did not want the Patrick
Henry Branch of UVA included, and by Senator Almer Ames of Accomac who did not want the Eastern Shore branch of UVA included. Other problems of a significant nature existed at the Richard Bland branch of William and Mary, and there was some dissent in the Roanoke area.

Political considerations, according to Godwin, beyond the college program itself had something to do with the Senate Education Committee. A problem arose in getting the bill reported out. Entering the final week of the General Assembly, Godwin made a concerted effort to get the bill out of the committee. He called the presidents of UVA, W&M, and VPI to the Governor's Office, along with the patrons of the bill (Slaughter and Byrd), Dr. Dana Hamel, and senior staff members, to discuss the situation. Doctors Hahn (VPI) and Paschall (W&M) were quite supportive--Dr. Shannon (UVA) to a lesser degree because of problems with some of his branch colleges.

Godwin realized that he had to have a unified effort and that the bill should not pass unless it included all the institutions. He could not permit UVA and not others to be out of the system. Describing how he handled the situation, Godwin recalled:

I talked quite frankly to the presidents about the problem and told them that I would have no alternative if the bill were defeated except to tell the people of Virginia why it had been defeated. Rather frank discussion lasted several hours and near the conclusion I suggested that I would be willing to defer the Patrick Henry branch and the Eastern Shore branch from being taken into the system for a period of two years and that all other branches would be taken in except, perhaps, Richard Bland which might continue because of special circumstances (political--to get the bill passed). Richard Bland had a number of community students and general education courses. There were some liberals who wanted to combine it with Virginia State (this was opposed, and today Richard Bland is still an appendage) (1986).
According to Godwin the opponents of the bill agreed to this deferral of the two institutions with the understanding that they would automatically come into the system in 1968, and the bill promptly emerged from the Senate Education Committee and passed the senate without dissenting vote. "It was a good compromise that enabled us to get a prompt beginning for the system" (1986). Godwin added that there had been a lot of intrigue and conversations prior to this meeting. Hahn had spoken publicly on a number of occasions for the system, and wanted approval. Paschall did somewhat the same. Dr. Shannon remained relatively quiet about it. While the Board of Visitors at UVA approved the community college program by resolution, there was little help forthcoming when it was needed for the legislature. They key was the conference he called.

Godwin also noted that after the bill was passed, members of the new state board were appointed. He also noted that Virginia's plan was a bit different compared to other states in that it had a strong central board and director (Hamel) appointed by the Governor, and they set policy for all the colleges, and administratively the program was run through the state board. The system got under way immediately in planning stages. Consultants were put to work to recommend sites. A minimum of 100 acres for each campus was wanted with locations in appropriate places within driving distance of any students.

When asked to list the reasons for the development of the Virginia Community College System, Godwin responded:

"industrial/economical; crowded; to accept students who were
economically deprived; did not require rigid entrance; relieved pressures of enrollment in other colleges; helped late bloomers find their way, but it opened the door of higher education to a group who did not and would not have had the opportunity; tuition set low; and it made available a new level of education to thousands of Virginians who we had not had previously." Godwin added that the necessity of the program is evident by the way things took place (both part-time, full-time basis). He said that the success of graduates who have gone on to other degrees and accepted at higher institutions also speaks for itself. He noted that industry has had its requirements met by community service, continuing education, and business training before and after start-up. He ended this particular interview by saying, "It has had growing pains and it has served a very useful purpose. I am very proud of it."

In a subsequent interview with Dr. George Vaughan (1987, p. xi), Godwin was questioned on the establishment of the community colleges being contradictory to the tradition of Virginia. Vaughan asked him "why a group of Virginia politicians, steeped in the philosophy and wedded to the organization of Harry F. Byrd, Sr., would take on as a political and economic issue the development of a comprehensive system of public colleges. The development of colleges designed to serve people of all ages, all races, and both sexes appeared to be a departure from the norm in a state with a tradition of 'pay-as-you-go' and segregated education. Indeed, the open access community college would seem more in line with populist and progressive political philosophies than with the conservative
philosophy of Virginia democrats" (Vaughan, p. xi). According to
Vaughan, "Godwin responded that he did not recall any of the more
resolute Byrd supporters in the General Assembly opposing the bill for
philosophical reasons. The opposition from Senators Stone and Ames
(the two leading opponents of the development of community colleges)
was from parochial interests and not philosophical" (Vaughan, p. xi).
Vaughan added, "Indeed, Godwin believes very strongly that the time
was right for the development of a system of community colleges.
Politicians steeped in the Byrd tradition not only supported the
community college idea, but also saw it as politically wise to do so"
(Vaughan, p. xi).

The Community College System: A Reality

The Virginia Community College System finally became a reality.
The apparent factors leading to its inception include a call for
vocational/technical training to assist industrial development, a
concern for Virginia's low status with reference to college-going
youth, a need to coordinate the postsecondary system in the State in
the most efficient and effective manner, and the opportunities
envisioned by Governor Godwin. Democratization, however, was not a
factor as this research suggests.
In making any analysis of historical events, such as the establishment of the community college system in Virginia, it is interesting to interview key persons "after-the-fact." Sometimes missing links can be found to connect the traces left recorded by historical records and documents. S.V. Martorana, author of the 1959 study which recommended community colleges in Virginia; Dana B. Hamel, first Chancellor of the Virginia Community College System; Sol W. Rawls, Jr., Chairman, State Council of Higher Education and Member of the 1965 Higher Education Study Commission; and former Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr., "the father of the Virginia Community College System," each have contributions to make as missing puzzle pieces for the overall picture of the real reasons for the development of the Virginia Community College System. Each of these individuals was interviewed personally by this author who wanted to find out what they consider to be the real focus of the development of the community college system, and most especially to see whether or not they would mention "broadening the base" or "democratization."

S.V. Martorana

According to Martorana (1987) the second half of the fifties found Virginia, like all states, examining responsibility for population and enrollment increases. The post World War II conditions
provided an excellent opportunity for kindergarten through twelfth grade and beyond to further study. In place were very strong, traditionally oriented universities. Added to that were pressures for expanding the base, along with a network of vocational school centers. Again, like many other states, Virginia had to find a way to accommodate these pressures. The problem was how to bring about change in the Commonwealth without disrupting the existing structure. As a result of these circumstances, according to Martorana, another incipient development was that of the establishment of a coordinating agency. Compounding the call for this young coordinating board to work for higher order efficiency was pressure for expansion and reform that could affect articulation of secondary schools. Martorana noted that not only study, but also procedures followed, and everywhere you went were written accounts in the newspapers. Additionally, these pressures and changes led to reconsideration of the power bases of the State's universities (such as Virginia Tech) and whether or not they should become decentralized.

Sol W. Rawls, Jr.

Sol W. Rawls, Jr. (1987) commented first on Virginia's unique system of higher education then (in the 1950s period) and now, adding that Virginia's system is even more unique than other states. Citing the College of William and Mary, Mr. Jefferson's University, and Virginia Military Institute, he also noted that these three oldest schools, with extremely separate objectives, were very different and very protective of their uniqueness. They were also very jealous of people getting into their areas. He also made reference to Virginia's
strong system of private and girls' schools, adding that needs basically were being met.

Prior to World War II, Virginia lagged behind. In midwestern states, however, he noted, any high school graduate was accepted into senior systems. Rawls also made reference to the very advanced California system, founded on practicality. According to Rawls, California's system of postsecondary schools was developed outside very metropolitan areas alongside large regional high schools. These two-year postsecondary schools included technical institutes and junior colleges.

After World War II, the need to accommodate new demands for postsecondary education was a pressing issue. Existing institutions of higher education, according to Rawls, decided to strengthen themselves and started moving out from their home campuses. He gave examples of the branches of William and Mary (Norfolk Division, Richmond Professional Institute, and Richard Bland College), the University of Virginia (Clinch Valley and the Northern Virginia area); and Virginia Polytechnic Institute (extension centers in Norfolk and Roanoke). These branches, according to Rawls, were growing hodgepodge.

Following these developments, a group of young "turks" in the General Assembly visualized the growth in higher education and started looking around at what other states had been doing. And for the first time, they started looking at the total picture. These actions resulted in the creation of the State Council of Higher Education, a coordinating board. There also was pressure that this board become an
operating council (super board), yet it was very vital that the character and uniqueness of Virginia's institutions be preserved.

According to Rawls, the board too, (State Council of Higher Education) began seeing the total picture and started making recommendations. The State legislature, in turn, gradually started listening.

One of the first items to be dealt with was the proliferation of courses. These had been spurred on by the interest in Sputnik and technical institutes. "You began to see all institutions trying to put branches here, there, and everywhere" (Rawls). This problem led to the consideration of a very comprehensive study for higher education in Virginia with very specific recommendations (The Higher Education Study Commission).

The Higher Education Study Commission Report which would result in the recommendation for the development of a comprehensive system of community colleges, was commissioned because of the hodgepodge branch-growth concern, the concept that everyone ought to have an opportunity to improve themselves, and the need to break up the William and Mary campus into a free-standing school versus a "tail-wagging-the-dog" situation. With reference to the opportunity to improve, he said that the experience with the existing institutions led to the need for schools where the people are. He also stated that the Higher Education Commission resulted in the independent status of the Norfolk Branch of William and Mary and Richmond Professional Institute (RPI) (also a branch of the College of William and Mary) and the merger of RPI with the Medical College of Virginia. He also cited the free-
standing status that was awarded Clinch Valley (a branch of the University of Virginia).

Rawls also mentioned that the first concept of a two-year postsecondary institution for Virginia was that of a two-year transfer school versus a two-year certificate program, and that before the State was firm with economic development, there was a need for technical institutes.

Dana B. Hamel

According to Dana Hamel (1988), most of the states in the South were involved in economic development (1960), but Virginia was one of the last. Other states were ahead of Virginia (especially North Carolina, Florida, South Carolina) by ten to fifteen years.

Hamel also noted that Virginia never had had a high unemployment rate, and that Governor Godwin knew that if we did not provide education for people coming on, we would indeed have unemployment and poverty. Hamel also said that "most of us (in Virginia) would not admit that tobacco would not be sustaining," and that we had not necessarily been visionary up until the early sixties.

In calling for two-year technical institutes which would later become comprehensive institutions, Virginia found a way to provide both education and training to her citizens while keeping maximum employment in Virginia and attracting new industry to the state.

Hamel noted that the initial schools of the system yet to develop were called technical "colleges," versus "institutes," because people want to go to college. And a plus for these two-year colleges was that they were inexpensive. He added that you could sell
efficiency, and this at least got people supporting the idea. The system thus started with the two-year technical colleges, reinforcing the concept that one half a loaf of bread is better than none. Hamel added that the system started with these, and comprehensiveness later was added. In recalling the days of speech-making in support of these new institutions across the State, Hamel affirmed that race and color were not an issue. He stated that never was there discrimination in enrollment by sex, students, or faculty qualifications when the two-year colleges began. On the speaking trail, Hamel championed education for citizens in Virginia, presenting the two-year postsecondary college as more than high school, but less than a baccalaureate degree, as well as a way to realize a full-employment economy. The way to a full-employment economy, he firmly believed, was to give educational opportunities to the citizens of Virginia.

When asked to list the reasons he felt resulted in the development of the comprehensive community college system in Virginia, Hamel listed four (1989). First, he said that North Carolina and South Carolina were moving heavily into economic development ("smokestack chasing"), bringing new industries from other states. He added that the focus on attracting new industries to create new jobs started with Governor Harrison. Secondly, there was an influx of non-Virginians with different thinking. Thirdly, people were starting to recognize that there were legitimate reasons why people were not ready to go to four-year colleges (could not afford, late bloomers, did not want to leave home, some who wanted to learn other than four-year offerings with nowhere to go). Hamel said that states in the South,
especially North Carolina and South Carolina, were setting a very active pace for bringing business and industry into the area, and this in turn helped unemployment, providing a diversification of industry and business so that when there was a downturn in economy, it did not affect quite as many people. Lastly, he cited the driving need for skilled artisans, craftsmen, and technicians. There was a creation of jobs that required more than high school but less than the BS degree. As technology developed, the two plus two articulation also developed, so there was not a closed system.

With reference to the proverbial "open door" philosophy of the community college, Hamel said that he had recommended a "modified" open-door policy. This idea, he added, was not accepted by other state leaders. Hamel believed it would be committing academic suicide to use the open-door approach. Students could be admitted, but they had to meet basic requirements for participation in programs. His approach involved assessing "where you are, where you are going, and how to get you there." Accordingly, it is apparently incorrect to refer to the Virginia Community College System as an open-door institution when placement tests are administered upon admission.

Although Hamel gave credit to both Governors Harrison and Godwin, he had more to say about Godwin. He underscored, particularly, the leadership of Godwin, saying that he never got so far that you could not tell where he was (he did not move ahead too fast). Hamel also said that Godwin typifies a visionary and deserves credit for putting the sales tax and money into public education, increasing opportunities for Blacks and others across the State.
According to Hamel (1989), "Governor Godwin has done more for public education in the Commonwealth of Virginia than any man in the century. Because of the leadership he provided, opportunities that were not there before were made available to all Virginians through the community colleges. Through additional funding to the public schools as a result of his tax efforts, improvements were begun which opened the door for all Virginians."

Mills E. Godwin, Jr.

In discussing his perceived reasons for the development of the community college system, Godwin (1989) firmly asserted that it was "purely for the purpose of bringing educational opportunities to young Virginians." And these opportunities related both to academic reasons and economical reasons. With reference to the possibility that the community college system could have been developed along racial lines, Godwin said that it has always been an irritation that credit had not been given for the opportunities the system brought to a larger segment of the people which obviously included the Black population. He also denied vehemently that any plans were made to keep the races separate (in postsecondary education) when the community college system was established. He added that, "Liberals have made that accusation."

George Vaughan, interviewing Godwin (May 26, 1987), asked that Godwin respond to the question regarding the possibility that the community colleges preserve the socioeconomic status versus equal opportunity. He asked Godwin if there had been any idea of developing a system of community colleges so that members of the lower
socioeconomic groups (especially Blacks) could attend the community college and thus preserve Virginia's elite institutions (William and Mary, University of Virginia) for the middle and upper-class white. According to Vaughan (1987), Godwin "...replied that this kind of thinking was alien to the community college philosophy in 1966 and how he understands it today." Vaughan, quoted Godwin as saying, "I would disagree vehemently with any belief that the community colleges were designed for anyone other than all of the people. I think the community college has been the greatest godsend that ever came to our moderate income and low income members of society." Vaughan also stated that Godwin noted no evidence of tracking Black students into the community college.

During this author's interview with Godwin (March 21, 1989), the subject of Massive Resistance was broached, as well as the tradition of elitism and conservatism in Virginia through the years. Stating that while this author did not believe that racial matters were a factor in creating the Virginia Community College System, the era of massive resistance did make a statement on Virginia's prevailing attitude. And while the subject was not often brought to light, this author felt the need to address it in this study. This author also pointed out to Godwin that while democratization and broadening the base had been touted as reasons for the development of the community college system in Virginia, no evidence had been found to support this thesis. In fact, the reasons identified relate more to the Virginia tradition of conservatism and elitism. Factors found affecting the development of the community college system in Virginia
included the need to attract industry for economic development, concern for course and program proliferation and coordination, concern for Virginia's place in both southern and national rankings with reference to higher education, concern for accommodating a burgeoning college-age population with the most efficient approach, and the need to keep up with advancing technology. The community college system, it seemed to this author, was an answer to multiple problems--not any of which was a cry for equal opportunity from any one or any group. Stating that this author wished to address these various points in contrast to the usual community college rhetoric of Jeffersonian ideals and equal opportunity, Godwin's opinion was solicited. After listening thoughtfully and absorbingly to this proposition, Godwin stated, "I am glad you are addressing it--the truth about the matter--regardless of what others say."

And with reference to equal opportunity and the community college, this author also mentioned that while the system had never been intended for separating along racial or gender lines, there is evidence to support certain feelings. Blacks and females were not being accommodated in Virginia's public institutions of higher education in any significant way at the time of the establishment of the community college system. Elitism in higher education was indeed still alive. This author asked Godwin, if indeed, the community colleges were not also seen as a vehicle for sorting out those students who would not be accepted at the University of Virginia et al. Godwin replied that it was recognized at the time that there was a need for a "cooling-off" period for some students seeking higher
education. Obviously, this "cooling-out" or sorting of students at the community college level was more efficient than sifting them through the four-year schools. And it also contributed to the continuation of an elitist attitude regarding higher education in Virginia (in this author's opinion).

The "cooling-out" function in higher education was addressed by Burton S. Clark in 1960 (pp. 569-576). Therefore, it was a familiar term prior to the establishment of the Virginia Community College System. According to Clark (1960, p. 569):

The wide gap found in many democratic institutions between culturally encouraged aspiration and institutionally provided means of achievement leads to the failure of many participants. Such a situation exists in American higher education. Certain social units ameliorate the consequent stress by redefining failure and providing for a 'soft denial;' they perform a 'cooling-out' function. The junior college especially plays this role.

Revisionists Accounts

In exploring reasons other than democratization and broadening the base of higher education for the establishment of the community college, revisionist accounts are helpful. Karabel, for example, stated that a critical factor in the expansion/differentiation of the system of colleges and universities had been a change in the structure of the economy. He noted that between 1950 and 1970, the proportion of technical and professional workers in the labor force rose from 7.1 per cent to 14.5 per cent. He further noted that without the major changes in the American economy, it would have been most unlikely that the community college system would have reached its present dimensions (in 1972). Karabel (1960, p. 522) also reported, "Although a change
in the nature of the labor force laid the groundwork for a system of two-year public colleges, the magnitude and shape of the community college owe much to American ideology about equal opportunity through education." Karabel also noted that Americans have always believed in the possibility of upward mobility through education. And likewise, they have become convinced that a lack of proper degrees could be detrimental to the realization of their aspirations. Consequently there has been pressure for entrance to higher education leading to greater hierarchical differentiation within higher education.

According to Karabel:

Existing four-year colleges did not, for the most part, open up to the masses of students demanding higher education (indeed, selectivity at many of these institutions has increased in recent years); instead, separate two-year institutions stressing their open and democratic character were created for these new students. Herein lies the genius of the community college movement: it seemingly fulfills the traditional American quest for equality of opportunity without sacrificing the principle of achievement. On the one hand, the openness of the community college gives testimony to the American commitment to equality of opportunity through education... On the other hand, the community colleges leave the principle of achievement intact by enabling the state college and universities to deny access to those citizens who do not meet their qualifications. The latent ideology of the community college movement thus suggests that everyone would have an opportunity to attain elite status, but that once they have had a chance to prove themselves, an unequal distribution of rewards is acceptable. By their ideology, by their position in the implicit tracking system of higher education--indeed, by their very relationship to the larger class structure--the community colleges lend affirmation to the merit principle which, while facilitating individual upward mobility, diverts attention from underlying questions of distributive justice.

The community college movement is a part of a larger historical process of educational expansion. In the early twentieth century, the key point of expansion was at the secondary level as the high school underwent
a transition from an elite to a mass institution. Then as now, access to education was markedly influenced by socioeconomic status (pp. 523-524).

Karabel concluded that the extension of educational opportunity had resulted in little or no change in the overall extent of both social mobility and economic stability. His thesis was that "...the community college, generally viewed as the leading edge of an open and egalitarian system of higher education, is in reality a prime contemporary expression of the dual historical patterns of class-based tracking and of educational inflation" (Karabel, p. 526). Karabel further asserted (p. 526) that "An analysis of existing evidence will show that the community college is itself the bottom track of the system of higher education both in class origins and occupational destinations of its students. Further, tracking takes place within the community college in the form of vocational education." Karabel noted that "Class-based tracking, whether between schools, within schools, or both, is not new in American education. This pattern extends back into the early twentieth century, the period during which the American high school became a mass institution" (p. 540). And referring to the "cooling-out" process, Karabel reported that it not only allowed the junior college to perform its sorting and legitimation functions, but it also enabled the two-year college to contribute to the intergenerational transmission of privilege. "At the bottom of an increasingly formalized tracking system in higher education, community colleges channel working-class students away from four-year colleges and into middle-level technical occupations. Having gained access to higher education, the low status student is often cooled out
and made to internalize his structurally induced failure" (pp. 539-540). And it must be remembered, according to Karabel, that increased access does not automatically lead to genuine expansion of educational opportunity. "The critical question is not who gains access to higher education, but rather what happens to people after they get there" (p. 530).

Karabel also noted that the American Association of Junior Colleges (now the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges) since its beginnings had encouraged the growth of vocational education. Karabel also reported that the American Council of Education had also given significant support to postsecondary technical education. In a study sponsored by the American Council of Education, in fact, one of the conclusions was that if two-year colleges were to assume their proper and effective role in the educational system, they should make vocational and technical education programs a major part of their mission and a fundamental objective" (p. 547).

Another point highlighted by Karabel was that from the beginning of the junior college movement of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, there had been a recognition among many university academics that it was in their interest to have a diversified system of higher education. Karabel wrote that "A number of observers have noted that the community colleges serve as a safety valve, diverting students clamoring for access to college away from more selective institutions. Elite colleges neither want nor need these students..." (p. 547). He also included a note on a quote from
Amitai Etzioni, chairman of the Department of Sociology at Columbia University. This quote was cited in a speech by Vice President Agnew in 1970 attacking open admissions. Etzioni had said, "If we can no longer keep the floodgates closed at the admissions office, it at least seems wise to channel the general flow away from four-year colleges and toward two-year extensions of high school in the junior and community colleges" (p. 547).

Karabel also reported that a great deal of emphasis was being placed on improving the public's view of vocational education, but that little emphasis was being made on the substantive matter of class difference in income, occupational prestige, power, and opportunities for autonomy and expression at the workplace. According to Karabel:

The Carnegie Commission, whose ideology is probably representative of the higher education establishment, blurs the distinction between equality and equality of opportunity. Discussing its vision of the day when minority persons will be proportionately represented in higher occupational levels, the Commission hails this as an 'important signal that society was meeting its commitment to equality.' The conception of equality conveyed in this passage is really one of equality of opportunity; the Commission seems less interested in reducing gross differences in rewards than in giving everyone a chance to get ahead of everyone else. The Carnegie Commission, reflecting the values of the national educational leadership but also of the wider society, shows concern about opportunities for mobility, but little concern about a reduction in inequality (p. 549).

Referring again to vocational training in the community college, Karabel asserted that the push for it in the community college had been sponsored by a national educational planning elite whose social composition, outlook, and policy proposals were indicative of the interests of the more privileged state of society.
"Notably absent among those pressuring for more occupational training in the junior college have been the students themselves" (p. 552).

Zwerling reported (1976) ..."that the expansion of vocational education, first in the high schools (after an aborted beginning in the land-grant colleges) and then in the junior colleges, was more an ingenious way of providing large numbers of students with access to schooling without disturbing the shape of the social structure than it was an effort to democratize the society. What is important is the kind of education one gets, and vocational education is not the kind that leads to more social mobility" (p. 61).

Pincus reported (1980, p. 336) that "Although vocational education for manual skills was not found in most forms of higher education during the nineteenth century and early twentieth centuries, it was prevalent in segregated Black colleges. According to Pincus:

Northern philanthropists and industrialists who provided funds for many Black colleges seemed to feel that being a skilled worker was the best that most black people could hope for. This attitude was supported by the second Morrill Act of 1870, which allocated land to states to establish segregated agricultural and mechanical colleges for Blacks. Consequently, the curriculum of these black colleges featured industrial and agricultural arts, home economics, and teacher training (p. 336).

Pincus argued that while vocational education in community colleges had been touted as an attractive alternative to the bachelor's degree, it had in fact been developed in response to the rising educational aspirations of the working class and the decreasing opportunities for young college graduates to find employment.

According to Ericson and Robertshaw (1982, p. 327), "The belief in the social efficacy of education springs from 18th-century liberal
ideology that holds that social rewards and privileges belong not to
an elite, hereditary social class, but should go to those individuals
of talent, intelligence, and industry. The ideology of America, if
not the reality, has always been one of meritocracy rather than
aristocracy." And:

The American community college has been considered a more
democratic and meritocratic institution than its four-year
BA counterpart. Accordingly, it has been touted as a leader
in the battle for equal educational opportunity and social
mobility for those of lower socioeconomic status. In the
past decade, however, influential critics of the community
college have argued that it is in reality a social expres­
sion of class-based tracking that functions to preserve and
reproduce the existing, unjust social order. Central to
this indictment is the claim that the community college
redirects the educational aspirations of large numbers of
low-status students away from four-year degrees and toward
two-year terminal degrees and eventually lower-status socio­
economic positions. The community college is neither
democratic or meritocratic (Ericson and Robertshaw, p. 315).

In sorting out these allegations, however, Ericson and
Robertshaw concluded that there was in the community college then
(1982) no conspiracy to retain advantage for middle or upper-
socioeconomic groups. The problem they found was that aspiration, not
induced failure, determined completion of a two-year degree and
transfer to a BA program. And they concluded that "Whatever the case,
the community college is more or less a meritocratic institution that
distributes its benefits on the basis of educationally relevant
attributes" (p. 339).

Virginia-After the Fact

Armistead (1977) did a ten-year follow-up study of the Virginia
Community College System. In summing up her responses from
interviewees for her follow-up report, Armistead noted (p. 63), "By
far the most frequently cited reason given by the entire group of interviewees for establishing Virginia's system of community colleges was to provide increased opportunities for post-high school education to the citizens of the Commonwealth." She further stated that the need was highlighted by the fact that admission to the State's senior institutions was becoming increasingly difficult. The college-going population was swelling too fast for the four-year institutions to handle them. The community college thus was a way to eliminate the tremendous pressure on the four-year colleges to accommodate the mounting numbers.

Armistead also cited the wave of egalitarianism in higher education to be spreading. She reported that several interviewees said that broader equal opportunity requirements were emerging in a more clear-cut fashion than in the past, and that talk of open access was increasing both in Virginia and nationwide.

According to Armistead:

Virginia's poor higher educational position as compared with other states, the growth of the community college movement nationwide, the demographic pressures, and desires for equal opportunity and open access were seen by the interviewees as coalescing in the mid 1960s and giving the thrust for Virginia to move ahead and expand its postsecondary offerings.

The Community College and the American Dream

On the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the Virginia Community College System, Dr. George Vaughan, with the assistance of others, repackaged his 1971 monograph entitled Some Philosophical and Practical Concepts for Broadening the Base of Higher Education in Virginia. Renamed Pursuing the American Dream: A History of the
Development of the Virginia Community College System, it included a new forward and a new final chapter featuring an overview of the Virginia Community College System in 1987. In the new preface, Vaughan, on reflection, noted:

In many ways the development of the community colleges in Virginia came at a propitious time in the history of the state and the nation. The G.I. Bill following World War II set the stage for higher education to be viewed as a right rather than a privilege, college for everyone rather than the chosen few. The nation’s economy remained good after the war. Indeed, the United States seemed well positioned to be the first (and still the only) nation in the world to commit itself to universal higher education.

The confluence of three events finally made the dream of open access to higher education a reality. First, the baby boomers began enrolling in college in the 1960's. Second, the open society of the more progressive thinking politicians became a reality during the 1960's as the nation moved to eliminate poverty and its progeny, ignorance. Third, the Higher Education Act of 1965 and its later amendments, especially the 1972 amendments, made it possible for virtually everyone who could establish a need for financial assistance to receive such assistance. In Virginia, the General Assembly, under the leadership of Governor Godwin, entered the higher education mainstream of America's movement toward a more open society when it passed legislation creating a system of community colleges in 1966 (Vaughan, 1987, pp. x-xi).

In Summary

In summarizing the factors accounting for the development of the Virginia Community College System, the leadership of former Governor, Mills E. Godwin, Jr., is foremost among others. Obviously he had the vision to seize the moment, foreseeing future possibilities with the creation of a comprehensive community college.

In tracing the historical events leading up to the inception of the community college system in 1966, the Virginia tradition of elitism and conservatism stand true. From the days of the early
settlement in Virginia, an elitist attitude toward public education has been in place. Likewise, concern for unnecessary spending and getting the most for dollars spent has also been prevalent in Virginia's history, especially since the Byrd era. Neither elitism nor conservatism was aborted in the chain of events and circumstances resulting in the final adoption of a comprehensive community college system in Virginia.

The fact that Virginia was late with a community college system in some respects supports her conservative stance. The system was not created haphazardly. It was well planned, well thought-out, and designed to provide educational opportunity within commuting distance of every citizen in the Commonwealth. Drawing from the experience (and mistakes) of other states, the lateness of Virginia's system was actually a plus. Today it is recognized as one of the best in the nation (Finley, 1989).

The fact that Virginia's system did begin with vocational/technical schools (1964) additionally supports the elitist theory. According to revisionist accounts, vocational/technical training or education is at the bottom of the hierarchy in the higher education arena. That this piece of the system came first, seems to this author a statement on its primary intent. And that intent was not the grand and glorious call for equal opportunity or democratization. It was rather a vehicle for responding to the needs of a society that was changing from rural and agriculture to one that was highly technical. The technical schools could solve a number of Virginia's problems: unemployment, attracting business and industry to
the state for economic development, and providing a vehicle for the increasing college-age population to have access to postsecondary education without disturbing the existing system. And the focus on vocational/technical education was the beginning of what the comprehensive community college later became.

In the early days of the junior college movement nationwide, the two-year public institution was primarily intended to provide instruction of a purely collegiate grade. In Virginia, its earliest form of public two-year institutions was the branch of the university or four-year college. And this, in fact, was late in coming as well as selective in the admissions process. The branches were indeed intended to be equivalent to the first two years of the traditional college program.

Goodwin (1971) noted that by 1920, "One is hard pressed to speak of a junior college movement, not to mention a junior college ideology. A set of ideas had been formulated, however, which promoted the idea of the junior college on the basis of an efficient, cultured people and an efficient, industrial nation" (Goodwin, 1971, p. 92). From this set of ideas, he maintained, the community-junior college ideology developed. Virginia's community college movement appeared to have been in line with Goodwin's perceptions. This author, accordingly agrees with Vaughan's thesis that the community college in Virginia was an evolutionary process. It did, in fact, evolve from a concern for economic development, accommodation of an increasing college-age population, and a concern for efficiency and cost-effectiveness to a comprehensive system which could be hailed as
democratic and broadening the base of higher education. Its metamorphosis, however, was not complete until after its inception.

Again, Godwin's leadership and vision helped spur on the possible dream which was his. Through his entreaties and those of Dana Hamel's throughout the state, people were encouraged to see all that the comprehensive community college could be. The combination of the existing branch institutions and technical colleges with newly established comprehensive units was indeed a stroke of genius. It prevented unwieldy, chaotic growth in many directions (as had been the case in other states), and it served many publics. Its comprehensive focus included vocational/technical training, college transfer, developmental (remedial) education, community service, guidance and counseling, and continuing education for adults. It was the best of all worlds wrapped into one package and a grand solution for all of Virginia's problems while still maintaining status quo in the higher education scheme. In actuality, the higher education philosophy of Virginia prior to 1966 did not change thereafter.

And that philosophy was also responsible for Virginia's late entry with a community college system. Always taking one step at a time, ever cautiously, in typical Virginia fashion the community college evolved with foresight and planning and studies to help chart the course.

The political and social forces occurring before 1966 also contributed to Virginia's late coming with a community college system. Certainly the era of Massive Resistance helped drain energies from other directions, just as it helped sell the populist notion of a
community college after the 1950s. As stated before, the community college became the democratizing agent after-the-fact, much like a planned marriage. Obviously this public two-year institution would be a vehicle for opportunity for many citizens in Virginia, and Blacks were not excluded. Greatly assisted by the interest of key politicians and the influx of federal dollars for assistance, the vocational/technical system, within two years, evolved into a much more comprehensive approach. And the time was ripe for its acceptance.

Democratization did not play a major role in the development of the Virginia Community College System. It did come to have significance after its establishment. And Mills E. Godwin, Jr., visionary, provided the leadership to make it happen. Apparently he was the right man at the right time to see the possibilities and grab the opportunity to make them realities. His endorsement of the community college gave many Virginians a vehicle for pursuing the "American Dream."

According to Vaughan (1987), "We must never forget that all Americans have the right to pursue the American Dream; we must never forget that the community college represents the only hope millions of Americans have of achieving that Dream" (Vaughan, 1987). Vaughan, at the end of the Virginia Community College's first twenty years, compared it to the Statue of Liberty. He felt that both the community college and the Statue represent hope for the "neglected masses." Paraphrasing the famous lines of "Give me your tired, your poor," he offered this summation:
Give us your young, and your not so young;  
Give us your capable, and your not so capable;  
Give us your minorities, and your homemakers;  
Give us your employed, your underemployed, your unemployed.  
Give us those in society who have too long lingered on the  
periphery of the American Dream,  
And we will help them to become better students,  
better workers, better citizens, better people (Vaughan, 1987).

Yes, the community college does perpetuate class-tracking. Yes,  
the community college is a vehicle for "cooling-out." Yes, the  
community college provides a sorting function. But, it also provides  
a second chance, an opportunity to connect with higher education via  
its transfer programs. And it does open its door to all who come. It  
does not, however, guarantee equal opportunity in higher education,  
because equal opportunity is not necessarily equal access to a  
community college. (It involves many other variables including  
income, socioeconomic status, and academic preparation.)

It is indeed the "people's college." And it has certainly  
provided opportunities for training for employment and movement in the  
higher education track--opportunities that would not have been  
available otherwise.

And it is fitting to speak of the Virginia Community College  
System with reference to Thomas Jefferson. The System does provide  
higher education to all citizens within commuting distance, while at  
the same time allowing for elitism in the senior institutions. The  
current Chancellor, in his remarks regarding the mission of the  
Virginia Community college System noted, "Obviously Mr. Jefferson's  
feelings for education took shape through concern for people"  
(Hockaday, 1981, p. 1). He then demonstrated those feelings by citing
(as Lancaster had done in 1943) Jefferson's words to George Wythe:

Preach, my Dear Sir, a crusade against ignorance; establish and improve the law for educating the common people. Let our countrymen know that the people alone can protect us against these evils, and that the tax that will be paid for this purpose is not more than a thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests, and nobles who will rise up amongst us, if we leave the people in ignorance (p. 1).

Hockaday also made reference to Godwin's belief in the values of an educated citizenry both within and without Virginia. He also quoted Godwin:

If there is a universal enemy, if there is a main root to the excesses and to the inertia which get in our way--if there is a handmaiden to poverty and failure, it is ignorance. Let us marshall all our resources against it (p. 4).

Citing the architect named Dana Hamel and early-day presidents, among others, Hockaday gave credit for their putting together "a sophisticated system of community colleges--strongly swayed, by intent, toward centralization, but flexible enough to allow for local discretion and direction--colleges strategically placed to serve the vision of Mr. Jefferson" (p. 4).

In Vaughan's final words on the movement to extend higher education in Virginia (1987, p. 63), he cites the importance of leadership. The leadership of Mills E. Godwin, Jr., in particular, provided the opportunity for the dream of Thomas Jefferson to manifest itself in the form of the Virginia Community College System.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation was to explore the facts regarding the rhetoric of democratization and broadening the base of higher education with reference to the development of the Virginia Community College System. In a state with a tradition of conservatism and elitism toward public education, this study sought to identify those factors which accounted for the adoption of a populist notion, the community college system.

Established in 1966, the system was late in coming compared to other states. The first continuously operating two-year public college was established in Joliet, Illinois, in 1901, and California, along with other states, soon followed. This study also sought to answer why Virginia did not act sooner in creating a public community college system.

Relying primarily on available documents, forces and changes of the 1950s and 1960s which finally resulted in the adoption of the two-year comprehensive community colleges were explored and interviews of some key individuals were also used to confirm the importance, credibility, and interpretation of those documents.

Based on the findings, several conclusions were made. First and foremost, the development of a comprehensive community college system in Virginia was not the direct result of a cry for democratization or broadening the base of higher education (equal opportunity). The development, in fact, evolved from a series of problems facing the State. Through the vision and leadership of Governor Mills E. Godwin, Jr., the establishment of the Virginia Community College system was promoted and adopted. Time, care, and thoughtful consideration (in the traditional Virginia fashion) brought to fruition this system which was an immediate cure for a number of ills. It answered the following needs: It provided a cost-effective and efficient way to accommodate an increasing enrollment; it was a vehicle for occupational/technical training in support of industrial development and keeping up with advancing technology; and it provided a method for coordination of all two-year institutions. And finally, although the Virginia Community College System was adopted without compromising the past tradition of conservatism and elitism, it did come to be a vehicle for broadening the base of higher education in Virginia.